

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Various pagings.

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

---

THIRD SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

---

52<sup>o</sup> VICTORIÆ, 1889

---

VOL. XXVII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF JANUARY TO THE  
TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE, 1889.



OTTAWA:  
PRINTED BY BROWN CHAMBERLIN, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.  
1889.



# MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE 3rd SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT,

1889.

---

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

---

*Clerk of the Privy Council* . . . . . JOHN JOSEPH MCGEE, Esq.

---

### OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

---

### OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

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

---

\* Died 1st April, 1889.



ALPHABETICAL LIST  
OF THE  
CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS  
OF THE  
**HOUSE OF COMMONS.**  
THIRD SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA,  
1889.

ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.  
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.  
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.  
ALGOMA—Simon J. Dawson.  
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.  
ANTIGONISH—Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson, K.C.M.G.  
ARGENTEUIL—James C. Wilson.  
ASSINIBOIA, East—Hon. Edgar Dewdney.  
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.  
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.  
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.  
BELLECHAËSE—Guillaume Amyot.  
BERTHEB—Cléophas Beausoleil.  
BONAVENTURE—Louis Joseph Riopel.  
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.  
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.  
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.  
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.  
BROME—Sydney Arthur Fisher.  
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.  
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.  
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.

CAPE BRETON— { Hector F. McDougall.  
                  { David McKeen.

CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.  
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.  
CARLETON (O.)—George Lemuel Dickinson.  
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.  
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.  
CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.  
CHARLEVOIX—Simon O'Brien.  
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.

CHATEAUGUAY—Edward Holton.  
CHICOUTIMI and SAGUENAY—Paul Couture.  
COLCHESTER—Hon. Sir Adams G. Archibald, K.C.M.G.  
COMPTON—Hon. John Henry Pope.\*  
CORNWALL and STORMONT—Darby Bergin.  
CUMBERLAND—Arthur R. Dickey.  
DIGBY—Herbert Ladd Jones.  
DORCHESTER—Honoré J. J. B. Chouinard.  
DRUMMOND and ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.  
DUNDAS—Charles Erastus Hickey.  
DURHAM, E. Riding—Henry Alfred Ward.  
DURHAM, W. Riding—Hon. Edward Blake.  
ELGIN, E. Riding—John H. Wilson.  
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.  
ESSEX, N. Riding—James Colebrooke Patterson.  
ESSEX, S. Riding—James Brien.  
FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.  
GASPÉ—Louis Z. Joncas.  
GLENGARRY—P. Purcell.  
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.  
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—Walter Shanly.  
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.  
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.  
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.  
GUYSBOROUGH—John A. Kirk.  
HALDIMAND—Charles Wesley Colter. †  
HALIFAX— { Hon. Alfred G. Jones.  
          { Thomas E. Kenny.  
HALTON—John Waldie.  
HAMILTON— { Adam Brown.  
              { Alexander McKay.

\* Died, 1st April, 1889.  
† Elected 30th January; took seat 14th February, and sat for balance of Session.

- HANTS**—Alfred Putnam.  
**HASTINGS, E. Riding**—Samuel Barion Burdett.  
**HASTINGS, N. Riding**—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.  
**HASTINGS, W. Riding**—Henry Corby.  
**HOCHELAGA**—Alphonse Desjardins.  
**HUNTINGDON**—Julius Scriver.  
**HURON, E. Riding**—Peter Macdonald.  
**HURON, S. Riding**—John McMillan.  
**HURON, W. Riding**—Robert Porter.  
**IBERVILLE**—François Béchard.  
**INVERNESS**—Hugh Cameron.  
**JACQUES CARTIER**—Désiré Girouard.  
**JOLIETTE**—Hilaire Neveu.  
**KAMOURASKA**—Alexis Dessaint.  
**KENT (N.B.)**—Pierre Amand Landry.  
**KENT (O.)**—Archibald Campbell.  
**KING'S (N.B.)**—Hon. George E. Foster.  
**KING'S (N.S.)**—Frederick W. Borden.  
**KING'S (P.E.I.)**— { Peter Adolphus McIntyre.  
                               { James Edwin Robertson.  
**KINGSTON**—Rt. Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, G.C.B.  
**LAMBTON, E. Riding**—George Moncrieff.  
**LAMBTON, W. Riding**—James Frederick Lister.  
**LANARK, N. Riding**—Joseph Jamieson.  
**LANARK, S. Riding**—Hon. John Graham Haggart.  
**LAPRAIRIE**—Cyrille Doyon.  
**L'ASSOMPTION**—Joseph Gauthier.  
**LAVAL**—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.  
**LEEDS and GRENVILLE, N. Riding**—Charles Frederick  
     Ferguson.  
**LEEDS, S. Riding**—George Taylor.  
**LENNOX**—Uriah Wilson.  
**LÉVIS**—Pierre Malcolm Guay.  
**LINCOLN and NIAGARA**—John Charles Rykert.  
**LIEGAR**—Arthur Wellington Ross.  
**L'ISLET**—Philippe Baby Casgrain.  
**LONDON**—Hon. John Carling.  
**LOTBINIÈRE**—Côme Isaie Rinfret.  
**LUNENBURG**—James Daniel Eisenhauer.  
**MARQUETTE**—Robert Watson.  
**MASKINONGÉ**—Charles Jérémie Coulombe.  
**MÉGANTIC**—George Turcotte.  
**MIDDLESEX, E. Riding**—Joseph Henry Marshall.  
**MIDDLESEX, N. Riding**—Timothy Coughlin.  
**MIDDLESEX, S. Riding**—James Armstrong.  
**MIDDLESEX, W. Riding**—William Frederick Roome.  
**MISSISSQUOI**—David Bishop Meigs.  
**MONCK**—Arthur Boyle.  
**MONTCALM**—Olaüs Thérien.  
**MONTMAGNY**—P. Aug. Choquette.  
**MONTMORENCY**—Charles Langelier.  
**MONTREAL, Centre**—John Joseph Curran.  
**MONTREAL, East**—Alphonse Télesphore Lépine.  
**MONTREAL, West**—Sir Donald A. Smith, K.C.M.G.  
**MUSKOKA**—William Edward O'Brien.  
**NAPIÉVILLE**—Louis St. Marie.  
**NEW WESTMINSTER**—Donald Chisholm.  
**NICOLET**—Fabien Boisvert.  
**NORFOLK, N. Riding**—John Charlton.  
**NORFOLK, S. Riding**—David Tisdale.  
**NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)**—Hon. Peter Mitchell.  
**NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. R.**—Edward Cochrane.  
**NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. R.**—George Guillet.  
**ONTARIO, N. Riding**—Frank Madill.  
**ONTARIO, S. Riding**—William Smith.  
**ONTARIO, W. Riding**—James David Edgar.  
**OTTAWA (City)**— { William Goodhue Perley.  
                               { Honoré Robillard.  
**OTTAWA (County)**—Alozo Wright.  
**OXFORD, N. Riding**—James Sutherland.  
**OXFORD, S. Riding**—Hon. Sir R. J. Cartwright, K.C.M.G.  
**PEEL**—William A. McCulla.  
**PERTH, N. Riding**—Samuel Rollin Hesson.  
**PERTH, S. Riding**—James Trow.  
**PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding**—John Lang.  
**PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding**—James Stevenson.  
**PICTOU**— { Hon. Charles Hibbert Tupper.  
                   { John McDougald.  
**PONTIAC**—John Bryson.  
**PORTNEUF**—Joseph E. A. De St. Georges.  
**PRESCOTT**—Simon Labrosse.  
**PRINCE (P.E.I.)**— { Stanislaus F. Perry.  
                               { James Yeo.  
**PRINCE EDWARD**—John Milton Piatt.  
**PROVENCHER**—Alphonse A. C. La Rivière.  
**QUEBEC, Centre**—François Langelier.  
**QUEBEC, East**—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.  
**QUEBEC, West**—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.  
**QUEBEC (County)**—Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron, K.C.M.G.  
**QUEEN'S (N.B.)**—George F. Baird.  
**QUEEN'S (N.S.)**—Joshua Newton Freeman.  
**QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)**— { Louis Henry Davies.  
                               { William Welsh.  
**RENFREW, N. Riding**—Peter White.  
**RENFREW, S. Riding**—John Ferguson.  
**RESTIGOUCHE**—George Moffat.  
**RICHELIEU**—Jean Baptiste Labelle.  
**RICHMOND (N.S.)**—Edmund Power Flynn.  
**RICHMOND and WOLFE (Q.)**—William Bullock Ives.

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

---

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

<b>BÉCHARD</b> , Mr. François ( <i>Iberville</i> ).	<b>PRIOR</b> , Mr. Edward Gawler ( <i>Victoria, B.C.</i> )
<b>CHARLTON</b> , Mr. John ( <i>North Norfolk</i> ).	<b>SCRIVER</b> , Mr. Jules ( <i>Huntingdon</i> ).
<b>COLBY</b> , Mr. Charles C. ( <i>Stanstead</i> ).	<b>SOMERVILLE</b> , Mr. James ( <i>West Bruce</i> ).
<b>DAVIN</b> , Mr. N. F. ( <i>West Assiniboia</i> ).	<b>TAYLOR</b> , Mr. George ( <i>South Leeds</i> ).
<b>DESJARDINS</b> , Mr. Alphonse ( <i>Hochelaga</i> ).	<b>TUPPER</b> , Mr. Charles H. ( <i>Pictou</i> ).
<b>ELLIS</b> , Mr. John V. ( <i>St. John, N.B., City</i> ).	<b>VANASSE</b> , Mr. Fabien ( <i>Yamaska</i> ).
<b>INNES</b> , Mr. James ( <i>South Wellington</i> ).	<b>WELDON</b> , Mr. R. Chapman ( <i>Albert</i> ).

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



## LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. Mulock's proposed resolution (Removal of Duty on Artificial Fertilisers) 13th February:—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. JONCAS.	MR. GODBOUT.
MR. FERGUSON (Leeds).	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. PRIOR.	MR. FISHER.
HON. MR. KIRKPATRICK.	MR. WALDIE.
MR. MCCARTHY.	MR. PURCELL.
MR. LABELLE.	MR. PRÉFONTAINE.

On Mr. Landerkin's proposed resolution (Rebate of Duty on Corn) 14th February:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
HON. MR. POPE.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. FERGUSON.	MR. BERNIER.
MR. CURRAN.	MR. WELSH.
MR. JONCAS.	MR. PRÉFONTAINE.
MR. MCCARTHY.	MR. MULOOK.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	MR. HOLTON.
HON. MR. DEWDNEY.	MR. CHARLTON.

On Sir Richard Cartwright's proposed resolution (Address to Her Majesty *re* Commercial Treaties) 18th February:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
HON. MR. POPE.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. McMILLAN.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. STEVENSON.	MR. COOK.
MR. WILMOT.	MR. McMULLEN.
MR. SHANLY.	MR. BEAUSOLEIL.
MR. LÉPINE.	MR. TURCOT.
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).	MR. WELSH.
MR. RYKERT.	MR. MULOOK.
MR. COOKBURN.	MR. CHOQUETTE.
MR. DAOUST.	MR. LANGELIER (Montmorency).
MR. JAMIESON.	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. COLBY.	MR. BURDETT.
MR. KENNY.	HON. MR. JONES (Halifax).

On Mr. Jamieson's proposed resolution (Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors) 21st February:—

MR. BROWN.	MR. SUTHERLAND.
HON. MR. TUPPER.	MR. DAVIES.
MR. MARSHALL.	MR. WELDON (St. John).

On Mr. Watson's amendment (Maximum Rate on Coal) to Mr. Shanly's motion for third reading of Bill 14, incorporating the Alberta Railway and Coal Company, 25th February:—

MR. MCGREEVY.	MR. LANGELIER (Quebec).
MR. STEVENSON.	MR. BARRON.
MR. COBBY.	MR. WALDIE.
MR. WILSON (Argenteuil).	MR. DESSAINT.
MR. SPROULE.	MR. GUAY.

*Ministerial.*

MR. MASSON.  
MR. HICKEY.  
MR. DAOUST.  
MR. WOOD (Brockville).  
MR. FERGUSON (Leeds).  
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).  
MR. PRIOR.  
MR. GIROUARD.  
MR. MCCARTHY.

*Opposition.*

MR. BEAUSOLEIL.  
MR. RINFRET.  
MR. DOYON.  
HON. MR. JONES (Halifax).  
SIR R. J. CARTWRIGHT.  
MR. LANGELIER (Montmorency).  
MR. PRÉFONTAINE.  
MR. BÉCHARD.  
MR. WELSH.

On Mr. Laurier's proposed resolution (Fisheries), in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 1st March:—

HON. MR. POPE.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. TISDALE.	MR. EDWARDS.
MR. McKEEN.	MR. MULOOK.
MR. MONCRIEFF.	MR. SUTHERLAND.
MR. STEVENSON.	MR. COOK.
MR. CARPENTER.	MR. LISTER.
MR. WARD.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. BOYLE.	MR. McMILLAN.
MR. BERGIN.	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. BRYSON.	MR. BERNIER.
MR. PUTNAM.	MR. ROBERTSON.
MR. MEIGS.	MR. HUDSPETH.
MR. MOFFAT.	MR. HALL.
MR. CAMERON.	MR. HOLTON.
MR. COBBY.	MR. CASEY.
MR. LABROSSE.	MR. LIVINGSTON.
MR. SUARTE.	MR. AMYOT.

On Sir Richard Cartwright's proposed resolution (Unrestricted Reciprocity) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 19th March:—

HON. MR. POPE.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. MCKAY.	MR. LAVERGNE.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	MR. GEOFFRION.
SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. TISDALE.	MR. COLTER.
GEN. LAURIE.	MR. AMYOT.
MR. THÉRIEN.	MR. FISSET.

On Mr. Laurier's amendment (Repeal) to Sir John Thomson's motion for second reading of Bill 4, respecting the Electoral Franchise, 3rd April:—

MR. HALL.	MR. AUDET.
MR. GIROUARD.	MR. BEAUSOLEIL.
MR. IVES.	MR. GEOFFRION.
MR. DAVIS.	MR. EDWARDS.
SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
HON. MR. DEWDNEY.	MR. MCINTYRE.
MR. RYKERT.	MR. WELSH.
MR. COLBY.	MR. COULOMBE.
GEN. LAURIE.	MR. BERGERON.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	MR. YEO.
HON. MR. COSTIGAN.	MR. COOK.
MR. MCCARTHY.	MR. BARRON.

On Mr. Ellis' amendment (six months' hoist) to Mr. Tupper's motion for third reading of Bill 129, to amend the Fisheries Act, 9th April:—

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. GEOFFRION.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. FISHER.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Gen. LAURIE.	Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

On Sir Richard Cartwright's proposed resolution (Loan of 1888) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 10th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. EISENHAUER.
HON. MR. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. GEOFFRION.

On Mr. Jones' (Halifax) amendment (Reduction of Salaries) to Sir John A. Macdonald's motion for second reading of Bill 118, respecting Pensions to Mounted Police Force, 15th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MCKAY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. LANGELIER.

On Mr. Charlton's amendment to Sir John Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 4, respecting the Electoral Franchise, 15th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MCKAY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. LANGELIER.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. DESSAINT.
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. DE ST. GEORGES.
Mr. WRIGHT.	HON. MR. MITCHELL.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. HALE.

On Mr. Davies' (P.E.I.) amendment:—  
(Same as last) with the addition of  
Mr. DAWSON. Mr. SCRIVER.

On Mr. White's (Renfrew) amendment (Registration Fee on Letters) to Mr. Haggart's motion for third reading of Bill 93, to amend the Post Office Act, 15th April:—  
(Same as last) with the addition of  
Mr. McKEEN. Mr. WELSH.

On Mr. Holton's proposed resolution (Customs Seizures) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 16th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MCKAY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. COUGHLIN.	Mr. BÉCHARD.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. COOK.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	Mr. GEOFFRION.

On Mr. Fisher's proposed resolution (Intoxicating Liquors in North-West Territories) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 17th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. BOISVERT.	Mr. TURCOT.
Mr. LABELLE.	Mr. COFFURE.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. TROW.
Mr. HICKEY.	Mr. LANDERKIN.
Mr. MADILL.	Mr. INNIS.
HON. MR. FOSTER.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. LANDRY.	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. GEOFFRION.

On Mr. Laurier's amendment (re Steamship Service, B.C. and Australia) to Mr. Foster's motion to concur in resolution reported from Committee of Whole, 22nd April:—

Mr. MCKAY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. BOISVERT.	Mr. TURCOTTE.
Mr. HUDSPETH.	Mr. BARRON.
Mr. JAMIESON.	Mr. FISHER.
Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. OROUETTE.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. FERGUSON (Renfrew).	Mr. MEIGS.
Mr. BOYLE.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. DENISON.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.	SIR R. J. CARTWRIGHT.
Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. COUGHLIN.	Mr. GEOFFRION.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. BERNIER.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. DE ST. GEORGES.
Mr. HICKEY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).

On Mr. Barron's proposed resolution (Sale of Timber on Indian Reserves) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 23rd April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. BAIN.	Mr. DE ST. GEORGES.
Mr. LANDRY.	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. EDWARDS.
SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.	Mr. ROWAND.
Mr. HALL.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. KIRK.
Mr. COUGHLIN.	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. MCINTYRE.

## LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. Mulock's proposed resolution (Militia Clothing) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 25th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. MCKAY.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. SCARTH.	MR. YEO.
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).	MR. BURDETT.
MR. MONORIEFF.	MR. LISTER.
MR. CHISHOLM.	MR. DE ST. GEORGES.
MR. O'BRIEN.	MR. MEIGS.
HON. MR. COSTIGAN.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
SIR JOHN A. McDONALD.	HON. MR. LAURIER.
MR. CORBY.	MR. BOWMAN.
HON. MR. TUPPER.	MR. EDGAR.
MR. ROOME.	MR. McDONALD (Huron).
MR. HALL.	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. WRIGHT.	MR. CASGRAIN.
HON. MR. CHAPLEAU.	MR. AMYOT.
MR. MACDOWALL.	MR. CHOQUETTE.
SIR D. A. SMITH.	MR. GILLMOR.

On Mr. Barron's proposed resolution (Duty on Saw Logs) in amendment to Committee of Supply, 26th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. MCKAY.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. SCARTH.	MR. YEO.
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).	MR. BURDETT.
MR. MONORIEFF.	MR. LISTER.
MR. CHISHOLM.	MR. DE ST. GEORGES.
MR. O'BRIEN.	MR. MEIGS.
HON. MR. COSTIGAN.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. CORBY.	MR. BOWMAN.
MR. TUPPER.	MR. EDGAR.
MR. ROOME.	MR. McDONALD (Huron).
MR. WILSON (Lennox).	MR. COUTURE.
MR. JONCAS.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. WHITE (Renfrew).	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. HICKEY.	MR. LANGELIER (Quebec).
MR. WRIGHT.	MR. HALE.
MR. WHITE (Cardwell).	HON. MR. MITCHELL.

On Sir Richard Cartwright's amendment (*re* Manitoba Penitentiary) to motion to concur in resolution reported from Committee of Supply, 26th April:—

SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. SCARTH.	MR. YEO.
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).	MR. BURDETT.
MR. MONORIEFF.	MR. LISTER.
MR. CHISHOLM.	MR. DE ST. GEORGES.
MR. O'BRIEN.	MR. MEIGS.
HON. MR. COSTIGAN.	HON. MR. BLAKE.
MR. CORBY.	MR. BOWMAN.

HON. MR. TUPPER.	MR. EDGAR.
MR. ROOME.	MR. McDONALD (Huron).
MR. WILSON (Lennox).	MR. COUTURE.
MR. JONCAS.	MR. LAVERGNE.
MR. WHITE (Renfrew).	MR. MULOCK.
MR. WOOD (Brockville).	MR. CHOUINARD.
MR. HICKEY.	MR. LANGELIER (Quebec).
MR. WRIGHT.	MR. HALE.
MR. WHITE (Cardwell).	HON. MR. MITCHELL.
MR. HESSON.	MR. LIVINGSTON.
MR. PERLEY.	MR. EDWARDS.
MR. SKINNER.	MR. SCRIVER.
MR. CARGILL.	MR. LANDERKIN.

The following paired on all Subjects for balance of Session,

29th April:—

MR. McDOUGALD (Pictou).	MR. FLYNN.
MR. VANASSE.	MR. BOURASSA.
MR. THÉRIEN.	MR. GAUTHIER.
MR. DESAULNIERS.	MR. BEAUSOLEIL.
MR. JAMIESON.	MR. BÉCHARD.
MR. WILSON (Argenteuil).	MR. GUAY.
MR. FREEMAN.	MR. LANGELIER (Montmorency)
MR. NEVEU.	MR. GIGAUT.
SIR A. ARCHIBALD.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. AUDET.	MR. TURCOT.
MR. DALY.	MR. WELSH.
MR. WOOD (Brockville).	MR. LANGELIER (Quebec).
MR. BELL.	MR. BERNIER.
MR. GRANDBOIS.	MR. FISET.
MR. BAIRD.	MR. HALE.
MR. CARPENTER.	MR. AMYOT.
MR. HESSON.	MR. LIVINGSTON.
MR. SMITH (Ontario).	MR. SEMPLÉ.
MR. COULOMBE.	MR. RINFRET.
MR. BOYLE.	MR. DESSAINT.
MR. FERGUSON (Welland).	MR. BURDETT.
MR. SCARTH.	MR. YEO.
MR. MONORIEFF.	MR. LISTER.
MR. CHISHOLM.	MR. DE ST. GEORGES.
MR. O'BRIEN.	MR. MEIGS.
MR. CORBY.	MR. BOWMAN.
MR. ROOME.	MR. McDONALD (Huron).
MR. WILSON (Lennox).	MR. COUTURE.
MR. CARGILL.	MR. LANDERKIN.
MR. TISDALE.	MR. LANG.
MR. MASSON.	MR. ROWAND.
MR. FERGUSON (Renfrew).	MR. GODBOUT.
MR. MARSHALL.	MR. McMILLAN (Huron).
MR. HUDSPETH.	MR. BARRON.
MR. MILLS (Annapolis).	MR. ROBERTSON.
MR. PUTNAM or LANDRY.	MR. EISENHAUER.

# House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—52 VIC.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 31st January, 1889.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 31st day of January, 1889, for the Despatch of Business.

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

### PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

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

For the Electoral District of Halton.

For the Electoral District of Shelburne.

For the Electoral District of Northumberland, East.

For the Electoral District of Haldimand.

For the Electoral District of Joliette.

For the Electoral District of Hastings, East.

For the Electoral District of Laprairie.

For the Electoral District of Maskinongé.

For the Electoral District of Simcoe, East.

For the Electoral District of Cumberland.

### VACANCIES.

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

Of CHAS. HIBBERT TUPPER, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Pictou, by acceptance of office of emolument under the Crown.

Of the Hon. Sir CHAS. TUPPER, G. C. M. G., Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, by acceptance of office of High Commissioner for Canada in London, G. B.

Of ATHANASE GAUDET, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, by decease.

Of the Hon. A. W. McLELLAN, Member for the Electoral District of Colchester, by acceptance of office of Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Nova Scotia.

Of WM. DELL PERLEY, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Assiniboia East, by being summoned to the Senate.

Of JOHN GRAHAM HAGGART, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Lanark, South Riding, by acceptance of office of emolument under the Crown.

Of MICHEL JOSEPH C. COURSOL, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Montreal East, by decease.

Of the Hon. THOMAS WHITE, Member for the Electoral District of Cardwell, by decease.

Of JAMES REID, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cariboo, by being summoned to the Senate.

Of the Hon. JOSEPH ROYAL, Member for the Electoral District of Prov-  
encher, by the acceptance of the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories.

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

### NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of the Hon. CHAS. HIBBERT TUPPER, for the Electoral District of Pictou.

Of ARTHUR R. DICKEY, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cumberland.

Of FABIEN BOISVERT, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Nicolet.

Of the Hon. Sir ADAMS G. ARCHIBALD, K.C.M.G., for the Electoral District of Colchester.

Of JOHN WALDIE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Halton.

Of the Hon. JOHN GRAHAM HAGGART, for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Lanark.

Of the Hon. EDGAR DEWDNEY, for the Electoral District of East Assiniboia.

Of ALPHONSE TÉLESOPHORE LÉPINE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Montreal East.

Of ROBERT SMERTON WHITE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cardwell.

Of Lieut.-Gen. J. WIMBURN LAURIE, for the Electoral District of Shelburne.

Of FRANK STILLMAN BARNARD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cariboo.

Of EDWARD COCHRANE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Northumberland (Ont.) East.

Of HILAIRE NEYRU, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Joliette.

### MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

HON. CHAS. H. TUPPER, Member for the Electoral District of Pictou, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson.

FABIEN BOISVERT, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Vanasse.

HON. JOHN G. HAGGART, Member for the Electoral District of North Lanark, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.

HON. EDGAR DEWDNEY, Member for the Electoral District of East Assiniboia, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Foster.

SIR ADAMS G. ARCHIBALD, Member for the Electoral District of Colchester, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir John S. D. Thompson.

ALPHONSE TÉLESOPHORE LÉPINE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Montreal East, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. J. J. Curran.

ROBERT SMERTON WHITE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cardwell, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. N. C. Wallace.

ARTHUR R. DICKEY, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir John S. D. Thompson.

HILAIRE NEYRU, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Joliette, introduced by the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Beausoleil.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the administration of oaths of office.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

In addressing the Parliament of Canada for the first time, in fulfilment of the important trust which has been committed to me as Her Majesty's Representative, I desire to express the satisfaction with which I resort to your advice and assistance.

I am conscious of the honor which attends my association with your labors for the welfare of the Dominion, and it will be my earnest endeavor to co-operate with you, to the utmost of my power, in all that may promote the prosperity of the people of this country, the development of her material resources, and the maintenance of the constitutional ties which unite her provinces.

It is to be regretted that the treaty concluded between Her Majesty and the President of the United States, for the adjustment of the questions which have arisen with reference to "The Fisheries," has not been sanctioned by the United States Senate, in whom the power of ratification is vested; and that our legislation of last year on the subject is therefore in a great measure inoperative.

It now only remains for Canada to continue to maintain her rights as prescribed by the Convention of 1818, until some satisfactory readjustment is arranged by treaty between the two nations.

A measure will again be submitted to you to amend the Acts respecting the Electoral Franchise, for the purpose of simplifying the law and lessening the cost of its operation.

It is expedient, in the interests of commerce, to assimilate, and in some particulars to amend, the laws which now obtain in the several Provinces of the Dominion relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes; and a Bill with this object will be laid before you.

A Bill will also be provided for making uniform throughout the Dominion the laws relating to Bills of Lading.

During the recess my Government has carefully considered the subject of Ocean Steam Service, and you will be asked to provide subsidies for the improvement of the Atlantic Mail Service, and for the establishment, in concert with Her Majesty's Government, of a line of fast steamers between British Columbia and China and Japan. Your attention will also be invited to the best mode of developing our trade, and securing direct communication by steam with Australasia, the West Indies and South America.

A Bill will be submitted for your consideration for the prevention of certain offences in connection with Municipal Councils, and to give greater facilities for making enquiries as to such matters.

Several measures will also be presented to you for improving the Law of Procedure in Criminal Cases. Among these will be a Bill to permit the release on probation of persons convicted of first offences, a Bill authorising regulations to be made for the practice in cases partaking of the nature of criminal proceedings, and a Bill to make the Speedy Trials Act applicable throughout Canada.

Bills relating to the inspection of timber and lumber, for the improvement of the Postal System, and for increasing the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police, will also be submitted for your consideration.

The Royal Commissioners on Labor having concluded their enquiries, I hope to be able to lay before you at an early day their report with the important evidence collected by them in various parts of Canada.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

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

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I now commend these several subjects and the others which may be brought before you to your earnest consideration, and I trust that the result of your deliberations may, under the Divine Blessing, tend to promote the well-being and prosperity of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

## REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House,—The Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament.

## SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

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

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

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election appeal of Poirier vs. Fiset, said judgment dismissing the appeal.

## NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Alphonse A. C. LaRivière as Member for Provencher.

## REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

The Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Foster.)

Annual Report of the Department of Marine for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Tupper.)

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

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Costigan.)

#### DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I wish, with the consent of the House, to make the usual motion for the appointment of the *Hansard* Committee. The motion is as follows:—

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

The names are the same as those which have been on the committee for the last two years, with the exception of Mr. Royal. It is proposed to substitute Mr. Vanasse for Mr. Royal.

Mr. LAURIER. With regard to this motion, I wish to ask will the hon. gentleman tell the House that this is substantially the same committee as was appointed last year?

Mr. BOWELL. The names of the committee are precisely the same with the exception of the substitution of Mr. Vanasse for Mr. Royal, who is now Lieut. Governor of the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

EDWARD COCHRANE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of East Northumberland, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Taylor.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I have to ask from this House that indulgence and kindly consideration which have always been generously accorded to young and inexperienced members—an indulgence and a consideration the more needed in my case, because I cannot stand on the floor of this House without having pressed home upon me the recollection of the circumstances under which I came to have the honor to be here. When this House met a year ago another voice spoke as the representative of Cardwell, the voice of one whose public services were deemed by his constituency, by a generous and loyal people, to merit the election of myself as his successor in this House. Since Parliament prorogued we have speeded a parting Governor General and welcomed a coming one; and I am sure I but echo the sentiments of every gentleman in this House when I say that Lord Stanley, the present Governor General, since his advent to Canada, has manifested his appreciation of the importance of the Dominion, the magnificence of her resources, and the splendid opportunities afforded her of building up a powerful and prosperous country in alliance with Great Britain. He has done, Sir, more than that; he has shown himself to possess a hearty sympathy with the aspirations of the people of this Dominion; he has, in the speeches he has made throughout the country, urged them to cultivate a national sentiment, and to rally round the Dominion as the central power; and I think I can confidently express the conviction that when Lord Stanley, having served his term, comes to say farewell to this coun-

try, he will receive the unanimous testimony of the Canadian people to his earnest endeavors to co-operate with them in all that tends to promote the prosperity of the people of this country, the development of her material resources, and the maintenance of the constitutional ties which unite her Provinces. The first question touched upon in the Speech of His Excellency is one of very considerable importance, that of the fisheries. It must be a matter of regret to every gentleman in this House that the work of the Joint High Commission, which met at Washington a little over a year ago, has been rendered inoperative by the action of the Senate of the United States. Sir, since Parliament prorogued, since the very thorough discussion of that question which was had on the floor of this House, it has passed through several phases. It will be remembered that President Cleveland consented to the appointment of a Joint High Commission, and no doubt he had an accurate knowledge of the proceedings of that Commission from time to time; and in submitting to the Senate the treaty which was agreed upon, he used this language:

"The treaty meets my approval, because I believe that it supplies a satisfactory, practical and final adjustment upon a basis honorable and just to both parties, of the difficult and vexed question to which it relates."

Well, Sir, after a discussion continuing through some months, the Senate of the United States, by a strict party vote, rejected the convention, and two days afterwards President Cleveland sent down to Congress what is known as his retaliatory message. Everybody must regret most sincerely that that message was sent down, and I think I do not exaggerate when I say that the position taken by the President of the United States in that document was an illogical and inconsistent one, directly opposed to his whole anterior course in relation to the question. Sir, it seems to me I am justified in holding that that message was prompted by the exigencies of party politics in the United States, and that Canada was made, on the eve of a general election, the football of both parties, to be kicked about for the amusement of the Anglophobes in the United States. Now, Sir, may I be permitted for a moment to refer to that retaliatory message? It began by reiterating the President's approval of the convention that had been shortly before concluded between Great Britain and the United States. In it the President declared:

"I fully believe that this treaty just rejected by the Senate was well suited to the exigency, and that its provisions were adequate for our security in the future from vexatious incidents, and for the promotion of friendly neighborhood and intimacy without sacrificing in the least our national pride and dignity."

So that, you will observe, he repeated in express terms his approval of the treaty which had been concluded between the two nations. Then he went on to propound his retaliatory policy, the ostensible pretext for which was, to quote his language, that:

"In forbidding the transit of the catch of our fishermen over their territory in bond and free of duty, the Canadian authorities deprived us of the only facility dependent on their concession, and for which we could supply no substitute."

That is to say, the Canadian people were threatened with a measure of commercial non-intercourse, not because they had declined to treat, not because they had refused to accept a new convention covering the fisheries, but because the Republican majority in the Senate had rejected the work of the Joint High Commission. Canada did, it is true, and does yet, as I understand, deny the privilege of transhipment of catch, and what is her warrant for that course? The Treaty of 1818? Yes, no doubt; but not the British and Canadian interpretation of that instrument alone. There is yet another, and, perhaps, a higher justification of Canada's course, namely, the full and absolute recognition by the United States Government of the right of such refusal. The treaty concluded in February last year, the treaty to which President Cleveland gave his consent, upheld every material

and substantial claim made by Canada under the Convention of 1818. By that treaty United States fishermen were excluded from the purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits; transshipment of catch, for transport by any means of conveyance, and shipping of crews, until and only when Congress abolished the duty on Canadian fish imported into the United States. If that convention, to which President Cleveland had given his assent, had been adopted by the Senate of the United States, American fishermen would still have been debarred from the privilege of transshipping their catch in bond through Canada, and from enjoying commercial rights in our ports. So that you will observe the inconsistency of Mr. Cleveland's course in first of all recommending to the Congress of the United States the adoption of this very treaty, which provided for the exclusion of American fishermen from the right of transshipping their catch, and then, when the Senate rejected that treaty, turning round upon Canada and menacing us with the threat of commercial non-intercourse because we declined to allow, in contravention of the Treaty of 1818, American fishermen to transship their catch to our country in bond. It must, I am sure, have been a matter of gratification to every member of this House, to observe the admirable temper in which that threat of retaliation was received by the people of Canada. The press of both parties, I think, almost without distinction, declared that the course of the Canadian Government was the right one, and that we should not, in the face of a threat, recede from the position we had assumed. There was, indeed, one voice—and I presume that during this Session the subject will be referred to—raised, if not in support of the position of the United States, at least in opposition to the course of Canada. I refer to the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier), who declared at St. Thomas, some two or three days after the retaliation message was sent down to Congress, that the policy of the Canadian Government was a vicious policy, that it was an unfriendly, injudicious and a harsh policy, and that it ought to be reversed. Why? Because it was said that Canada, in the enforcement of her interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, had pursued an illiberal, vicious course towards the United States; and yet, within a few days after that statement was made, President Cleveland sent down to Congress a message, in which he declared that since March 3rd, 1887—that is to say, through two whole fishing seasons—"No case has been reported to the Department of State wherein complaint has been made of unfriendly or unlawful treatment of American fishing vessels on the part of the Canadian authorities, in which reparation was not promptly and satisfactorily obtained by the United States." It seems to me that that statement affords sufficient answer to the contention that the course of Canada, in the enforcement of her rights under the Treaty of 1818, has been harsh and illiberal. What has been the course of Canada? She has pressed for the last thirty-five years for an arrangement with the United States which would suspend the operation of the Treaty of 1818 and supplant that by a new arrangement based upon mutual concession and mutual advantages. The Treaty of 1854 was concluded with that object in view, and so was the subsequent Treaty of 1871. Both treaties were terminated by the United States. The latest effort to settle the question has also been rejected by the United States; and if to-day the provisions of the treaty of seventy years ago are deemed oppressive, if to-day they are found to be harsh towards the United States fishermen and to operate to their injury and disadvantage, the fault rests, not with Ottawa, not with London, but with Washington and the Congress of the United States. There is, therefore, no other course now open to the Parliament of Canada than that of firmly maintaining the rights solemnly covenanted between the two countries in 1818; and I am in hopes that the incoming

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

Administration in the United States, controlling both Houses, a Republican Administration, which, both in 1854 and 1871, concluded treaties that have been in force, will regard the position in another light than that in which they have regarded it during recent months, and will be able to devise such a basis of settlement as will be satisfactory to the two countries and promote those friendly relations we all desire should exist between them. Had that threat of retaliation been listened to, had the recommendation of President Cleveland been acceded to by the Congress of the United States, Canada would undoubtedly have suffered for a time more or less seriously; but I may point out this fact, that while the transit trade of Canada across the territory of the United States, in 1832 and 1883, averaged about \$66,000,000 annually, in 1886 and 1887 that trade had fallen to an average of only \$32,000,000, or to one-half, showing the growing independence of Canada with regard to her channels of communication with foreign countries. His Excellency, in the Speech from the Throne, has intimated that a measure will be introduced this Session for the purpose of amending, in some particulars, the Franchise Act. That Act has undoubtedly enlarged the electorate by broadening the basis of the suffrage, and has secured the advantage of practical uniformity the country over. The subject of the franchise has been debated more or less since 1885, in the press, on the platform, and on the floor of this House, and I think it is a fair interpretation of the discussions to say that the current of opinion has favored the principle of the Dominion law, and that the only objections advanced to the measure have had relation to the expense of the revision and preparation of the lists and the somewhat complex character of the law. The House has, therefore, I am sure, heard with pleasure the intention of the Government to simplify the law and lessen the cost of its operation. These reforms effected, there should be little to cavil at in the Franchise, for its character is already so liberal as virtually to confer the suffrage on every citizen who is not a confirmed pauper, who, in a word, has a stake in the country's progress and prosperity and is interested in the maintenance of law and order. But by far the most important subject alluded to in the Speech from the Throne is that in which we are promised measures looking to the improvement of the Atlantic mail service and to the establishment of steam communication between British Columbia and China and Japan. There can be no doubt of the importance of perfecting the chain of communication *via* Canada between England and the East, and of making the Canadian route the principal avenue of the inter and transcontinental trade. If there could be any cause for hesitation in the adoption of this policy, I imagine it would be based upon the consideration of the expense involved, because it is presumable that in the establishment of a line of steamships on the Pacific, and in the improvement of the Atlantic mail service, some additional expenditure will have to be made by Parliament; but I may recall to the House this fact, that, thirty-five years ago, the old Province of Canada thought the establishment of direct communication between Canada and Great Britain of so much consequence as to warrant the granting of a subsidy of no less than \$220,000 a year for that purpose; and it seems to me that the Dominion, with the immense development which has taken place in the past thirty-five years, with the vastly increased wealth and resources of the country, is quite well able to stand any expense which the establishment of this service may entail. As evidencing the improved financial condition of Canada in recent years, let me quote this fact, that between Confederation and 1879, in the first twelve years after 1867, of the total increase of \$67,200,000 in the debt of the country, every dollar but \$6,000,000 was obtained from London by means of loans, whereas in the last nine years of the total increase in the net debt of \$91,500,000, no less than \$43,200,-

000 has been obtained from the Canadian people alone. And of the interest payable on our debt in London between 1867 and 1879, the first twelve years after Confederation, the amount of that interest increased \$2,178,600, whereas in the last nine years the increase has only been \$1,084,100. That is to say, our people, through their increased wealth, are able to carry a larger proportion of the debt of the country than ever before, and to make a larger contribution to capital account for works of general utility. It is true that we have spent a good deal of money in the past, largely in connection with the Pacific Railway, but, while, when these expenditures were first contemplated, it was stated that the result would be bankruptcy and ruin to Canada, we find in the last year that the Government has been able to effect a loan in England on the best terms ever obtained by this country, that is, at 95-10 for a 3 per cent. loan, thus placing the credit of Canada on a parity with that of India and very nearly as high as that of the mother country herself. This is due to the material development of Canada which has resulted from the policy of the present Government. In the Speech from the Throne, attention is also called to the best mode of developing our trade, and securing direct communication by steam with Australasia, the West Indies and South America. These are countries which afford markets of exchange and not markets of competition. Canada has already made some progress in the development of its trade with these countries, the aggregate trade of Canada with the West Indies, South America and China and Japan, having increased in the last nine years from \$6,000,600 to \$10,518,540. In order to show the possibilities of that trade, let me mention that in 1887 the United States traded with these countries to the extent of \$234,437,000, as against an amount of \$10,518,540 for Canada; and I cannot better illustrate the promise of that trade than by making such a contrast as this between the two countries. The trade of the United States, in 1887, with South America was \$1.55 per head of the population, while the trade of Canada with South America was 48 cents per head. The trade of the United States with the West Indies was \$1.50 per head of the population, while the trade of Canada was \$1.17 per head. The trade of the United States with China and Japan was 85 cents per head, and that of Canada was only 45 cents per head. The aggregate trade of Canada with these different countries amounted to only \$2.10, while the trade of the United States was nearly double, being \$3.90 per head. It is known to you that we possess the materials of trade to the same extent, or nearly so, as the United States. If we lack anything in the way of natural products it is in respect of raw cotton, but our facilities for the manufacture of cotton are quite as good as those on the other side, and an instance of this is the fact that during the past year there have been exported from the product of the Canadian cotton mills to China and Japan no less than 12,000 bales of manufactured cotton. As another illustration of the ability of Canada to carry on successfully commerce with foreign nations if sufficient facilities are provided, I may mention that Canada's trade with Great Britain last year was \$17.90 per head, while the trade of the United States with Great Britain was \$8.85 per head, only half that of Canada. That is to say, our trade with the mother country is double that of the United States, while with South America, China and Japan, and the West Indies, it is only half that of the United States. What we require is improved facilities of communication, and these improved facilities of communication cannot be obtained without some expenditure on the part of the Government, but the results to be achieved will fully justify such an expenditure in the future, as they have justified the expenditures in the past, in relation to which I cannot state a better instance than that the cost of transportation has been so largely decreased on railroads which have been assisted by the Dominion of Canada. We find that

the cost of transportation on these railways is lower than the cost of transportation over the railway system of any other country in the world, and the credit of the country has at the same time been enhanced by its enterprise in material development. Various other measures are indicated in the Speech from the Throne, all of them designed to promote the welfare of the people, to perfect the machinery of administration, and to provide for the uniformity of the laws. If there is not much legislation proposed, we may remember that it has been said to be good policy not to make many laws, because many laws occasion much transgression. Finally, we have the usual reference to the estimates and the accounts, and it will be learned with pleasure by the House that the financial results of the last six months have assured a large and substantial surplus during the present year. The trade of the past year has been generally favorable. The crops, which contribute so largely to the revenues of the country, have not been notably prosperous, I grant you, but the harvest has been a fair one, and the prices for nearly all cereal products have been higher than usual. I quote only one fact in order to show the steady progress the country is making, and that is, that the assessed valuation of real property in the cities of Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Sherbrooke, London, Hamilton and Halifax, which are the only returns I have been able to obtain, has increased last year by no less than \$26,191,000, or more than \$10,000,000 over the total increase of the assessment from 1873 to 1878. I have to thank the House for the patience, courtesy and kindly consideration which it has given to me, and, in conclusion, I beg to move:

That a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session; and further to assure His Excellency that we are grateful to him for intimating to us that, in addressing the Parliament of Canada for the first time, in fulfilment of the important trust which has been committed to him, as Her Majesty's Representative, he desires to express the satisfaction with which he resorts to our advice and assistance.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that he is conscious of the honor which attends his association with our labors for the welfare of the Dominion, and that it will be his earnest endeavor to co-operate with us, to the utmost of his power, in all that may promote the prosperity of the people of this country, the development of her material resources, and the maintenance of the constitutional ties which unite her provinces.

That with His Excellency we agree that it is to be regretted that the treaty concluded between Her Majesty and the President of the United States for the adjustment of the questions which have arisen with reference to "The Fisheries," has not been sanctioned by the United States Senate, in whom the power of ratification is vested, and that our legislation of last year on the subject is therefore in a great measure inoperative.

That we concur with His Excellency in the view that it now only remains for Canada to continue to maintain her rights as prescribed by the Convention of 1818, until some satisfactory re-adjustment is arranged by treaty between the two nations.

That we learn with satisfaction that a measure will again be submitted to us to amend the Acts respecting the Electoral Franchise, for the purpose of simplifying the law and lessening the cost of its operation.

That, having been informed by His Excellency that it is expedient, in the interests of commerce, to assimilate, and in some particulars to amend, the laws which now obtain in the several Provinces of the Dominion relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes, any Bill with this object will receive our earnest consideration.

That we will carefully consider any Bill provided for making uniform throughout the Dominion the laws relating to Bills of Lading.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that during the recess his Government has carefully considered the subject of Ocean Steam Service, and that we will willingly enter upon the consideration of a measure to provide subsidies for the improvement of the Atlantic Mail Service, and for the establishment, in concert with Her Majesty's Government, of a line of fast steamers between British Columbia and China and Japan; and that we are grateful to His Excellency for the intimation that our attention will also be invited to the best mode of developing our trade, and securing direct communication by steam with Australasia, the West Indies and South America.

That His Excellency may rest assured that any Bill submitted for our consideration for the prevention of certain offences in connection with Municipal Councils, and to give greater facilities for making inquiries as to such matters, will receive our thoughtful attention.

That we learn with interest that several measures will also be presented to us for improving the law of procedure in criminal cases, and that among these will be a Bill to permit the release on probation of persons convicted of first offences, a Bill authorising regulations to be made for the practice in cases partaking of the nature of criminal pro-



ceedings, and a Bill to make the Speedy Trials Act applicable throughout Canada, and that all such measures will be willingly considered by us.

That we assure His Excellency that any Bills relating to the inspection of timber and lumber, for the improvement of the Postal System, and for increasing the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police, which are submitted for our consideration, will receive our earnest attention.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the Royal Commissioners on Labor having concluded their inquiries, he hopes to be able to lay before us at an early day their report with the important evidence collected by them in various parts of Canada.

That our thanks are due to His Excellency for informing us that the accounts for the past and the Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before us, and that we will respectfully consider these Estimates, which will, we trust, be found to have been prepared with a due regard to economy and the efficiency of the public service.

That His Excellency may rest assured that these several subjects and any others which may be brought before us will receive our earnest consideration, and that with him we trust that the result of our deliberations may, under the Divine Blessing, tend to promote the well-being and prosperity of Canada.

Mr. LÉPINE. (Translation.) It is with a feeling of gratitude, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time with much diffidence, that I rise to support the resolution, which has just been moved in such eloquent language by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). With much hesitancy, I say, because I feel that I am incapable of accomplishing satisfactorily the task which has been set me. Nevertheless, without desiring to occupy the attention of the House for any great length of time, I will presume to make some remarks on the matters which have been laid before Parliament in the Speech from the Throne. Allow me to premise by saying that I experienced a lively pleasure in hearing the representative of our Sovereign express himself in the French language with as much ease, with as much eloquence as an academician could have done. French Canadians ought to be proud to see the representative of our Sovereign speaking so fluently our beautiful language. He has set a noble example which all Canadians ought to follow, no matter to what nationality they may belong, in becoming conversant with the French and English languages, in order that all may work together, with a common agreement, for the prosperity, the increase, the wealth, and the future of our magnificent and extensive country. His Excellency regrets that the Fishery Treaty has not been ratified by the American Senate. As a fact it is much to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that this Fishery Treaty has been attacked, that it has been fought against with so much ferocity, not only in the Senate of the United States but during the entire presidential election campaign. It was alleged that the Fishery Treaty had been drawn up in the exclusive interest of those in Canada, that the rights of the Americans had been absolutely sacrificed. Notwithstanding this, however, Mr. Speaker, if reference is made to the Debates of this House, it will be found that our Government was also found fault with in the matter of this Fisheries Treaty; it will be found that this treaty was vigorously attacked; that the Government was accused of having been too generous towards the United States, of having disregarded the interests of Canada, of having sacrificed her rights, and of having surrendered a property which was one of the chief resources of the country. Does not such conduct on the part of the Americans show that the action of our Government, at this juncture, was most praiseworthy? Future events showed that those who prepared this treaty, Mr. Speaker, had done so while inspired with a most profound love of their native country; that they had been most jealous for the interests of Canada. This question of the fisheries is, in fact, one of the most important, and deserves the most undivided attention on the part of this honorable House. This branch of industry is carried on to a very considerable extent; it gives employment to an immense population, to thousands of workmen engaged in an employment arduous and exposed to many dangers. I am happy to see that the Government is endeavoring to enact measures to protect this vast number of people, by causing

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

the treaties signed in the past to be respected. The Governor General tells us also that there will be submitted a measure having for its effect the amendment of the Electoral Franchise Act. This is a very important measure. I am sure that both sides of this House will give it equal attention, and that the members on the Government side will approve of its conduct in thus endeavoring to improve the law of elections by making it as inclusive as possible, while at the same time keeping out all persons who are not worthy to enjoy the privilege of the suffrage. During the recess, the Government has considered the subject of ocean steamship service. The result demands that we should place ourselves in more direct communication with the countries with which we have already established relations. Such a course has also in view the opening of new outlets and new markets, by means of which the trade and industries of Canada will be greatly benefited. A Bill will be submitted for the prevention of certain offences in connection with municipal councils, and to give greater facilities for making inquiries as to such matters. Most certainly such a proposed law will be well received, for it will ensure a better administration of municipal matters, and will re-establish public confidence. For several years nothing has been heard of but inquiries and boodle, and never as yet has a law been suggested to render more effective these inquiries, and to allow of the arm of the law being placed on those municipal representatives who engage in dishonest practices. Several measures will also be presented for improving the law of procedure in criminal cases. Among these will be a Bill to permit the release on probation of persons convicted of first offences. For a long time back Canada ought to have possessed such a law. Many persons who have been convicted of a first offence and who have been committed to prison, have, in consequence, become irreclaimable criminals; while we see in other countries where such a law exists, persons convicted of a first offence and set at liberty on probation, make excellent citizens. I doubt not but that this measure will produce the same results in Canada. It will not cause you surprise, Mr. Speaker, if I attach much importance to that portion of the Speech referring to the Labor Commission. The laborious and very lengthy inquiry made by this commission, is the most convincing answer that can be made to those who persist in regarding this commission to be a political engine. By the creation of this commission, the Government has shown itself to be a staunch friend of the working classes; it has given substantial proof of the interest with which it regards the working classes, and of its determination to render justice to all ranks in the community, without distinction. Before this inquiry, open as it was to all persons, and during which masters as well as workmen came forward to make their respective grievances heard, to pronounce their opinions and express their hopes, no one in the country had an exact knowledge, a positive knowledge, of the labor question. The revelations made before this commission have excited the indignation of all men of feeling, and voices of men of more weight than myself, have, even in this House, denounced in forcible terms the guilty employers. It is in great part owing to this inquiry that I have the honor of sitting in this House; and I believe it to be my duty to set forth plainly and honestly the object aimed at by the electors who have given me their trust. The population of the electoral division of Montreal East, the largest division in the Dominion of Canada, which has been represented of late years by a very intelligent man, by a distinguished legislator, by an upright citizen, by a good patriot,—had no object of an aggressive nature, when it selected its candidate. Those who are acquainted with our noble workmen know that they are absolutely devoid of all revolutionary ideas; they only desire one thing, to live peacefully and honestly on the

fruits of their labors, under the protection of just and equitable laws. The workmen of Montreal East, in choosing one of themselves, had but one object—that of representing themselves in the council of the nation when the question of their interests was being discussed. By their interests, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean their material interests, I do not refer to the question of wages, for Parliaments are powerless to regulate such matters, but I mean their much dearer interests—their self-respect, their future and the future of their families. It is to put an end to monstrous abuses, to iniquitous regulations, which have been complained of for a long time past, that the Labor Commission has been appointed, and that the electors of Montreal East have elected me as their member in the House of Commons. It is to explain in a public manner, in the face of the whole country, the harshness of the laws which affect them in the matters of debts or contracts. It is to publish to the representatives of the country the unknown sufferings, the injustice submitted to, the thousand and one difficulties which the workmen have to overcome, and which they cannot even oppose. It is to unmask all these things to the House that the electors of Montreal East have chosen me as their representative. I am aware that the task which has been imposed upon me, on me an inexperienced workman, is a difficult one; so difficult that, to come out well, I rely more than ever upon the powerful assistance, upon the generous support of a great number of the members of this House, who have already yielded me their confidence and have given me their support. But I reckon above all upon the assistance and co-operation of the hon. Ministers who form the Government. In fine, I reckon on the good-will of all; because, Mr. Speaker, I represent here not only the workmen; but, further, all the electors who during the last campaign have magnanimously abandoned their former notions respecting the labor question. I represent all the large-hearted men who think that the laboring classes should be represented in Parliament. Workingmen—and I can say it emphatically, Mr. Speaker—do not demand any exceptional laws in their favor; they do not ask for any special legislation which may be antagonistic to capital. Workingmen only ask for one thing: that is, justice; and from justice they expect but one thing,—sufficient protection to place them on a footing of equality with the capital which purchases their labor. At the present moment, Mr. Speaker, I shall refrain from speaking about the laws respecting the protection of the lives of workmen; or respecting the laws having reference to the regulation of employment of women and children; or about the doing away with assisted immigration, which flows naturally and strongly from the principles of the National Policy. I think it useless to take up the time of the House in setting forth my views at greater length on the labor question; especially as a discussion will soon take place on the presenting of the Report of the Labor Commission to the House. Let me be permitted to say, however, that the constitution of the country renders the solution of the problem raised in the labor question all the more difficult of solution, as unfortunately there exists in the minds of our legislators a doubt about the powers bestowed on the Provincial Legislatures by the British North America Act, in all matters respecting the relations between capital and labor. I hope that during the present Session this difficulty will be removed and each will obtain the privileges belonging to it. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne acknowledges that it is absolutely necessary that certain questions in commercial matters should be regulated by a uniform law applicable to all the Provinces. I would wish that the same thing could be done as respects all questions bearing on the labor question. If a practical solution can be arrived at for the first named cases, I see no reason preventing us from proceeding to obtain the same advan-

tages in all things respecting work and labor. I should, however, add, Mr. Speaker, that uniformity which I desire, I do not wish to secure at the expense of the rights recognised as belonging to the Provinces by virtue of the Act of Confederation. I will fight against any measure which might injuriously affect the autonomy of the Provinces; whereas, on the contrary, I will support any scheme which might bring the Provinces to an understanding, either by means of an interprovincial conference, or by any other means which the House might adopt, for the establishment of a system of legislation common to all the Provinces and acceptable to all the Legislatures. The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, announces that the Government will present Bills relating to the inspection of timber and lumber, and also for the improvement of the postal system, and for increasing the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police force. The increase in the efficiency of the Mounted Police will doubtless prevent the Americans from committing on our borders depredations, which have been long a subject of complaint. Besides, we cannot pay too much attention to such a territory as that known as the North-West, which is almost as large as Europe, and which is destined to give a renewed prosperity to all the other Provinces of the Dominion, which, thanks to the National Policy, are already very prosperous and very contented. I conclude, Mr. Speaker, in thanking you, as well as the other hon. members of this House, for the attention which they have given to my few remarks, and I repeat that it is with pleasure that I second the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White).

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is, I am sure, with more than ordinary pleasure that the House has listened to the speech of the hon. mover of the Address, and to that of the seconder. Those hon. gentlemen had charged themselves with a task ever difficult, under any circumstances, and perhaps especially so under present circumstances, in a manner most creditable to themselves; and I am sure it will be a pleasure to their colleagues to extend to them their hearty congratulations. The mover of the Address has furnished additional evidence that the aptitude and inclination for public life which are so common among young men in the mother country, are not deficient with us. The name which the hon. gentleman so worthily bears, and to which he so feelingly alluded, is, I can tell him, a name still fresh and green in the memory of all the members of the House, on account of the great ability and genial qualities of him whom a premature death has removed from the service of his country. I am sure that it was with special gratification on this occasion that the House cheered the hon. member when he rose, and cheered him again as he proceeded and gave unmistakable evidence that he was a chip of the old block. As to myself, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, I was not at all surprised at the manner in which the hon. gentleman acquitted himself. He alluded to me a moment ago in his speech, and his allusion reminded me that this was not the first time I had met his steel. It was my advantage, or, perhaps, my disadvantage—at all events, my pleasure—a few years ago, to meet the hon. gentleman on the stump, in the good old Province of Quebec; and I have ever since carried a recollection of the value of his steel, and this recollection adds to my individual pleasure in congratulating him on his entry to this House. Well, Sir, although I have listened to the hon. gentleman with intense pleasure, as I have also listened to the speech of the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Lepine), there is but very little indeed in what they said in which I can agree; but I can most cordially agree, and on this side we all most cordially agree, in the genial compliment which the hon.

gentleman who moved the Address paid to His Excellency the Governor General. Sir, it is a pleasure to state that ever since Confederation Canada has been eminently fortunate in the selection made by the Imperial Government of those who were to represent in this House the Majesty of the Throne, and to preside over our destinies. One and all of our Governors have been men of distinguished though different merits; and one and all have left this country and carried with them into their new spheres of usefulness, the respect of the Canadian people, and, in some instances, the affection, I may say, the deep affection of the Canadian people. Lord Lisgar, our first Governor, was a man of sound judgment and conciliatory disposition, and, therefore, well fitted to render, as he did render, valuable services at a most critical period of our history. Of his successor, Lord Dufferin, it is useless to speak. His name is familiar, not only in this country, not only throughout the British Empire, but throughout the world wherever the English language is spoken. His successor, Lord Lorne, was also very popular among us; and it is impossible to mention the name of Lord Lorne without at the same time mentioning the name of his gracious consort, the Princess Louise, to whose presence among us, no doubt, Lord Lorne himself would admit, was due a good deal of his popularity. Her Royal Highness, while she was a resident of Canada, exhibited very many of those womanly virtues and qualities which have made the name of her Royal mother dear, not only to her subjects, but to all those in any quarter of the globe who appreciate womanly qualities and virtues, appreciable everywhere indeed, and especially so when found in so exalted a station. The course of Lord Lansdowne was not only popular, not only unimpeachable, but marked, it is only fair to him to say, with qualities of the higher order. Now, His Excellency Lord Stanley of Preston comes to us, bearing one of the greatest historical names of England. The name of Stanley is to be found on almost every page of English history amongst warriors and statesmen, and nowhere shining more conspicuously than in our own day, when proudly borne by the great Earl of Derby, whose eloquence has long held sovereign sway over both Houses of Parliament. It has been the privilege of His Excellency to be engaged from early life in the public service, and it is therefore an easy task for him to adapt himself to any position to which he may be called by the choice of Her Majesty; and it is in no spirit of fulsome flattery, but with entire truthfulness, that I cheerfully say that in the few months that His Excellency has been with us, he has already exhibited qualities of mind and heart which have won for him the respect and the sympathy of the Canadian people of all classes, nationalities and religions. But now, Sir, having said so much, it is my sad duty, I must say, and my unpleasant duty, to leave these topics and to come to the hard and dry matter of the Speech. I am sure the right hon. gentleman will agree with me when I repeat the usual expression that he has presented us with a very "meagre bill of fare." I have heard the expression before; but it is, perhaps, even more meagre than usual. Of this, however, I do not complain, because I believe that Canada to-day is in a position where she requires very few reforms of immediate application, save the great reform of the extension of our trade with the great and powerful nation to the south of us. In all candor, Sir, I must say that I did not expect even that measure of reform in the Speech, but I do not despair—and I say this in all candor also—I do not despair of seeing the right hon. gentleman some day a convert to that idea. It is not expecting too much either, that some day or other he will see more clearly, and that this great reform will press itself upon his attention, and that he will relieve us from the duty and the pleasure of putting it upon the Statute-book. But, Mr. Speaker, if I did not expect that reform to be announced in the Speech from the Throne, I did expect to see other

Mr. LAURIER.

reforms announced, and I am disappointed on account of their absence. I expected to see some of that long promised legislation in favor of the workingmen. We have been looking for it, not one year, not two years, but three years. It has been put off from to-day until to-morrow, and from to-morrow until the next day; and this year again it is put off until to-morrow. We had reason to expect something better. It is true that in the Speech there is an allusion made to a commission which has been investigating the wrongs of the workingmen—which, indeed, are visible to the naked eye, and which we, on this side of the House, could remedy, I am sure, without any commission, if we had the power. Reference has been made to that commission, and we are led to expect a report at no distant day. But, Sir, is it possible that this commission is also affected with the disease of procrastination, too prevalent in the present Government of Canada? Is it possible that the report of the commission which was to be ready to-day is to be postponed till to-morrow? The remarks which fell from the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Lepire), would lead us almost to infer something of the kind, because, from a remark that fell from his lips, I find that the Government are overwhelmed with the great constitutional difficulties which attend legislating for the workingman. Well, Sir, I say we had reason to expect something better; and from a special circumstance which took place lately in the province to which I belong, I had reason, when I came here—I have such implicit confidence in the press of hon. gentlemen opposite, which is understood to speak the truth, and of course always the views of hon. gentlemen opposite—to expect that we should have such legislation. Sir, some time ago—not very remote, not two weeks ago—there was an election in the good county of Joliette, and one of the organs of the Government, *Le Canada*, published in Quebec, under the heading "Joliette Election," stated as follows on 19th September:—

"The two parties in this county are in the field, the county having been opened by the unseating of Mr. Guilbault, the Federal member. Mr. Guilbault is the Government candidate again, and his old opponent, Mr. Neveu, is the Liberal candidate. The election will take place at an early date. The contest will be sharp on both sides, Mr. Guilbault having been elected at the last election only by the casting vote of the returning officer. It is, however, said that the chances of Mr. Guilbault are much more favorable now than the Federal Government have favored this county with several important works—namely, a post office."

But, Mr. Speaker, was there not also a post office in Haldimand? It is astonishing the importance which the institution of post offices has assumed at the present time. Then this paper goes on to say:

"Mr. Lepine is to address a meeting of the workingmen of Joliette on Thursday next, and it is probable that all the workingmen will support the candidate of the Conservative party as they did in Montreal East. As the Government is to propose at the next Session several measures in the interest of the working classes, it is reasonable to suppose that the workingmen will support the Conservative candidate."

I took it for granted, Mr. Speaker, when I saw this announcement in the organ of the Government that we would have such measures proposed this Session in favor of the workingmen. But the wily workingmen of Joliette saw, and had good reason to believe, as the event now shows, that promises made to-day would be violated to-morrow, and they decided not to wait till to-morrow to vote against the Government, but voted against them at once. There is another measure, and the reform which I expected to find announced in the Speech from the Throne. I am sure the mercantile community at large will be disappointed to observe that no measure is to be introduced this Session by the Government to amend the Customs Act. The manner in which the Customs Act has been administered, not, I am sure through any fault of the Minister in charge, but on account of the provisions of that Act, is such as to incite revolt in the commercial community. What do we see? We find that, last year, almost \$100,000—to be precise, something over \$98,000—were levied upon the commer-

cial community in the shape of seizures, fines and forfeitures, and this amount was distributed almost wholly, with the bare exception of something like \$5,000, among the officers of the Customs Department. At present what do we see? Officers with salaries of \$1,000 and \$1,600 respectively added to their salaries, one \$1,200, the other \$2,000, and other officials obtained as high as \$5,000. The truth is these men are making for themselves princely incomes out of spoils derived from the mercantile community. What did we see last year and the year previous? Merchants had their books seized, their stores closed, their business stopped at the will of revenue officers without any process of law, and those merchants were forced to defend their business and their honor in the courts of law, at tremendous expense. It is said that the firm of Ayer & Co. spent \$30,000 in order to obtain justice in the courts at the hands of the Canadian Government. And yet these outrages which have been denounced again and again, and to which the attention of the Government has been called, are to be left unredressed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that this Session will not pass without some measure being introduced to alleviate the position in which this class of our population is placed. But if the Customs Act is to remain the same—

Mr. BOWELL. It is all the same.

Mr. LAURIER. It is all the same in the way of remedial legislation. If this Act, I say, is to remain the same, there is an Act which is more privileged. It is the Franchise Act. Every man must admit, even hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House must admit, that the career of the Franchise Act has not been a glorious one. It would seem almost as if the Government had been ashamed from the first of their progeny. They had provided that the Act should be enforced year after year, and yet, having put the light of the Act under a bushel for one year, now they are prepared to amend it. I do not know what is the nature of the measure which is to be proposed, but I am quite sure it will be merely patchwork. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who proposed the Address, stated that the criticism which had been applied to the Act was simply with regard to the preparation of the lists. It appears to me, astonishing as the fact may be, that the hon. gentleman does not read the *Montreal Gazette*; for, if he did so, he would be aware that not later than last Monday it contained the opinions of the *Hamilton Spectator*, of the *St. John, N. B., Sun*, and I believe another leading Conservative organ, to the effect that the Act should be amended—in what manner? Not in regard to the preparation of the lists, no, but in the direction of an extension of the franchise. Still I am confident that the reform which is asked by the whole of the Conservative press, by the whole of the Conservative party, and by hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, a reform in the direction of an extension of the franchise will not be proposed, and the Government will not dare to bring in a measure to extend the franchise. What is asked by the Conservative press and by the Conservative party of all the Provinces except one, is manhood suffrage; and I believe the hon. leader of the Government, himself, would not be averse to manhood suffrage, because we know he is in favor of womanhood suffrage. Though he is prepared to grant womanhood suffrage, yet he will not grant manhood suffrage. Why? Because of the very reason why we on this side of the House voted for that Act, because it is a measure of legislation which should be left to the Provinces and not to the Dominion Government. Why is it that the hon. gentleman does not answer to the call of the press which supports him in Ontario and in the Maritime Provinces? Why is it that he does not grant manhood suffrage? Because, Sir, the condition is imposed that it must be regulated in accordance with all sound principles, according to the

views, the methods, the manners and the social habits of the people in the different Provinces. Those are the views which were held in 1855, when this Act was introduced. Those are the views which all authors who have treated that question have developed, and in that respect let me quote here the opinion of Judge Story upon the American Constitution. Speaking on this very question he said:

"So that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people, convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters, the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere state policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority. An absolute, indefeasible right to elect or be elected, seems never to have been asserted on one side or denied on the other; but the subject has been freely canvassed as one of mere civil polity, to be arranged upon such a basis as the majority may deem expedient, with reference to the moral, physical and intellectual condition of the particular State."

Those reasons apply, Sir, not only to the regulation of the franchise, but they are the very reasons which are the basis of the federative form of government. Why is it we have a federative form of government? It is simply because the manners, and the habits, and the interests of the people will vary from one State to another State, or from one Province to another Province. And in all reason, since we have a federative government, it should also be left to the Provinces to determine in what manner the franchise in each Province shall be exercised. No greater evidence of the statement which I now make is to be found than in the conduct of the Government which resists the will of the majority of their organs who are asking for an extension of the franchise, who are asking for manhood suffrage; and though some of them are in favor of that system, yet the Government will not grant it, because there are some Provinces—amongst others, the Province to which I belong—which would not look upon an extension of the franchise to that extent favored. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that, whatever may happen, the Conservative press, which have been asking for an extension of the franchise to the extent of manhood suffrage, is doomed again upon this occasion to bitter disappointment. There are other measures, Mr. Speaker, which are mentioned in the Speech; one relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes and bills of lading, offences in connection with municipal councils, improvement of criminal procedure, inspection of lumber and timber, improving the postal system, and increasing the efficiency of the Mounted Police. But of all these I have only to say that none of them will set the world on fire. They may be good or they may be bad, but we do not know, and I will not pronounce upon them until they are brought down. They are without importance most of them, and I do not know that they will have any effect but that of tinkering with the recently Revised Statutes, and of making up a big volume of statutes for this year. Now, among the only other measures which are announced is a measure for promoting our trade with Australasia by means of a subsidy. As to the subsidy itself I have nothing to say at this present moment, and we had better wait until the details of the measure are brought down, in order to see what they are with regard to the general idea which they are supposed to involve, viz.: extension of trade with Australasia. I need only say that, on this side of the House, we shall ever be disposed to favor an extension of trade with any part of the world. It is the basis of our system; it is our very policy to extend trade. When the hon. gentlemen want to go to the Antipodes in order to get a trade, I am only sorry that they cannot see the advantage of knocking at the door of our neighbors where they would be sure to find a better and more extended trade. But, Sir, in the Speech to which we listened yesterday there is a very novel feature. As far as my memory goes, for the last ten years we have never found the feature which we see to-day in the Speech. There is not the slightest self-congratulations which hon.

gentlemen generally indulge in, as to the happy condition of the country, due primarily to their own efforts, and then to Providence. There is not the slightest reference to the prosperity of the country, due in the first place to the National Policy and then to the good crops, the benefit of Providence. Neither the hon. gentleman who proposed the Address, nor the hon. gentleman who seconded it, indulged, as was usual in former years, in congratulations as to the benefactions which had been bestowed upon this country by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Well, Sir, I want ever to be a generous foe.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Nay, more, I claim to be an admirer of the hon. gentleman for many causes; and for many other causes also, if I were to scan his career, I would find reason for blame and censure. To day, however, since his followers have failed to bestow upon him the praise to which he is entitled for his policy, I will do so. How is it, Mr. Speaker, that no reference has been made to-day—or only very slight reference, which was not coupled with any congratulations at all—to the increase in the price of cereals? The hon. gentleman who moved the Address stated that though the crop had not been a very good one, still the prices of cereals had largely increased since last season. Can it be, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen shall not receive their due meed of praise because the price of cereals has been increased. They have forgotten that the inducements given to the farmers of Ontario in 1878 was that they could regulate the price of wheat and other cereals by Act of Parliament. They were not flies on the wheel; they knew all the resources of legislation, and if only they had the power in hand what would they not do? The price of cereals would always be kept up, it would never go down. In fact, after a few years that the National Policy had been in force, when the boom was prevalent from one end of the country to the other, their followers could stump the country and ask the people to vote for the Government because, as they said, the Government had increased the price of wheat from 79 cents to \$1.40 a bushel. It is true that afterwards the price fell, and the hon. gentleman no doubt was applied to again and again, to resort to those powers of legislation of which he had boasted while in Opposition, and to restore the price. But still for many years the hon. gentleman was obdurate; he put it off from to-morrow until to-morrow, but now at last we have the price of cereals gone up again. And why, I ask again, no mention has been made of this? The hon. gentlemen have not been accustomed in the past to so much modesty, and I want to give them the due praise to which they are entitled. But, Sir, if no mention of it is made to-day it is because the farmers of Ontario who at one time believed in those promises, have seen their utter folly. The farmers have now understood that the duty on wheat and cereals, though it is an impediment to trade, though it is an injury to those in the Maritime Provinces and the Province of Quebec, who have to buy wheat, and though it is fatal taxation, still that duty is no benefit to them, and they now understand that the National Policy so-called, in so far as they are concerned, is a mockery, a delusion and a snare. Snare, I say, and the word is not too strong. It has been the habit, one of those little habits which we can always forgive, of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, not exactly to say that they were the dispensers of the favors of Providence, but jocosely to refer to them; and a few days ago, while hunting for some other material, I happened to fall upon a speech delivered by my hon. friend at St. Andrews in New Brunswick, on the 8th of August, 1887, and which it may, perhaps, give him some pleasure for me to recall to the House. He then said:

"It is a great pleasure to me, wherever I go, to find signs of good Conservative Government. I find a first-rate crop in every part of Canada."  
Mr. LAURIER.

ada, and of course this great boon is due to a good, strong, honest and patriotic Government. We have always tried to show the Grits the great mistake they made in not supporting us. With Grit rule first came the Hessian fly, next the weevil, and later on when the Mackenzie Government was in power, came the Colorado bug. Now we have smiling crops, a contented people and a prosperous country."

Well, Sir, by parity of reasoning, if the hon. gentleman had gone to the vicinity of the city which he has the honor to represent in this House, the good city of Kingston, last summer, he would have seen there some evidences of a good, strong, honest Conservative Government; he would have found places where every vestige of vegetation was destroyed by the sun.

An hon. MEMBER. He was away from here then.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, in the Eastern Provinces and about the Lower St. Lawrence, he could have found other evidences of a good, strong, honest Conservative Government, in fields devastated by rains. Now, it seems to me that Providence has forsaken the hon. gentleman, for the country is visited by fire and water at the same time. I understand that this unfortunate region about the city the hon. gentleman represents, which is a dairying region, is now almost in a state of famine. The papers were telling only a few days ago of a farmer who had to sell two yearling cows and a spring calf for \$25, and I understand, from neighbors there, that this is not an isolated case; and if it were not for the railway facilities we have, there would actually be a state of famine in that section of the country. If the people of that section are compelled to sacrifice their cattle because there is not sufficient market in that Province, would it not be to their advantage to be able to sell their cattle on the other side of the line, if we had reciprocity of trade? I am told, however, that this is a bargain which cannot be made by one party alone, but which requires, not only the consent of our Government, but that of the American Government as well. But there is a thing that might be done by our own Government—it could remove the duty on coarse grains; and since this is a dairying country there cannot be a shadow of doubt that the removal of that duty would be a benefit to those people. But as that is part and parcel of the National Policy, it must be left intact even if it impoverishes the farmers still more than they have been impoverished already by the hand of nature. But be this as it may, the policy of the Opposition has received the strongest illustration which it could receive by those unfortunate events of last summer. I believe I can say at least for some sections of the country that that policy is gaining ground. All the growers of natural products—the fishermen, the farmers, the lumbermen—now see the utter hollowness of the promises made to them in 1878. The voice of the tempter is always sweet, and it was the mistake of the farmers in 1878 to listen to that voice. But as our foremother, Eve, yielded to the voice of the tempter, we can forgive the farmers if they did the same thing. But now, after an experience of ten years, they see that the true policy does not lie in the restriction of trade, but in the extension of trade as far as possible I say we have the producers of natural products with us. The manufacturers are still against us.

An hon. MEMBER. Not all.

Mr. LAURIER. Not all, I am glad to say, and the day is not far distant, I have no doubt, when all manufacturers will come to a better understanding of the true principles of political economy. Last summer there was a meeting of cotton manufacturers in the city of Montreal. I find a report of that meeting in the good Conservative organ, the *Gazette*, and among other things in it I see the following statement, not made editorially, but by the reporter who attended the meeting:

"By actual comparison, good farmers' shirting can be obtained in Canada to-day at a lower figure than the same material can be pur-

chased for in the United States. This is one effect of the National Policy and is a great boon to the agricultural community. The country, however, requires about 600,000 more people in it to maintain the present number of cotton mills, but these are quickly coming, as 100,000 landed on our shores last year."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that statement has to be taken with more than one *granum salis*. 600,000 is a big figure, but we have been accustomed in the past to big figures. Year by year we were told that hundreds of thousands of people were coming into Manitoba and the North-West Territories; but these figures, when they came to be investigated, dwindled to very small proportions. But leaving that aside, it is now stated that good shirtings can be manufactured in this country at a lower figure than in the United States. Why, then, should the cotton manufacturers be afraid to throw down the barrier which is keeping the American market from them? Their advantage would be to have, not only an increased market of 600,000 souls, but of 60,000,000. Therefore I have every reason to hope that not merely a few manufacturers, but all the manufacturers of the country, will before long be convinced of the truth of the policy we have offered them. The most important feature of His Excellency's Speech is the paragraph referring to the Fisheries Treaties. The statement is not as clear and as simple as I would have desired, and I suppose we shall have occasion before long to revert to it, when we shall have a more precise communication from the Government. The only thing I would say at present is this: It now only remains for Canada to continue to maintain her rights, as prescribed in the Treaty of 1818, until some satisfactory re-adjustment is arranged by treaty between the two Governments. This is a matter which should be approached with a great deal of caution and deliberation. For my part, at this moment, I am not disposed to enter critically into the announcement which is here made, but will content myself with offering my suggestion as to what, in my estimation, should be the true policy to be followed. As I understand, the Government have determined to fall back upon the Convention of 1818, and to assert all the rights claimed as belonging to Canada under that convention. Before going further I would say sincerely I agree in this with the mover of the Address, that it is to be deprecated that the treaty of last year was not ratified by the Senate of the United States. Not that it was a satisfactory treaty; on the contrary, it was a very unsatisfactory treaty. It forced upon Canada concessions without giving any adequate return, but, in my opinion, the worst feature of the treaty was that it left open many of the causes of irritation which in the past had disturbed the cordiality of our relations with our neighbors. Still, it was a step in the right direction towards closer relations, and, though a feeble step, it would have met, as it did meet, with our approval as far as it went. Now, however, that treaty has been abandoned, and it is proposed to revert to the enforcement of the Convention of 1818. The only suggestion I would offer to the Government, approaching this question, not critically, not in any partisan spirit, would be that the Government should not be too hasty in adopting such a policy, but that perhaps it would be prudent on their part to wait until the month of March, when the new Administration is to come into power, and then ascertain how far they are prepared to meet our views. We must remember this, also, that although we have contended for a certain interpretation of the treaty, and although we have claimed to enforce rights under that treaty, we have also to a certain extent admitted, by the fact that we became party to the negotiation of a new treaty, that there were causes for considering the possibility of entering into new arrangements as far as our rights were concerned. We have thus admitted that the contention of the Americans that our views of the treaty are antiquated is, to some extent, true. The American statesmen say that our interpretation of the

treaty is antiquated. That may or may not be the case, but, if it be antiquated, it would be more logical, and more friendly as well, on their part, to make that representation when it can be coupled with an offer to negotiate a new treaty. I know that the position of our Government in that respect is not a facile one; I know that it is full of difficulties, and I recognise all those difficulties, but it would be, in my judgment, the part of prudence to enforce our rights, when our rights are to be enforced, with as gentle a hand as possible. I have stated elsewhere that the relations between the two countries have not been satisfactory. The hon. gentleman who moved the Address stated that I had taken an exceptional position on that question. Nay, the position which I took was the position always held by the Liberal party, that it was fair, right and just that our views of the treaty should be enforced; still, there were some acts which had been done by us which could not be condoned. Whatever you may say, when men are sent back in distress to sea and refused provisions, there are no mere technicalities which would force me to approve such an act. I say that this treatment cannot be condoned, and it was this treatment which I denounced last summer. As I said a moment ago, those were my views then and they are mine now, but I do not intend to enter critically upon that question to-day. We shall have occasion to do so at a later day when we will have more complete communication from the Government on the subject. The only thing I have to say at present is this, that the whole subject, in my judgment, should be approached in as friendly a spirit as possible. There are those among us who believe that a friendly act towards the American nation is an unfriendly act to Canada and to England. Such is not my view. My view, on the contrary, is that every act of friendship done by Canada to the United States is a good service to England. My hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the most admirable speech which he delivered some time ago in Ingersoll, elaborated the idea, at great length, that England would never have any better ally than the great Republic to the south of us, and it must strike everybody that if to-day or to-morrow England were entangled, as she may be any moment, in a continental war, her strength would be ten-fold, if she could depend upon the moral sympathy—I say, moral sympathy alone—not only of her colonies but even of the great American Republic; and if I were to speak my whole mind on the subject, I would say that any act done anywhere which would increase the friendship among the branches of the Anglo-Saxon family the world over is a step forward in the civilisation of the world. Further, I will not say to-day. We are not many on this side of the House, not as many as we should be for the good of the country, but few as we are we intend to do the best we can for the country; and though we shall exercise in a perfectly free spirit our right to criticise the acts of the Government, we shall at the same time do our best to accelerate the business of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can congratulate the House and the country on the very kindly and good-natured manner in which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has addressed the House. That has always, however, I am free to admit, been his course both before and since he assumed the responsible position which he now holds, and I hope and believe the tone which he has adopted will be followed not only by his own friends, but by those who are opposed to him politically, and that while we may agree to disagree on many points of public policy, we will forget all the old acerbities and continue, during this Session, the kindly, the parliamentary tone which my hon. friend has adopted. I can heartily agree with my hon. friend in the cordial and graceful compliments which he has paid to the mover and seconder of this Address. I shall say no more, leaving it to this House and the readers of the Debates, to

consider the compliment given by my hon. friend as just and well deserved. My hon. friend has, in a very good-natured manner criticised the speech. He says it will not set the world on fire. Well, we do not want to set the world on fire; and I do not believe my hon. friend, although he raises that objection, is much of a fire-eater except, perhaps, in the far North-West, so that I do not think this objection will be taken to heart by the hon. gentlemen who sit behind me. My hon. friend, however, complains that there is a very meagre bill of fare, but I, as leader of the Government, considered myself in a delicate position, and in settling this meagre bill of fare, I considered the weak digestion of hon. gentlemen opposite. Milk for babes and strong meat for men, you know. My hon. friend opposite is still in the infancy of his political position, and consequently we have kept the diet down so as suit his digestion. My hon. friend is very much pleased to observe in the Speech that there is an announcement of the extension of trade to all parts of the world, even to the Antipodes. He says he is willing that we should extend our trade to Australasia, to South America, or to New Zealand, but he says, why do you not extend your trade to the near south? The hon. gentleman knows why we do not extend our trade to the south. He knows full well that the reason is that they will not allow us to do so. We would be willing to do so; we have been always anxious to do so. From 1854 to the present moment Canada has shown her readiness to enter into the most friendly relations—into the most friendly commercial and social relations—with the United States; but they will not have us, except, perhaps, at a price that we do not choose to give. The hon. gentleman himself, I think, would not offer to give that price if he stood where I do. It has been announced by leading men in the United States, by men who will in the future, perhaps in the near future, govern the political course of the United States, that we shall have no extension of intercourse with the United States unless we are content to sell our heritage for a mess of pottage, unless we choose we give up our allegiance to our Sovereign and to change our proud position as a member of the greatest Empire the world ever saw, and to become a mere outskirt of the neighboring Republic. I know that the hon. gentleman himself would not pay that price, and, unless we do pay that price, our hopes of the extension of trade to the south cannot be satisfied, and the project of commercial union, I think, must be dropped in silence. The hon. gentleman said that, although I have been hopelessly wrong in my political economy, he hopes to see that, by-and-bye, I may change my opinion. Well, I like power; I like place; I like my present position. All I can say is that I believe that moment I adopted the hon. gentleman's advice and changed my opinions and my course in regard to the commercial and fiscal policy of Canada, I would have to give up all I like, and assume the position of the hon. gentleman opposite. I am in no hurry to do that, and until he and his friends, with all their ability, can induce the electors of Canada to change their fixed opinions on that point, I am not likely to change mine, or to change my course. The hon. gentleman deplored that, among the many omissions in the Speech, there is not a single word about the protection of the rights of the workingman. Mr. Speaker, if we had introduced measures such as he would indicate, the course of the hon. gentlemen opposite would at once be to declare that we were treading on the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures. We have heard that cry before in this House. We have heard, when measures relating to the position of the workingmen and the laws affecting them were introduced, that the different Provinces could deal with these subjects and had full power to deal with them. However, I believe that we have certain powers here in regard to that matter, and that the Provincial Legislatures have certain powers also; and, whenever the report is obtained from this Commission which the hon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

gentleman spoke of in rather a disparaging tone—I really do not know why—I think this House will receive sufficient instruction as to the subjects dealt with by that Commission, in regard to the manner in which the position and status of the workingmen can be improved, to enable it to take up the subject with full knowledge of all the grievances, or alleged grievances, of the workingmen, and will be able with that information to do whatever is necessary by legislation to improve their position. The hon. gentleman also complains that there is no announcement that there is going to be an alteration in the Customs laws and he specially complains of the sufferings of the mercantile community. Well, I think the commercial community can take care of themselves, and if the law relating to the Customs or to the administration of the Customs presses unduly on the commercial body, they will let this House and the country know it. But where do we find any complaint from the commercial people in regard to this matter? Where do we find any petitions from Boards of Trade or Chambers of Commerce laying their grievances on this Table and calling the attention of Parliament to the wrongs which they suffer under the Customs law? Of course, that law is a stringent law. It would be no law at all fit for the purpose if it were not stringent. The wiles of the smuggler and the dishonest trader are dark, and those men have to be watched closely. When we adopted the system of protecting the manufactures of this country, we were obliged to make the law under which that protection was given efficient, and in order to do that we had to pass a stringent Customs law, or the whole policy would be nugatory. We know what false invoices are, we know what the devices of dishonest trader are. We know the Protean changes of action which the dishonest trader adopts for the purpose of evading the law, and, notwithstanding our protective system, of making this practically a free trade country. Sir, whenever the commercial men of this country feel that the law is doing them wrong, they will let us know it, but the law is for the protection of the honest trader, of the honest man who pays the full duty according to an honest invoice on the articles which he imports, and he is to be protected against the smuggler and the dishonest tradesman who make false statements, false affidavits, and undersell the honest trader, and so prevent his having the fair protection which is afforded by the strict enforcement of the law. Oh, yes, the honest men of the country, the honest commercial men, do not complain of this law. The smuggler does, the dishonest man does; the man into whose warehouse the Custom house officer walks and finds the smuggled article, finds out the fraud and finds out the double invoice on looking at the books of the dishonest trader—all such men complain; but the honest trader recognizes the necessity of a stringent law, and I believe among the commercial community of Canada, there is no man standing higher than my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, for the manner in which he has carried out the law and protected the honest man against the smuggler and the swindler. The hon. gentleman says that there is one other omission in the Speech, that we have not congratulated ourselves upon the happy state of the country, and that we have not inserted into His Excellency's Speech a clause which may be laudatory of ourselves and of our administration. There is no necessity, Mr. Speaker, to praise ourselves—the country does that for us. The hon. gentleman says of his following: "We are a small body." Why are they a small body? Because the country does not give them the same complimentary confidence that it does to us. The hon. gentleman knows that under the dome of St. Paul's in London, there is a celebrated epitaph to Sir Christopher Wren: *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*—"if you seek for a monument, look around you"—at this magnificent building. We say the same thing in a humble spirit:

Look around at the prosperity of this country, look at the undiminished confidence in us of the people of Canada from one end to the other. That is our best monument, and I expect by-and-bye to see something of that kind inscribed on my tombstone.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He will see his own tombstone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be looking down upon my tombstone; I will be looking down upon the Conservative majority, which I shall leave in such good heart and spirit that they will carry on the traditions that have guided them since 1854, and especially since 1878.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the same grave yard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is rather inconsistent in his remarks about the Fishery question. I quite agree with him that we must be exceedingly cautious in all that is said in this House or in Parliament at present. In the present state of the relations between the United States and Canada, and England, as the paramount power, it will be exceedingly unwise if, by any hurried or false step, we should intensify the critical position of that question. I think my hon. friend will admit that on that question, at all events, "to-morrow" is a good cry. My hon. friend regrets greatly that that treaty was not ratified. To be sure, it was declared last Session to be a very unsatisfactory treaty. Yes; I do not remember whether he himself spoke against it, but those who are surrounding him spoke very strongly against the treaty as giving up everything—giving up a great deal too much, at all events, without getting any concessions whatever. I think the hon. gentleman took that line when the Bill for ratifying the treaty was before the House. Now the hon. gentleman says, unsatisfactory as it was, because it gave up Canadian rights which ought not to be given up, and without sufficient compensation—now, he says, we must be very cautious, and that we must not adhere to these antiquated claims, that we must deal with this subject *denovo*, as it were; that the true way, in fact, to settle with the United States is to forget the old Convention of 1818, and with the spirit of amity, and the spirit of increased friendship, and with the spirit of further concession, we should endeavor to settle this question. The hon. gentleman has just said that the treaty conceded too much, but he advises us now to be very cautious, to go slow, and by new concessions, by new exhibitions of friendship, to try to induce the United States to make some treaty with us. Mr. Speaker, we ought not to be drawn, and I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman does not desire that we should be drawn, into a discussion of that subject now. The fishing season is over, it is mid-winter now; and when the spring season commences, as the hon. gentleman said, there will be a new President in the United States, a new government; and I am very happy to know that in any arrangement which may be made with the United States in the near future the question will not be embarrassed in the fact of the President, the head of the executive, being unsupported by the Senate, the paramount branch of that executive. We have no right or reason to suppose that the Government, when it comes in, will be less friendly to England or Canada than the outgoing one; we have no reason to suppose that they will not be as anxious or desirous of entering into negotiations for removing any cause that may exist of disturbing the amity between Canada and the United States. We have the satisfaction of knowing and believing that if any arrangement is come to between the President of the United States and England, on this question, it will in all probability receive the support of the Senate of the United States, which is politically in accord with the incoming President. Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more. I again repeat my congratulations to my hon. friend on the tone he has adopted, and my hope

and belief that we will get on very well during the Session, and although we may not set the world on fire, that, with his assistance, and with his candid criticism, we will pass a number of useful Bills which will tend to the development and the progress of our beloved Canada.

Paragraphs one to fourteen agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

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

#### SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

JOHN WALDIE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Halton, introduced by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Paterson (Brant).

ALPHONSE A. C. LARIVIÈRE, Member for the Electoral District of Provencher, introduced by Mr. McDowall and Mr. Joncas.

#### REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending 31st December, 1888.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Annual Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Foster.)

#### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 6) to prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock.—(Mr. Boyle.)

#### PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to



animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled "An Act respecting Cruelty to Animals."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BROWN. I am prepared to explain the nature of the Bill, but perhaps it would be more convenient to the House to explain at a later stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now.

Mr. BROWN. As it seems to be the desire of some hon. members that I should explain the nature of the Bill, I desire, in very few words, to say that the object is to prevent cruelty to animals, not already provided for by law, such as cock-fighting and dog-fighting, but mainly the cruel sport of trap-shooting, where pigeons and small birds are often confined in boxes in cold weather for the sake of enabling men to engage in this sport, ostensibly for practice in shooting, when they could have every opportunity of distinguishing themselves in that particular by the use of clay pigeons without cruelty to innocent birds. I am sure I have the sympathy and support of a large majority of the members of this House in introducing this measure. I know that I am sustained by all the humane societies of the Dominion of Canada, and I hope that when this measure comes to be discussed, as it will be at a later stage of its progress, the strong sympathy of this House will be given in its support. I am certain that there is no education so demoralising for the young as that which leads them to treat with indifference any kind of cruelty to dumb animals.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: I will merely call attention to a few of the features of this measure, and will explain it more fully at a later stage. It is substantially the same Bill as was introduced last Session at an advanced period and deferred until this year, partly because the time at the disposal of the House did not warrant the taking up of the Bill, and partly because the printing of the lists was being proceeded with in the Government Bureau; and the Bill was unnecessary until this year in so far as it would apply to the lists being printed. The scheme proposed by this Bill for the revision of the lists is that, immediately after the 1st of June, the revising officer, availing himself of the sources of information to which he is directed to refer by the present statute—the electoral lists, the assessment rolls, and information of that kind—is to proceed with his revision, and he is to make supplementary lists of voters and of the names to be struck off the voters' lists—the supplementary lists giving the corrections—the additions to, and the subtractions from the list as sent to him from the Government printing office. These supplementary lists are to be sent to the Queen's Printer and printed and returned to the revising officer. The officer is then to post them up and fix a day when all parties interested shall be heard. Then the revision is to take place by inserting the corrections which are made in the list in the Government printing office. The supplementary lists having in that way been fixed by the revising officer, are to be sent to the Queen's Printer, and the whole list is finally to be struck off and distributed in the manner provided by the present Act. Another provision of the Bill is that the list, as then established, is to be final as to the qualification of voters, and a further provision is that the polling districts shall be sub-divided, so that from time to time they shall not exceed 250 voters in all. The present statute says 300. In addition to that, the form of the list of voters is simplified very materially, so as to curtail expense.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. BROWN.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes. He said: The object of this Bill is to render uniform in almost every particular the laws throughout the Dominion with respect to these contracts. The law under this Bill will be uniform in every particular, except as regards statutory holidays, in respect of which special provision is to be made as regards the Province of Quebec. I may say that the Bill is principally the codification of the existing law relating to bills, cheques and promissory notes, and that the changes which are made in our law on these subjects are in the direction of making it uniform with the English Statute law. The changes thus made will render our law similar to the English law, excepting in two or three unimportant particulars, and the principal one of these is the preservation of the present system of payment when the last day of grace falls on a Sunday or statutory holiday. Our existing provision is that in such a case, the bill or note shall be payable on the following day, while under the English statute it is payable the preceding day. In that respect, this Bill proposes to continue our present system. I may mention, briefly, for the information of the House, the alterations in the common law which the Bill proposes to make. The first is that:

"Unless the contrary appear on the face of the bill, the holder may treat it as an inland bill."

I presume it will be more convenient to the House that I should merely mention the changes without making any comments or entering into any explanations. The next is that:

"A bill may be made payable to two or more payees jointly, or it may be made payable in the alternative to one of two, or one or some of several payees. A bill may also be made payable to the holder of an office for the time being."

The next feature of that kind in the Bill is that:

"When a bill contains words prohibiting transfer, or indicating an intention that it should not be transferable, it is valid as between the parties thereto, but is not negotiable."

"A bill is payable to bearer which is expressed to be so payable, or on which the only or last endorsement is an endorsement in blank."

"A bill is payable to order which is expressed to be so payable, or which is expressed to be payable to a particular person, and does not contain words prohibiting transfer or indicating an intention that it should not be transferable."

Further changes are:

"Where a bill expressed to be payable at a fixed period after date is issued undated, or where the acceptance of a bill payable at a fixed period after sight is undated, any holder may insert therein the true date of issue, or acceptance, and the bill shall be payable accordingly."

"Provided that where the holder in good faith and by mistake inserts a wrong date, and in every case where a wrong date is inserted if the bill subsequently comes into the hands of a holder in due course, the bill shall not be voided thereby, but shall operate and be payable as if the date so inserted had been the true date."

"The drawer of a bill and any endorser may insert therein the name of a person to whom the holder may resort in case of need, that is to say, in case the bill is dishonored by non-acceptance or non-payment. Such person is called the referee in case of need. It is in the option of the holder to resort to the referee in case of need or not, as he may think fit."

"When a bill payable after sight is dishonored by non-acceptance and a drawee subsequently accepts it, the holder, in the absence of any different agreement, is entitled to have the bill accepted as of the date of first presentment to the drawee for acceptance."

"Where a bill purports to be endorsed conditionally, the condition may be disregarded by the payer, and payment to the endorsee is valid whether the condition has been fulfilled or not."

"A bill payable on demand is deemed to be overdue within the meaning and for the purposes of this section, when it appears on the face of it to have been in circulation for an unreasonable length of time. What is an unreasonable length of time for this purpose is a question of fact."

"Where the holder of a bill, drawn payable elsewhere than at the place of business or residence of the drawee, has not time with the exercise of reasonable diligence, to present the bill for acceptance before presenting it for payment on the day that it falls due, the delay caused

by presenting the bill for acceptance before presenting it for payment is excused, and does not discharge the drawer and endorsers

"Presentment in accordance with these rules is excused, and a bill may be treated as dishonored by non-acceptance, where the drawee is dead or bankrupt or insolvent, or is a fictitious person, or a person not having capacity to contract by bill; or where, after the exercise of reasonable diligence, such presentment cannot be effected; or where, although the presentment has been irregular, acceptance has been refused on some other ground."

There is a further provision that:

"Where a qualified acceptance is taken, and the drawer or an endorser has not explicitly or impliedly authorised the holder to take a qualified acceptance, or does not subsequently assent thereto, such drawer or endorser is discharged from his liability on the bill. The provisions of this sub-section do not apply to a partial acceptance whereof due notice has been given. Where a foreign bill has been accepted as to part, it must be protested as to the balance. When the drawer or endorser of a bill receives notice of a qualified acceptance and does not within a reasonable time express his dissent to the holder, he shall be deemed to have assented thereto."

There are also the following provisions:—

"The return of a dishonored bill to the drawer or an endorser is, in point of form, deemed a sufficient notice of dishonor.

"When the acceptor of a bill is or becomes the holder of it, at or after its maturity, in his own right, the bill is discharged.

"When the holder of a bill, at or after its maturity, absolutely or unconditionally renounces his rights against the acceptor, the bill is discharged. The renunciation must be in writing unless the bill is delivered up to the acceptor.

"Where a bill or acceptance is materially altered without the assent of all parties liable on the bill, the bill is avoided except as against a party who has himself made, authorised or assented to the alteration, and subsequent endorsers; provided that, where a bill has been materially altered, but the alteration is not apparent, and the bill is in the hands of a holder in due course, such holder may avail himself of the bill as if it had not been altered, and may enforce payment of it according to its original tenor.

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, where a cheque is not presented for payment within a reasonable time of its issue, and the drawer or the person on whose account it is drawn had the right at the time of such presentment, as between him and the banker, to have the cheque paid, and suffers actual damage through the delay, he is discharged to the extent of such damage, that is to say, to the extent to which such drawer or person is a creditor of such banker to a larger amount than he would have been had such cheque been paid.

"Where, by this Act, any instrument or writing is required to be signed by any person, it is not necessary that he should sign it with his own hand, but it is sufficient if his signature is written thereon by some other person by or under his authority."

And in the case of a corporation it is provided that it is sufficient if the instrument is sealed with the corporate seal, but it is not required that the seal of the corporation should be affixed. It is further provided that:

"Where a bill or note is required to be protested within a specified time or before some further proceeding is taken, it is sufficient that the Bill has been noted for protest before the expiration of the specified time, or the taking of the proceeding; and the formal protest may be extended at any time thereafter as of the date of the noting. Where a dishonored bill or note is authorised or required to be protested, and the services of a notary cannot be obtained at the place where the bill is dishonored, any justice of the peace, resident of the place, may present and protest such bill or note and give all necessary notices, having all the necessary powers of a notary in respect thereto."

It is also provided that this Act shall not come into force until the 1st September next, in order that its provisions may be fully known by time being given for the publication of the statute, as well as for the information which will at once be desired as to the changes in the present law. These are the changes which it is proposed to make in the law. Some of them, as the House will have observed, are either declaratory of the common law, or partially so, or they ratify the practice of the mercantile community in respect to these matters. One of the changes which it is necessary to make in the direction of uniformity is in relation to the Province of Quebec, and this Bill will require a protest in the case of foreign bills only, making the Quebec law uniform with that of the other Provinces. I may further observe that the Bill proposes to establish in Canada the English provisions in respect to crossed cheques.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## WRECKING AND COASTING PRIVILEGES TO UNITED STATES VESSELS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to admit United States vessels to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian waters. He said: In the first clause of the Bill, provision is made for vessels belonging to the United States of America being allowed to assist vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. In the second clause, it is provided that vessels belonging to the United States of America may tow vessels belonging to the United States from one port to another as well as vessels of any other nationality. The third clause provides that vessels belonging to the United States of America may enjoy the privileges of the coasting trade of Canada, by coasting from one port to another, subject only to the same regulations as Canadian vessels are subject to. The fourth clause provides that the Act shall go into effect when the Government of the United States have passed a similar law giving like privileges to the vessels of Canada in the waters of the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Has the Government caused to be printed the lists of voters as revised in 1886? 2. What numbers of such lists have been struck off, or are to be struck off, for each electoral district? 3. What number of such lists will be sent to each revising officer, and when? 4. Are such lists to be supplied to any other persons than revising officers; or have they been supplied to, or obtained by any other persons? 5. If it be permitted to any person, other than revising officers, to obtain copies of such lists, to whom should application be made for them; and is the price thereof to be regulated by analogy to the prices under section seventeen of the Franchise Act, or what price is fixed? 6. What number of copies of the lists as preliminarily revised is it proposed to print off for the revising officers to enable them to meet the demands of persons applying for such lists, under section seventeen, sub section one, of the Franchise Act?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. The electoral lists prepared after those revised in 1886, have all been put in type. 2. Fifty copies or proofs of each have been struck off. 3. This will necessarily depend on the size of the constituency, and may depend to some extent on the legislation which may take place during the present Session. The lists will be furnished in sufficient time to enable the revising officers to proceed with their revision at the proper time. 4. Lists have been issued to several parties when elections to the House of Commons, or under the Canada Temperance Act were going on, or about to be entered on, and only then. 5 and 6. No regulations have yet been made upon these points.

## SUBSIDY TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Government of Prince Edward Island drawn any sum of money from the Government of Canada, from the 1st day of January, 1888, to the 1st day of February, 1889, from capital or other than usual subsidy?

Mr. FOSBER. The Government of Prince Edward Island withdrew a sum of money from its capital account on the 14th of January, 1889, for local improvements. The sum was \$200,000.

## PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint preventive officers for Tignish and Nail

Pond, Prince Edward Island, in room of James Phee and Benjamin D. Waite, who were both dismissed in 1888?

**Mr. BOWELL.** It is not the intention of the Government to appoint preventive officers for Tignish and Nail Pond, until, in the opinion of the Government, such officers are necessary for the protection of the revenue.

#### SUBWAY ACROSS THE STRAITS OF NORTH-UMBERLAND.

**Mr. PERRY** asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates, during the present Session, a sum sufficient to build the subway across the Straits of Northumberland, connecting Prince Edward Island with the mainland, in accordance with the terms of Confederation, and as promised by Sir John A. Macdonald in a letter to Senator Howlan, dated January 28th, 1887?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The final clauses of the question are scarcely in order, as containing a statement of alleged facts. If my hon. friend will consent to the withdrawal of those, I will answer the question by saying that the intention of the Government will be shown in the Estimates which will shortly be laid before the House.

#### THE BROTHERS LÉBOURDAIS.

**Mr. CASGRAIN** asked. Whether the Government has had any correspondence respecting the trial of the two brothers, Lebourdais, from the County of L'Islet, which took place in Liverpool, England, in December last; and if so, whether the Government has taken, or will take, any action in the matter?

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** I find that the Government has had no correspondence on the subject, but a memorial was presented within the last few days, and in that memorial the wish was expressed that the case should be transmitted to Her Majesty. The conviction referred to in the question took place in Scotland, and His Excellency the Governor General has been moved to transmit the memorial for the consideration of Her Majesty's ministers.

#### FRAUDS UPON FARMERS.

**Mr. BROWN** moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed to enquire into the fraudulent practices which have prevailed, and still prevail, in various parts of the Dominion, by which farmers and others have been and are induced to give their promissory notes and securities to a very large amount in the aggregate, for seed, agricultural implements, grape vines, and other goods and merchandise, by various false pretexts; the goods in some cases never being delivered, and in other cases being comparatively worthless, the makers of such promissory notes being obliged to make payment, while the perpetrators of these wrongs evade justice; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and examine on oath or affirmation, where affirmation is allowed by law, such witnesses as may appear before the said committee, and to report what remedies exist in such cases, or what further remedies should be provided; said committee also be empowered to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as it may deem necessary, and to consist of Messrs. Amyot, Barron, Brown, Carpenter, Coochane, Desjardins, Fisher, Ferguson (Welland), Hale, McMullen, Marshall, Mills (Annapolis), Moncrieff, Rowand, Smith (Ontario), Welsh, and Wood (Brockville).

He said: In making this motion, I desire to say that the committee appointed last Session prosecuted their labors with all diligence during the limited time they had, and the work they did has borne very good fruit. During the recess the members of the committee, from the various parts of the country, in their several constituencies, have received further information as to the frauds committed and especially in that part of the country from which I come, vine-growers have been swindled, and desire to give evidence before the committee.

**Mr. PERRY.**

**Mr. ARMSTRONG.** I think, before the House consents to this motion, we ought to have some information as to what the probable cost will be, and also what has been the cost of the enquiry that was gone into last Session. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that a large committee was appointed last Session; a large number of witnesses were brought here, no doubt, at great expense, from a great distance; a large amount of evidence was collected, which was printed and distributed. Now, I submit that all that must involve a large cost to the country, and the question comes up, whether the results to be obtained are sufficiently important to justify the additional cost. These are points on which the House should be satisfied before they commit themselves to further expenditure in this matter. It seems to me that the evidence taken last year, voluminous as it was and costly as it was, was certainly sufficient to form a basis for the Government and the House to judge whether such legislation was necessary or not, and on what line such legislation should be enacted. I am one of those who have not much faith in that kind of enquiry and that sort of legislation. The fact of the matter is, that the great mass of the farmers of this Dominion and others, to whom reference is made, are not fools. It is true that here and there are found a few who can be gulled by such practices as those referred to, but they form a very small minority, and I submit that the great bulk of the farmers and traders in the Dominion are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves, and, so far as that small minority is concerned, committees might sit from now till doomsday, and enact as many laws as they please, and yet fail to save them from being taken advantage of. I hold that sufficient enquiry has been made to enable the House to judge whether such legislation is necessary or not, and what that legislation should be, and there is no necessity to burden the country with further cost for procuring evidence.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** In regard to the remarks of the hon. member, I may say that I happened to be a member of the committee in question. The committee got to work very late in the Session, and the opportunity to gather information of the kind necessary to enable them to form an opinion as to whether legislation was needed or not, was very limited. The information secured was of decided advantage to those who possibly might, from limited information and experience, be taken advantage of by those who are always waiting to take advantage of simple-minded men. I endorse to some extent the remarks made by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong); still I contend that there is a very respectable percentage of the farming community and the trading public who, from time to time, are victimised by men who make it a business to go from door to door and take advantage of these people. If we can, by any investigation or by any legislation enacted by this House, give those people information or pass such legislation as will prevent repetition of the frauds perpetrated, I think it will be wise and prudent on the part of this House to aid in any possible way the hon. gentleman who is asking for this committee. I am willing to consent that the expenditure should be incurred, and I know the expense last year was very limited. I can say for the chairman of the committee that he was exceedingly careful in regard to the expenditure, and that, when any person was asked to be brought before the committee, it was only when it appeared that he would be able to give good evidence, and, after an idea of the expense had been obtained, the chairman ordered the witness to be subpoenaed. I have no doubt he will follow the same prudent course this year, and, if he does so, I believe the committee will be of decided advantage to the simple-minded people in this country who are taken advantage of from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

## SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a Special Committee of seven Members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by the House on Thursday, the 31st ult., and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir John Thompson, and Messrs. Bowell, Laurier and Mills, do compose said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

## INLAND REVENUE REPORT—CORRECTION.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to call the attention of the House to an error which has occurred in one of the appendices to the report of the Inland Revenue Department, just published. I need not say that it is to be regretted that such an error should have occurred; but my attention having been called to the fact, instructions were immediately given to take measures to have it corrected, so that those to whom the reports were sent should be in possession of the correct figures. It has been insinuated that the commissioner was guilty of gross dereliction of duty in this matter, and it has also been insinuated that the error was purposely made in order to prejudice the case of the Scott Act, and that the statement of the great consumption per head of the population was in fact made against the Scott Act by those who were opposed to it. In reply, I need only call the attention of the House, after having admitted that a very serious blunder has been made, and one which is to be regretted, to the fact that the commissioner in his report himself states at page 19, paragraph 21 :

"It may be remarked that after reducing all spirituous and malt liquors and wines, domestic and foreign, to the basis of alcohol, the allowance per head of the population for the past decade does not exceed three-quarters of a gallon per annum, barely one-third of the quantity per head consumed throughout Europe."

The compilation of the appendix has for some years past been entrusted to Mr. Campeau, an old officer, and one of the most careful and industrious officers in the service. He is absent at present, or I would have procured from him a statement as to how the error occurred. I may state further that this paper was one of the last returned by the printers, and the schedule was not prepared before the last day for the report to be handed in. The House will no doubt be satisfied that this error must have accidentally crept into the table, it having been prepared by an officer of the standing of Mr. Campeau, whose work has always been found correct, and who has discharged his duty with great faithfulness. The House will no doubt also be satisfied that there was no intention to mislead, and I can assure hon. members that every means will be taken to place the correct figures into the hands of those who have received the report.

Mr. EDGAR. I did not catch the correction made by the Minister, if he made one.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The correction will be given. I have instructed the preparation of a corrected table, which will be ready in a day or two, to be supplied to members, to take the place of that which is incorrect.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister does not know yet what the correct figures are?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I know the percentage arrived at here in this report. It is three quarters of a gallon per head.

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

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

3

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN presented the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report Lists of the Select Standing Committees for the present Session. He moved that the portion of the report relating to the Committee on Standing Orders be adopted, as follows:—

## ON STANDING ORDERS.

## Messieurs

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

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

Motion agreed to.

## LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That a Select Committee composed of Sir Adolphe Caron, Messrs. Blake, Amyot, Chouinard, Colby, Davies, Davin, Desjardins, Kirkpatrick, O'Brien, Scriver, Thérien, Weldon (Albert), Weldon (St. John), and Wright, be appointed to assist the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, in so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses of the Library, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors therewith.

He said: This Committee is the same as last year, except that Mr. Edgar has been replaced by Mr. Blake, by consent of the Committee.

Motion agreed to.

## REPORT.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Haggart.)

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 8) to provide for the examination and licensing of all persons employed as stationary engineers, and all persons having charge of steam boilers and other devices under pressure.—(Mr. Cook.)

## RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) further to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is a similar Bill to the one I introduced last year. It has reference, in the first place, to the landing of passengers on the platform. It is the custom of the railway companies throughout this country to drop passengers wherever they see fit, and I think the travelling public should be protected against this. Another question dealt with by the Bill is the manner of handling baggage. It is well known that the baggage of passengers on railways has been smashed

and destroyed by railway officials to a great extent, and this Bill proposes to prevent these two actions which are against the public interest.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to report Lists of Members who compose the Select Standing Committees of this House, in so far as relates to the following Committees—on Privileges and Elections, on Expiring Laws, on Railway, Canals and Telegraph Lines, on Miscellaneous Private Bills, on Printing, on Public Accounts, on Banking and Commerce, and on Agriculture and Colonization—be concurred in, as follows:—

#### ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

##### Messieurs

Amyot,	Girouard,	McDonald (Victoria),
Barron,	Hall,	McIntyre,
Beausoleil,	Hudspeth,	Mills (Bothwell),
Blake,	Ives,	Moncrieff,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kirkpatrick,	Mulock,
Casgrain,	Landry,	Patterson (Essex),
Chapleau,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Préfontaine,
Colby,	Langelier (Quebec),	Prior,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Riopel,
Curran,	Laurier,	Temple,
Davies,	Lister,	Thompson (Sir John),
Desaulniers,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Desjardins,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (Albert), and
Dickey,	McCarthy,	Weldon (St. John).—43.
Edgar,		

#### ON EXPIRING LAWS.

##### Messieurs

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

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

#### ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

##### Messieurs

Archibald,	Edgar,	Mills (Annapolis),
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mills (Bothwell),
Armstrong,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Baird,	Geoffrion,	Perley,
Barron,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Beausoleil,	Girouard,	Platt,
Bécharde,	Godbout,	Porter,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Préfontaine,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Prior,
Bernier,	Guay,	Purcell,
Blake,	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Boisvert,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Borden,	Hale,	Robillard,
Bourassa,	Hall,	Roome,
Bowell,	Hesson,	

Mr. Cook.

Bowman,	Hickey,	Ross,
Boyle,	Holton,	Rykert,
Brien,	Hudspeth,	Scarth,
Brown,	Innes,	Scriver,
Bryson,	Ives,	Shanly,
Burdett,	Joncas,	Skinner,
Burns,	Jones (Halifax),	Small,
Cameron,	Kenny,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Campbell,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Labelle,	Sproule,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Landerkin,	Stevenson,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Landry,	Sutherland,
Casey,	Langelier (Quebec),	Taylor,
Casgrain,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Chapleau,	Larivière,	Thérien,
Charlton,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Chiquette,	Laurier,	Tisdale,
Chouinard,	Lavergne,	Trow,
Cimon,	Lépine,	Turcot,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Livingston,	Vanasse,
Cook,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Waldie,
Corby,	Mackenzie,	Wallace,
Costigan,	McCarthy,	Ward,
Couture,	McCulla,	Watson,
Couture,	McDougald (Picton),	Weldon (Albert),
Curran,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (St. John),
Daly,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	McIntyre,	White (Renfrew),
Davis,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dawson,	McKeen,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
D.-St. Georges,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Égin),
Desjardins,	McMullen,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dessaint,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Dewdney,	Mara,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Masson,	Wright, and
	Meigs,	Yeo.—162.

#### ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

##### Messieurs

Amyot,	Edwards,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Armstrong,	Eisenbauer,	McGreevy,
Audet,	Ellis,	McIntyre,
Barnard,	Geoffrion,	McKay,
Barron,	Gillmor,	McMillan (Huron),
Bell,	Girouard,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Borden,	Hale,	Madill,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Marshall,
Brien,	Holton,	Moffat,
Burdett,	Hudspeth,	Moncrieff,
Campbell,	Ives,	Montplaisir,
Carpenter,	Jamieson,	Mulock,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Joncas,	Robillard,
Casey,	Jones (Digby),	Rowand,
Chisholm,	Kenny,	Scriver,
Choquette,	Labelle,	Small,
Chouinard,	Labrosse,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Landry,	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Ward,
Daly,	Langelier (Quebec),	Watson,
Daoust,	Laurie,	Weldon (Albert),
Davin,	Lavergne,	Weldon (St. John),
Denison,	Lépine,	Wilson (Argenteuil), and
Dickey,	Lovitt,	Wright.—74.
Dickinson,	McCulla,	

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

#### ON PRINTING.

##### Messieurs

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

#### ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

##### Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Gillmor,	Moncrieff,
Baird,	Grandbois,	Mulock,
Baker,	Haggart,	Perley,
Bécharde,	Hesson,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Holton,	Rykert,
Blake,	Jones (Halifax),	Scarth,
Bowell,	Landerkin,	Scriver,
Cameron,	Langelier (Quebec),	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Lister,	Somerville,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Macdonald (Huron),	Tupper,

Chapleau, Charlton, Colby, Costigan, Davies, Ellis, Foster,	Mackenzie, McCarthy, McDonalld (Picton), McMullen, Madill, Mills (Annapolis), Mitchell,	Wallace, Welsh, White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Wilmot, Wood (Brockville), and Wood (Westm'ld).—57.
---	---	--

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

## ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

## Messieurs

Archibald, Baird, Baker, Barnard, Beausoleil, Béchar, d, Bernier, Blake, Borden, Bowell, Bowman, Boyle, Brown, Bryson, Burns, Cameron, Cargill, Cartwright (Sir Rich.), Cassgrain, Cimon, Cochrane, Cockburn, Colby, Cook, Curran, Davies, Dawson, Desjardins, Dickey, Dickinson, Dupont, Edgar, Eisenhauer, Ellis, Fiset, Flynn,	Foster, Freeman, Gigault, Girouard, Guillet, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Holton, Ives, Jamieson, Joncas, Jones (Halifax), Kenny, Kirk, Kirkpatrick, Labelle, Landerkin, Landry, Langelier (Quebec), Langevin (Sir Hector), Lister, Lovitt, Macdonald (Sir John), Macdonald (Huron), Macdowall, Mackenzie, McCarthy, McDonald (Victoria), McDonalld (Picton), McGreavy, McNeill, Mara, Masson, Meigs,	Mills (Bothwell), Mitchell, Moncrieff, O'Brien, Paterson (Brant), Perley, Préfontaine, Purcell, Putnam, Riopel, Robillard, Rykert, Scarth, Scriver, Sempie, Shanly, Skinner, Smith (Sir Donald), Sutherland, Temple, Thérien, Thompson (Sir John), Tisdale, Turcot, Vanasse, Waldie, Wallace, Weldon (Albert), Weldon (St. John), Welsh, White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Wilson (Argenteuil), Wood (Westmoreland), Wright, and Yeo—108.
--	---	---

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

## ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION.

## Messieurs

Armstrong, Audet, Bain (Noulanges), Bain (Wentworth), Baker, Béchar, d, Bell, Bernier, Boisvert, Bourassa, Bowman, Brien, Bryson, Burdett, Bu na, Cameron, Carling, Carpenter, Chapleau, Chisholm, Choquette, Cimon, Cochrane, Colby, Coughlin, Coulombe, Couture, Daly, Daoust, David, Davis, Dawson, Desaulniers,	Dessaint, Dewdney, Dickinson, Doyon, Edwards, Eisenhauer, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren), Ferguson (Renfrew), Ferguson (Welland), Fiset, Fisher, Flynn, Gauthier, Gigault, Godbout, Gordon, Grandbois, Guay, Guillet, Hesson, Innes, Joncas, Jones (Digby), Kirk, Labrosse, Landry, Lang, Laurie, Lépine, Livingston, Macdonald (Huron), McMillan (Huron), McMillan (Vaudreuil),	McNeill, Mara, Marshall, Masson, Mitchell, Montplaisir, Nevau, Paterson (Brant), Perley, Perry, Platt, Pope, Putnam, Robertson, Roome, Ross, Rowand, Ste Marie, Semple, Smith (Ontario), Sproule, Stevenson, Sutherland, Taylor, Trow, Tyrwhitt, Watson, White (Renfrew), Wilson (Elgin), Wilson (Lennox), Wright, and Yeo—96.
---	---	---

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

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting that their Honors will unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing of this House, namely, Messrs. Amyot, Bergin, Bourassa, Bowell Charlton, Davin, Desjardins, Foster, Granibois, Innes, McMullen, Putnam, Somerville, Taylor, Tisdale, Trow and Vanasse, compose the committee.

Motion agreed to.

## INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANDRY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled "An Act respecting interest." He said: The Bill requires very little explanation beyond this, that it seeks to fix the amount of interest charged on any contract.

An hon. MEMBER. To limit it?

Mr. LANDRY. Of course, if you fix it, it is limited. Of course I have my own ideas as to what it should be; but I should like to know the opinion of the House as to the amount at which it should be fixed, if it is thought reasonable to limit the interest.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it the same Bill the hon. member introduced last Session?

Mr. LANDRY. It is the same Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Mr. WALLACE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. He said: I think the necessity of this Bill is conclusively shown by the investigation that was held during last Session. The object of the Bill is to prevent any persons or corporations or companies from granting exclusive privileges to any person; to prevent them from denying privileges to any person that are granted to other persons in similar capacities and under similar conditions; also for preventing an undue restraint of traffic in certain articles of merchandise, and to make it impossible to prevent or restrain the manufacture, or production, or supply of articles that are either produced in this country or imported into it. The penalties provided by the Bill for infraction of these provisions may be either a fine or imprisonment, or both. There are three clauses in the Bill. The last clause provides that the Bill shall not interfere with chapter 131 of the Revised Statutes, relating to Trades Unions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## BONSECOURS MARKET HALL, MONTREAL.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to compensate the corporation of the city of Montreal for deterioration of the Bonsecours Market Hall during its occupancy by the volunteer corps?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to compensate the corporation of the city of Montreal for alleged deterioration of the Bonsecours Market Hall during its occupancy by the volunteer corps. A positive engagement existed, on behalf of the corporation of Montreal, to furnish to the Department of Militia drill accommodation. From reports received by the department from the Deputy Adjutant General, the building is shown to have been returned in as good order as when it was placed at the disposal of the militia.

## BRIDGE OVER THE LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to provide a new bridge over the Lachine Canal, to afford adequate facility for traffic between the city of Montreal and Point St. Charles?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not yet come to any decision on this matter.

## CROSSING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY IN MANITOBA.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court, given on 22nd of December last, in the case submitted to them respecting the validity of the statute of the Province of Manitoba authorising the construction of a railway crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is the intention of the Government to propose legislation this Session to repeal or amend the provisions of the Railway Act upon which the question was raised by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or to pass a declaratory Act affirming the construction put upon those provisions by the Supreme Court, in order to avoid uncertainty as to the state of the law in other cases?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not at present the intention of the Government to do this.

## PINE TIMBER UPON INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. BARRON asked, At what date was the sale completed of the pine timber upon Indian Reserve No. 6, under the Robinson Treaty, known in the Treaties as Shawanakisic's Reserve? To whom was the said pine timber sold? What was the cash bonus paid by the purchaser to the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In answer to the first part of the question, I beg to state that the sale of the timber was completed on the 30th September, 1886, and the license issued on the 14th October, 1886. The timber was sold to Mr. Robillard. The cash bonus paid was \$316.

## TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BARRON asked, Have the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners, appointed to take evidence and report as to the further progress of the work, yet sent in their report to the Government? If yes, do they report for or against further progress of the work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report has not yet been sent in.

## COST OF ISSUING BUDGET SPEECHES.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return giving the total cost of issuing the Budget Speech each year since 1880, together with a statement showing the number of copies issued yearly during said period.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no objection to the adoption of the motion, but I would like my hon. friend to amend it by having the return brought down for each year from 1867, so that we may have the information complete.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had already thought it would be desirable to have it extended back to the beginning of Confederation.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

## THE GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. RINFRET (translation) moved for:

Copies of all petitions, reports and other documents respecting the granting of subsidies by the Dominion Government to the proposed line  
SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

of railway between Montreal and Lévis, known as the Great Eastern Railway.

He said: In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the great importance, keeping in view the general interests of the country, that will be derived from the construction of the "Great Eastern Railway." This line will be the shortest and the most direct between the city of Montreal and the last station of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis. It will be, without doubt, especially during the winter season, the route over which will pass a great portion of the freight from the west and the north-west, coming by way of the great Pacific Road to its destination in the Maritime Provinces. Those who are acquainted with the blocked up condition of affairs on the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Lévis, and especially between Montreal and Richmond, cannot but admit that a second line on the south side of the St. Lawrence would greatly facilitate the moving of freight between the two points I have named, and would give the Intercolonial a very appreciable increase in its receipts. The policy of the Government, Mr. Speaker, has been, in later years especially, directed towards the building of railways. At the present day they are to be found running all over the country. Several of these lines less useful, doubtless, than the Great Eastern line, only looked to the satisfaction of local interests, without any thought of future revenue to the public treasury. The Great Eastern line, it is true, would cost several thousands of dollars paid as Federal and local subsidies, but the result would be in a few years to pay back to the public treasury both interest and capital, by way of the considerable surplus of revenue which it would earn for the Intercolonial. I will at this point presume to cite a short extract from an article in the *Monde*, the organ of the Minister of Public Works, bearing date the 2nd February last, in support of the statement which I have just made:

"There is a special reason which pleads in favor of a liberal grant from the Federal Government to this line, namely, that it is really a continuation of the Intercolonial Railway, and will be the latter's most important branch. The increase in freight to the Intercolonial which will be the result of its completion, will be an ample recompense to the Government for any subsidy which it might grant."

But there is another reason for which the Government should give its attention to the building of this line, and that is the reason afforded by the justice of the act. Upon the south side of the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, are found the oldest parishes in Canada. These parishes are, generally speaking, prosperous, in spite of the enormous public burdens which rest upon their shoulders, during the past twenty-five or thirty years, for the construction of railways in all parts of Canada. These parishes have contributed their share in the building of the Grand Trunk, the Pacific and the Intercolonial, which have cost the country millions and millions—not to mention a host of other lines of less importance. If I make mention of these facts, it is not by way of criticism on the acts or the conduct of the Government. I desire simply to remind it—and especially to secure the attention of the Minister of Public Works, the acknowledged chief of his party in the Province of Quebec—I wish to remind the Government that these parishes have not received their share in the distribution of the public expenditure. In the Counties of Lotbinière, Nicolet and Yamaska, railways are conspicuous by their almost entire absence. All that has been spent so far in the parishes of these counties—with the exception of two parishes of the county which I represent and which are traversed by the Grand Trunk—may be summed up as follows. I quote from the last Report of Railways (1888):—

"By the Act 49 Victoria, chap. 10 authority was given for the grant of a subsidy to an extent not exceeding \$32,000, on an estimated distance of 10 miles, towards the construction of a line from Yamaska to the River St. Francis, P. Q.; and the Great Eastern Railway Company having applied, and having satisfactorily shown their ability to perform the work, a contract was made with them on the 12th October, 1886,

under the authority of an Order in Council of the 9th of that month, the time for completion being fixed as the 1st of October, 1887."

"The road having been completed and inspected, the whole of the subsidy due for its actual distance, 6 miles, namely, \$19,200, has been paid under an Order in Council of the 27th March, 1887."

And further on, under the heading "Montreal and Sorel Railway Company," this is what I read:

"By the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, a subsidy not exceeding \$72,000 was authorised to be granted to this company for a line from St. Lambert to Sorel. Under an Order in Council of the 2nd October, 1885, a contract was made with the company on the 14th and under the authority of Orders in Council, the last dated 10th November, 1886, payments have been made, amounting in all to \$69,922, the road, 44.67 miles long, having been completed, with the exception of a small quantity of work, to secure the finishing of which \$1,550 was retained."

Perhaps altogether, nearly \$90,000 was spent on the road up to date. There was another sum of \$96,000 voted, but of this but a very small sum has been paid. There was, however, no lack of demands made, Mr. Speaker. I know that a great number of petitions were forwarded to the Governor General. The electors of these various parishes have, by returning to the matter on various occasions and in many ways, shown their lively desire to have this railway. The Hon. the Minister of Public Works knows something about this. We know that on the 6th September last, a political picnic was gotten up in honor of the hon. the Ministers of the Province of Quebec. According to the *Monde's* report, the greatest enthusiasm reigned without ceasing among the political friends of the hon. Ministers. I had not the pleasure of being present at the meeting, but I think I am in a position to state that we must paint somewhat of a shadow over the smiling picture as executed by the *Monde*, and that at least some of the electors were slightly disappointed when they found that the hon. Ministers made no allusion whatever to the building of the "Great Eastern Railway." I have just said that I was not present, and I only speak from what I read in *Le Monde* newspaper, the organ of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Was it through forgetfulness that these hon. Ministers made no allusion to the most important subject that they could, under the circumstances, have touched upon? It could not have been through forgetfulness, if the fact is considered that on the very day the Minister of Public Works received, from the Bishop of Nicolet, a very flattering letter; and one which allowed him to see between the lines that the construction of the "Great Eastern Railway" was not a thing to be treated as entirely foreign to the invitation which had been extended. I will venture to quote the following few words from this letter:—

"Our town has not much to offer that is attractive to a visitor of your importance; it has only just begun to receive the favors of fortune. On its behalf one must discount the future in order to answer satisfactorily the requirements of the present day. A harbor of refuge for the humbler vessels navigating the St. Lawrence, and the needs of our traffic in firewood; a railway in the direction of the interior parishes; and, above all the rest, the important project of a railway on the south shore, which, by affording a new outlet for the Intercolonial, will place Nicolet on the grand chain of communication binding Halifax to Victoria, and of which your opportune arrival places the first link in our soil of Nicolet."

So pretty a letter ought to have deserved, I think, some reference in the speech of the Minister of Public Works. The construction of this railway will be costly enough, Mr. Speaker; if I can rely upon certain information which I have received, it will cost nearly \$20,000 per mile. There must be added to this the cost of three or four very important bridges. One of them will cost more than one quarter of a million of dollars. The total cost of this railway will not be much less than three millions and a-half or four millions of dollars. During last Session a delegation waited on the hon. the First Minister, with reference to the bridges which I have just referred to. I do not recollect all the persons who composed this delegation, but I think that the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse) formed part of it. We were cordially received by the hon. Minister, but up to

the present time we have received no answer. Towards this immense undertaking, which will contribute so greatly to the prosperity of Canada as a whole, all the subsidies paid so far, if I have been well informed, amount to from \$90,000 to \$100,000 from the Dominion Government, and about \$145,000 from the present Government of the Province of Quebec. This sum bears no proportion to the importance of this undertaking. In conclusion, I trust that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who is especially charged with the interests of the Province of Quebec, will take this matter into his serious consideration, and that, with the assistance of the two Governments, the expectations of the Bishop of Nicolet will be realised, and at the same time justice will be rendered to the electors of three or four counties on the south shore of the St. Lawrence.

MR. BOISVERT. (Translation.) It is with pleasure that I rise, Mr. Speaker at this time, to second the motion which has just been presented by the hon. the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret). It is also with pleasure that I find the hon. gentleman take such a lively interest in this railway, in order to hasten its completion at the earliest date; and this in the interests of the population on the south shore through whose country this railway must pass. You are doubtless aware, Mr. Speaker, how greatly the people in the parishes of the south shore are isolated on account of the want of railway communication. And this is especially irksome to us, the inhabitants of the town of Nicolet, who have the great advantage and blessing of possessing in the heart of our town the episcopal residence of the Diocese of Nicolet; who have in addition a vast seminary to which a great number of students from the surrounding parishes, and even from the United States, come, in order to prosecute their classical studies,—without counting several other religious schools at which the students receive, to their advantage, a careful training. In fact, for the town of Nicolet, which possesses a great number of mills and manufacturing establishments, affording employment to a great number of workmen, this question of a railway is one of the gravest importance. On account of the above enumerated attractions, and by reason of several others which it would be a too great loss of time to enumerate at this moment, a great number of persons are compelled to come to Nicolet at all seasons and days of the year, and it is hardly necessary for me to state that they reach the place with difficulty whether by water or land. Besides, the hon. the Ministers of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) and of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron) know something about this, owing to the visit that they made us on the 6th September last, when Nicolet had the honor of receiving them. They must recollect very well that they narrowly escaped destruction in the mouth of the River Nicolet. Well, Mr. Speaker, for these various reasons, I hope that the Government will do all in its power to complete at an early date this railway, which will prove most advantageous for the people on the south shore, alongside of whom the railway must pass—for commerce in general—and also for the Government. In fact this railway must unite with the Intercolonial Railway, and by such an union increase the freight, and the receipts of the latter railway. I conclude these few words by expressing the flattering hope that I will soon see the opening for traffic of this Great Eastern Railway.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It is not my desire, Mr. Speaker, to leave unanswered the remarks which have just been made by the two members who have moved and seconded this motion. I will take this occasion to congratulate my hon. friend the member for Nicolet (Mr. Boisvert) upon his maiden speech. I am convinced that we shall hear from him more than once during the Session. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) alluded in his speech to an address delivered by me last



autumn when I went to Nicolet. The hon. member knows perfectly well that the speeches as reported in the newspapers are never complete, and that, therefore, he should not place to my credit or discredit the address as reported. As to the very flattering letter which the Bishop of Nicolet sent me about this time, there is no doubt but that prelate referred not only to the Nicolet River, that is to say, to the work done in and about it, but also to the railway; and in the remarks made by me I alluded to the two undertakings. The hon. member knows that for several years past grants have been made by the Government, and at the request of the Government,—in order to carry outworks on the River Nicolet, more especially to make a harbor of refuge of it. When this harbor is completed we shall possess a work of great usefulness. As to the railway, the hon. member cannot be ignorant that there have been several grants made towards that portion of the railway already built. He knows, besides, that there still remain, at the present moment, grants to be disposed of,—to be used for the purpose of driving the railway as far as St. Grégoire, on the Arthabaska Branch. These are now drawn on by contractors to push on the works. In proportion as these works are completed conformably to law, the grants will be expended. The hon. member has alluded to the continuation of this line. He ought to know that London was not built in a day, and that a little time must be given in order to build the railway throughout its whole length; probably as far as the Chaudière or to the Intercolonial station at Lévis. But, as regards this portion, I cannot pledge the faith of the Government, because this question will be brought before Council at the proper time. However, the hon. member should perceive that the Government has not lost sight of the opportunity for endowing with public works and railways such portions of the country which never possessed them, as, for example, the counties of Yamaska and Nicolet. The hon. member is perfectly right in wishing to have this portion of the country opened up by railways; and I am certain that in a short time the terminus of the road will be reached. I have no objection to this motion being carried.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) With the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will add a few words to the remarks which have already been made respecting the construction of the "Great Eastern Railway" by the hon. members for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) and for Nicolet (Mr. Boisvert). I myself represent a county which is as much interested as it is possible for a county to be in the extension of this railway, that is to say, in the junction of the two terminal sections which are now either built or under construction. It must be stated that there are already 45 miles of this railway nearly completed, that is, the railway from Montreal to Sorel, which extends from St. Lambert to Sorel. These 45 miles are not at the present moment in actual running order, because the company has not received the assistance from the Dominion Government which it ought to have received. I do not say this to criticize in any manner the proceedings of the Government, but it is a certainty that this company has only obtained, up to date, from the Government of Canada, the sum of \$70,000, whereas at the last session of the Local Legislature that Government gave a grant of \$112,000. I am satisfied that if the Federal Ministry would keep its promise,—because it appears to me that a promise was given at the time,—if an additional sum of \$70,000 was given, a great portion of the "Great Eastern" would now be in actual operation. Now the importance of continuing this line of railway is plain to the eyes of the whole world. This portion of the country has certainly been neglected. As I said a moment ago, I have no intention of criticizing the Government, but the time has come for putting this region in communication with the great centres. There lie there seven very rich

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

agricultural counties, each of which contains quite populous villages and even towns, such as Sorel, Nicolet, St. Ours, and others whose names I forget; and all these small centres are deprived, during the winter, of communication with the great centres of Montreal and Quebec. The advantages that the building of this railway would give to the Intercolonial are evident to everybody. The Intercolonial costs us considerable sums of money every year, and I am persuaded that if this road could take a short line to reach Montreal the receipts would be increased, or at least the deficits would be lessened. I cannot allow this question to pass, Mr. Speaker, without insisting upon immediate action on the part of the Government, and upon the granting of a subsidy this Session for that portion of the railway which is actually built—I mean the railway from Montreal to Sorel. I am convinced that if the Government would grant a fair subsidy to assist in the extension of the road, the Provincial Government would do its duty in turn and would give such money assistance as would result in the construction of the whole line. I venture to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will take the matter into serious consideration this Session, or at latest during the coming Session, on the eve of the Dominion elections, say: this would be a good way of pleasing the seven counties which are interested in the building of this railway. Some of them returned Opposition members—the county of Chambly, for example; but if the Government would do what we ask of it, there is no knowing what might happen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I will say but one word, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine). I will not discuss the question whether sufficient grants have been made by one Government or the other; but I do not wish to leave the House under the impression that it is because the grant was not large enough that the railway from Montreal to Sorel was not in operation this winter. It is useless to re-open discussion on this point, but I will not admit that it is on account of the insufficiency of the grants from the Dominion Government that this railway is not now in running order.

Motion agreed to.

#### SOUNDINGS IN THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. GIGAUT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the surveying and sounding operations still required on the Richelieu River in order to permit of the preparation of a chart for the guidance of masters of vessels navigating that river between the International boundary line and the St. Lawrence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I must say that the Department of Public Works has not made an examination of this river with the view of preparing a chart to be placed in the hands of the public. The Department of Railways has made a survey from the boundary, as far as St. John's, for the purposes of the canal. From Chambly proceeding downwards to Sorel there are buoys which mark the channel.

#### HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return of copies of all inspections and reports made by Homestead Inspectors in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, from the 1st day of January, 1887, to the 1st day of January, 1889, the dates of the several inspections and reports, and the name of the inspector.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think, when the hon. gentleman has heard from me the amount it will cost to furnish the particulars covered by his motion, he will probably not press it. I may state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the number of reports made in 1887 by homestead inspec-

tors was, as shown in the return presented to the House by Sir John Macdonald on the 19th May, 1888, 2,487; and 3,898 reports were made by them from 1st January, 1888, to 31st October, 1888; so that 6,385 reports were made during those 21 months. The cost of copying each report, at five cents per folio, would amount to at least one dollar; many of them would cost two dollars each, but my officers have averaged them at one dollar, which was considered a very low average. The hon. gentleman also asks for copies of the reports made during the three remaining months of 1888; so that the return would cost, according to information I have received from my officers, \$7,500, if it were prepared. I thought I had better mention this fact to the hon. gentleman, and ask him what course he proposes to follow under the circumstances.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps it would be preferable, under all the circumstances mentioned by the Minister, that the motion be allowed to stand till another day, so that the hon. gentleman would have time to consider what course to adopt.

Motion allowed to stand.

#### HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR IN MONTREAL.

Mr. CURRAN moved for :

Copies of all papers and documents furnished the Government by the Board of Examiners in connection with the recent examinations of candidates for the office of Hide and Leather Inspector in the city of Montreal.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make this motion on account of the surprise that was created in the city of Montreal at the result of the action of the board by which so many of the candidates who presented themselves for examination, and who were supposed in the public estimation to be men of qualification, some for the inspection of leather, and others for the inspection of hides, were not provided with certificates by this board of examiners. The facts are pretty well known that amongst those who had applied were men who carried on the leather business in various forms for a great many years. In one case there was Mr. Donovan, an old and experienced tanner, very well versed in the leather business, and there were also a number of French Canadian gentlemen who also had been engaged in this business, all of them occupying a very high position in the trade. I may say that one candidate was formerly a member of the board of examiners himself, and on a not remote occasion he issued a certificate to the inspector for the county of Hochelaga. He found himself plucked, or set aside; at all events, he did not get a certificate. There was a feeling of very considerable surprise that only two or three out of all these gentlemen who applied, should have been furnished with certificates by this board of examiners. This state of affairs caused us to look into the law as it now exists, and we find that in a number of cities in Canada the Board of Trade is authorised to appoint a board of examiners:

"Five fit and skilful persons, any three of whom shall be a quorum, for each class of articles to be inspected, in each such locality or county, to examine and test the ability and fitness of applicants for the office of inspector or deputy inspector of such articles."

This leads us to believe that the board has something more than the power to investigate the actual capability of any candidate aspiring to a certificate enabling him to fill such office; that is to say, that the board has also to judge of the fitness; and that, despite the second clause of the same section, which says:

"Every such board shall grant such certificates, and such only as to the qualification of the candidates who present themselves for examination, as the knowledge and proficiency of such candidates require or justify."

I think that, under those circumstances the board, or rather those who represent the board of examiners, and who are

authorised to call in skilled persons to assist them, are, to some extent, assuming a responsibility which ought to devolve on the Government, as to the fitness of the persons who may apply for the certificates or for appointment to the office that may happen to be opened. The mode in which those examinations have been conducted will be explained, I trust, by the documents that will be laid before the House, and that some substantial reason will be given why persons who are supposed to be so thoroughly competent have been set aside and the number of those who received certificates reduced to the number required to fill the offices that happened to be vacant. I think that there is another very objectionable feature in the state of the present law. If these inspectors are to be appointed, they are supposed to be skilful persons, thoroughly versed in their art; and I cannot see why they should not be subjected to the same test of examination as any other person requiring special skill. I think it would be far preferable if the Government would take the power into their own hands; and where an inspector is required for any of the articles enumerated in the statute, that say: The three senior inspectors of the Dominion should be a board, that would pronounce upon the capability of the candidates who would present themselves. This board would then be composed of persons outside of the trade, and persons who are not called upon to be in direct communication with those who are seeking a certificate at their hands. In almost all those cases, in fact, in every one of them, whether it be for inspector of leather, potash, flour, or anything else, the very men who are on the board of examiners are liable to have business connections with the gentleman appointed the very day after he receives his commission. I think that an independent board of examiners should exist, composed of persons skilled themselves, and who would not require to call on experts in order to assist them in their examinations. Above all, the board should not pronounce on anything but the ability of the persons who seek for a certificate, leaving the question of fitness to the responsibility of the Government itself. I direct the attention of the Government, and especially of the hon. Minister in charge of this particular department, to what I conceive to be a state of the law that is not calculated to promote the best interests of the trade and commerce of the Dominion. I trust that not only shall we have some light thrown upon the mode of conducting these examinations in the recent past, but also some explanation as to why men who were supposed to be thoroughly competent were set aside. I trust, also, that we shall have from the hon. Minister a statement that the Government intends to amend the law, in some way, so as to arrive at a more desirable result in the future.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not propose to enter into a discussion on this question before the papers are brought down. I may say, however, in view of some of the remarks which fell from the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, that it may be necessary, after consultation with the Minister of Justice, to make some amendment to the Act which would remove all doubt, if any doubt exists, under that law. The suggestion that these examinations should be held by the three senior inspectors of our department would involve considerable cost. This service is different from the service under any other department. It is not a compulsory act; it is an optional law, which the people can have at their request put into operation in any district. The officers are not paid by fixed salaries, but by fees. The choice of the board of examiners is left to the boards of trade in large cities, which I think are properly considered to be well qualified to make a selection of suitable examiners to examine candidates for the different inspectorships under that Act. The only question that arises in my mind is as to whether

some doubt has not arisen on account of the inconsistency, if I may use the term, of the two sections just read by the hon. member. That, as I have said, I will bring to the notice of the Minister of Justice. I may say, however, that the law itself, with regard to such appointments, clearly limits the choice to the persons who hold those certificates. The Government cannot appoint a man who does not hold a certificate; we have no right to go behind the reports of the examiners. All we have to be satisfied about is that the persons have passed the examination and obtained certificates.

Motion agreed to.

#### DISMISSAL OF THE HON. WM. ROSS.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports, correspondence and papers relating to the dismissal of the Hon. William Ross from the Collectorship of Customs at the port of Halifax.

He said: It has been rumored that the Hon. Mr. Ross has been dismissed for an act of courtesy which he extended to a foreign vessel. If this rumor is true, it is an action which ought to invite the scrutiny of the House. But I do not desire to judge of the question; I simply move for the papers, to-day, hoping that they will be brought down at the earliest possible date.

Motion agreed to.

#### RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the Receipts and Expenditures, in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of July, 1888, to 1st February, 1889, with a comparative statement of the same from 1st July, 1887, to 1st February, 1888.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the Exports and Imports from the 1st day of July, 1888, to the 1st day of January, 1889, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return of the names of all chaplains of public institutions under appointment of the Government, together with the dates of their appointment, the amount of their salaries, and the religious denominations to which they belong.—(Mr. Innes.)

Return showing—1st. A list of all the present shareholders of the Témiscouata Railway Company; 2nd. The number of shares held by each shareholder; 3rd. The amount paid by each of them on their respective shares.—(Mr. Dessaint.)

#### PATENT BALLOT BOX.

Mr. BROWN moved:

That a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Edgar, Girouard, Hudspeth, Kenny, Lépine, Madill, Skinner and Ward, be appointed to examine and report on a ballot or voting box invented by John Waddell, of Harriston, and constructed, by order of the House, under the superintendence of Mr. John R. Arnoldi, chief mechanical engineer of the Department of Public Works.

He said: It will be in the recollection of the House that the Select Committee appointed by the House to examine this box reported very favorably upon it, but desired that one should be made under the supervision of the chief mechanical engineer of the Public Works Department. That box has been made, and the object now in having this committee appointed is to examine the box, and report to the House upon it.

Motion agreed to.

#### MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman opposite made some enquiries about the ministerial changes, when I was not in the House, yesterday. They are as follows: It was thought well that Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Finance, should resume his position as High Commissioner in London, and he, therefore, resigned the position of Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Foster, was appointed in his stead and Mr. COSTIGAN.

now holds that office. Instead of Mr. Foster as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. C. H. Tupper was appointed. In place of Mr. McLelan, who was appointed Lieutenant Governor of his native Province, Nova Scotia, Mr. Haggart, the member for North Lanark, was appointed Postmaster General; and in place of the lamented Mr. White, Minister of the Interior, Mr. Dewdney, the member for West Assiniboia, was appointed to that office.

Mr. LAURIER. No one certainly would complain that the explanations, or rather the recitation, of the hon. gentleman has not been perfectly lucid. If anybody amongst us has failed to read the *Canada Gazette* for the last seven or eight months, and to notice what was going on with regard to the offices in the Cabinet, he cannot now have any doubt as to the changes that have taken place. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the occasion would have been right for some comments on the part of the hon. gentleman rather than the very meagre, bare statement of fact which he gave; and, perhaps, such comments will not be out of place at this moment. In the first place, I desire at once to tender my congratulations to the present incumbent of the portfolio of the Minister of Finance. He is one of the young members of this House, his promotion has been very rapid, and he has a very arduous task to perform. My hon. friend, the First Minister, can be congratulated also upon the fact that he has at last found a Minister of Finance for this country. It was, if I remember rightly, Diogenes who, in the street at Athens, went along with a lantern in the day-time seeking to find a man. The hon. gentleman, very much in the same way, went through the ranks of his party seeking to find a Minister of Finance. He went from one constituency to another, until at last he came upon the county of King's, N.B. Still, all I can say to my hon. friend, the present incumbent of the office, is that I wish him, with all my heart, the strength, the courage, and the patience to resist the many applications which will come to him, from day to day, from the many friends of the National Policy, who, ever praising that instrument as being everything that is good, right and fair, still are never satisfied with it, but always want it tinkered at, and, like *Oliver Twist*, are always begging for more. As to the hon. the Postmaster General—well, from what his record has been in the House in the past, I can only say I believe he will be a very efficient Postmaster General. And now, as to my hon. friend, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend is a young man, which is an advantage. I think he is ambitious, which is not at all a fault, and he has been placed at the head of one of the most onerous departments in the service of his country. I have no advice to tender him, and perhaps if I were to do so, he would accept it; but all I can say is that if he will realise, and realise early, that restriction, obstruction and hardship are not the true lines to be acted on in his department, but that breadth of thought and action, generosity in thought and deed, are the best attributes that can be applied, not only to domestic affairs, but to international affairs as well, he will have the opportunity of being most useful to his country. As to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, I am sorry to say—I need I am very sorry to say—that in my conception of public duty and of the discharge of what I conceive to be my duty, not only to the House, but to my own conscience, I cannot say otherwise than that his appointment to the office he now occupies cannot be met but in terms of the most grave censure. Against the hon. gentlemen personally, as a man, I have not the slightest feeling, nor would I do him the slightest injury, but I cannot be indifferent, and am not indifferent to the fact which must stare every man in the face who has followed the history of his country for the last few years, that the appointment of the hon. gentleman to the onerous post he

now occupies cannot be viewed in any other manner than as an unfortunate one. He has been called to what is, in my judgment, the most important of all the departments of the state. The importance of that department is derived from the fact that its executive sphere extends over those vast territories which only a few years ago were added to the Dominion of Canada, and in which advancing civilisation and receding savagery are every day coming more and more into contact and are exposed every day to come into conflict; where the various interests, rights, wants, passions and prejudices of the active and enterprising white man, and of the indolent, shiftless, diffident and jealous Indian, and of the only half-tutored half-breed, are always to be met, some to be checked, others to be advanced, all to be kept in hand in order to prevent possible collision, and therefore require an ever-watchful eye and an ever ready hand. The hon. gentleman has been for more than seven years up to a recent date, from the fall of the year 1881 up to the early months of this year, in the capacity of Lieutenant Governor of these territories, in the capacity of official responsibility to the department of which he is now the head, and who has in charge the destinies of those territories; and now, for the services which he has rendered, I suppose, for the zeal and efficiency with which he has discharged the duties which were incumbent upon him, he is promoted to be head of the department to which he was lately responsible. What has been his services? What has been the discharge of his duty? When the hon. gentleman took office, an important body of the population of that country, the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan, were petitioning, and had been petitioning for some time, the Government for what they conceived to be their just rights, arising out of the new condition that was imposed upon them by the transfer of their territory to the Government of Canada. That was, after all, a very simple matter. They asked simply that the same treatment which had been meted out to the half-breeds of Manitoba should be meted out to them. It has been the policy of England, wherever she has taken up a new country, to deal fairly with the aborigines. It has been her policy never to take possession of their lands without giving compensation. That treatment was allotted to the Indians and half-breeds of Manitoba as well as to the first white occupants. The half-breed titles were extinguished as well as the Indian titles, the latter, though not in the same manner, in a manner peculiar to itself. In Manitoba the Indian title was replaced by free grants of land to heads of families and to minors, and the same rights were asked for the population in the territory of the Saskatchewan. In Manitoba all the holdings which the half-breeds had taken, after the manner of their own forefathers of the French race, were granted to the half-breeds without any difficulty. The half-breeds on the Saskatchewan asked for the same privileges. The propriety, the fairness, the justice of those demands were more than once not only acknowledged, but recommended to the Government by the North-West Council, over which the hon. gentleman presided, and over which his predecessor, Governor Laird, had also presided. Yet, those demands, just, fair and equitable as they were, stipulated as they were, not only by the North-West Council, but by all men in authority in the North-West, were disregarded and never listened to. An agitation grew among the half-breeds to obtain what was refused to them, an agitation just, constitutional, right and legitimate, but growing gradually unconstitutional, turbulent, violent and dangerous, ever growing more dangerous, until at last it broke out into civil war and rebellion; and for the horrors of that civil war, for the millions of treasure spent, for the property destroyed, for the blood shed, for the lives lost, for the scaffold and prison, the men responsible are not the poor half-breeds who one day, goaded to madness, driven to despair by the silent contempt with which all their demands had been met, took their

lives in their hands and risked everything dear to man—life, limb and freedom—in order to get justice, and finally got it. No, they are the men who now sit on the Treasury benches, who never listened to the demands of the half-breeds, but who, deaf to their entreaties, their prayers, at once fell down on their knees the moment the rights of those men were enforced by the bullets at Duck Lake; and of all the men who now stand on the Treasury benches, I say that the man who is most responsible is the hon. the Minister of Interior. The hon. gentleman had a duty to perform, not only to those over whose destinies he had been appointed to preside, but to the Government also who had appointed him. And what was it? It was to present the case of those people. It was to call the attention of the Government to what was going on, and as that agitation became more and more dangerous, it was to endeavor to do everything in his power in order to rouse the Government out of its lethargy. What did he do? I charge against the hon. gentleman that for the long time he was in office, though that agitation was going on in the territory, he never once called the attention of the Government to the claims of the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan. I have here the blue-book brought down by the Government in reference to this matter. I have here all the correspondence which was exchanged on that subject, and I fail to see in any of these documents a single line written by the hon. gentleman in reference to the condition of the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan River, in reference to their claims, or in reference to the dangerous character of the agitation which was going on there. This is a very voluminous document. It extends to 113 pages, and I find four communications from the hon. gentleman, one enclosing the memorial of the North-West Council, recommending special surveys and grants to land occupied by half-breeds. That is dated the 19th October, 1883. Another is dated the 22nd March, 1882, enclosing the resolutions adopted at a public meeting held at Prince Albert. Then there is a letter of the 19th March, 1883, setting forth that the lands occupied by the half-breeds should be sold, and the price distributed among them. The last communication is dated 29th August, 1882, which is a letter on the same subject. In reference to the state of the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan River, there was never a word sent to the Government by the hon. gentleman. There is more than this. We have it in evidence from the letter addressed by Bishop Grandin to the Minister of Public Works, which was introduced in this House by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) in 1884, that the hon. gentleman visited the Saskatchewan district and was met not only with coolness, but with discourtesy, on account of the long delays which the half-breeds had met with in the settlement of their rights.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says "No." This is what the bishop says, under date of 13th June, 1884:

"I take the liberty of addressing to your honor the accompanying letter to the hon. premier, containing the cause of complaint communicated to me by the half-breeds of the district of Lorne on the occasion of my journey to Prince Albert. I cannot express to you the pain I felt on learning that they had sent a message to Louis Riel, and that they had given so unbecoming a reception to the hon. Governor of the North-West. On seeing their state of excitement and discontent, almost amounting to revolt, I perceived them to be under some painful, hostile influence. I was even convinced of this by communications made to me by certain most respectable persons of Prince Albert. They detailed their sources of discontent and grievances to me. Whilst not approving some, I must acknowledge that there are many with which I heartily sympathise. I deeply deplore the scornful way in which the Government has a fashion of treating the native half-breeds. The gentlemen of the Government cannot be ignorant of the fact that the half-breeds, as well as the Indians, have their national pride; they like to meet with attention, and are greatly irritated by the contempt with which they, rightly or wrongly, believe themselves to be treated."

It appears, therefore, from this letter, that the hon. gentleman visited the district of the Saskatchewan, that he met

with no courteous treatment on the part of the half-breeds, some of them presented their claims, some of which were not entertained while some were afterwards allowed; but it does not appear that the hon. gentleman communicated these facts to the Government of which at that time he was an officer. I ask the House if such an offence as that can be condoned, and if there was ever such an offence in any part of the world, followed by such results, which could be condoned. It was the duty of the hon. gentleman then and there to report to the Government the dangerous condition of the North-West; it was his duty, and it should have been his pride to be the protector of these people, because they had no other protector there; it should have been his pride to be their friend, because they had no other friend; and it should have been his pride to speak on their behalf. He never did, he never gave any warning, and the consequences we know; we know the storm which was raised, and which reached himself in his gubernatorial home in 1884, and afterwards swept over the prairies of the North-West. Under the circumstances, I say that there was a time in the history of England, and perhaps in the history of this Country, when such an offence would have brought the hon. gentleman to the Bar of this House. In these days, perhaps such a course could not be adopted here; but, though the hon. gentleman's action may be condoned elsewhere, it cannot be properly condoned on the floor of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman opposite cannot get over the events of some years ago. It will be remembered that, in one of his works, Dickens refers to a man who, though ordinarily in the enjoyment of a reasonable amount of intellect, always had the head of Charles I coming in between him and any conversation or employment in which he might be engaged. My hon. friend opposite, though rational, and more than rational on general subjects, cannot forget that he sympathised with those battles on the banks of the Saskatchewan.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen do not like to hear that statement, but it is true; and the hon. gentleman finds himself unable to forget the views which he expressed, perhaps more warmly than loyally, and he now throws across the floor of the House these accusations against my hon. friend who is in every way his equal, and in some respects I would not compare them. The hon. gentleman says that he holds my hon. friend behind me primarily responsible for the events in the North-West. My hon. friend had just as much to do with those events as the hon. gentleman who attacks him. The half-breeds were not Indians. They stood in the position of white men with Indian mothers, with a little more or less of the bow and arrow in their strain, but their cases were to be judged just the same as those of any settler in the country, just the same as the case of any man who was altogether white. They had their claims, and they made their claims, and through whom did they make them? Not through my hon. friend as Indian Commissioner, because as Indian Commissioner he had nothing to do with the half-breeds; not through my hon. friend as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, because in that capacity he had nothing to do with the land granting department. He could not influence the officers of the Dominion Government as to the granting of a single quarter-section in the North-West. His duties were altogether limited by the Act of Parliament which was passed in reference to the North-West, which did not give any control of the land or the settlement of the claims of any man—red or white or half breed—as to lands or compensation for lands, or anything of that kind. My hon. friend had nothing in the world to do either with the half-breed question or the half-breed claims, no more than any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. LAURIER.

An hon. MEMBER. Who had?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government of the day; and having been a member of the Government of those days, I desire to take the whole responsibility. If there is any blame to be thrown it is on the Government of those days, or of this day, and not upon my hon. friend. I think it was an ungenerous and unfounded attack of the hon. gentleman on my hon. friend. It was altogether unwarranted, it was altogether baseless. No matter what my hon. friend's sympathies may have been, no matter whether he thought the half-breeds had a good case or a bad case, he could not in any way decide those claims or adjudicate upon them. These went to the different land agencies in the North-West, and from the land agency to the chief officer at Winnipeg, and from the chief officer at Winnipeg to the Government at Ottawa. As to our responsibility, as to the responsibility of the Government of those days, we have had that discussed *ad nauseum*. We have had it from year to year, and this House, and a previous House, and the people of the country, have declared upon the conduct of the Government with respect to what is called the North-West disturbance. We are quite willing to rest our case upon the facts as laid before Parliament; we are quite willing to rest upon the decision of Parliament; we are quite willing to rest upon the decision of the people with respect to the unhappy events to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. But I declare in my place that in no way whatever can the hon. member from East Assiniboia (Mr. Dewdney) be charged with neglect. He was not a member of the Government, he had no control over the Government in any respect, and he cannot be charged with complicity or with neglect, with sins of commission or omission of any kind, with respect to the events in the North-West. If there was wrong done, it was the Government of the day who did the wrong. If there were any evil consequences arising from the policy of the Government, they must be held responsible for them; but the hon. gentleman, having no power, having no commission given him to act in any of these matters, having no means to influence in any respect any of those matters—I say the attack upon him was undeserved, altogether uncalled for, I must say altogether hasty and unconsidered; and my hon. friend has not acted with his usual sense of justice in making this attack. The hon. gentleman says that he does not find there was any correspondence brought down between the Government and my hon. friend when he was Lieutenant Governor of the North-West. Mr. Speaker, what would be the value of any correspondence? In those days, with trouble impending, with threats of all kinds held out to the Government, with claims pressed unduly and disloyally, and with the whole country in a state of disturbance—what would have been the value of official reports made by the hon. gentleman? The whole value of any such reports lies in their confidential nature; and I can state in my place, as having been First Minister in those days, that an active, and a constant, and a continual confidential correspondence was conducted between the Government at Ottawa and my hon. friend behind me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say so—that he expressed his views. If he received any information he conveyed that information, and he did not hesitate to write continually, to communicate everything that he considered of value to the Government; and not only that, but we had still more important communications from the officers who were responsible—from the Indian agencies, from the Indian inspectors, from the land agents, from the land inspectors. Those men were responsible, those men did report, those men spoke with authority. My hon. friend, in any communications to the Government, made them confidentially,

as being a high officer in the Government and anxious to convey all the information within his power. But, Mr. Speaker, he had no authority, he had nothing to do with the land grants, he had nothing to do with the claims of the Indians, he was not called upon to make a single report, and he could not have the means of making a report, as to the justice or injustice of the claims of these half-breeds, or any of them; and, therefore, I say again, that I regret the attack made upon my hon. friend. Now, as the debate has gone on, I may state the reason of the appointment. My hon. friend was selected to take his present position from his long acquaintance with that great country west of the Province of Ontario. Those hon. gentlemen who have sat in Parliament for some time remember my hon. friend as a British Columbian, representing a British Columbia constituency. He represented that country for some time, and he was resident in that Province for many years, and held a very high professional position as civil engineer and surveyor before he came here. He knew that Province thoroughly. He had been appointed by the Government, of which I was the head, as Indian Commissioner, and he had been in the North-West for some time. He knew the Indian tribes, he knew the Indian habits, he knew the best mode of dealing with the Indians, from his long experience as Indian Commissioner; and if any hon. gentleman will make enquiries, from the great chief of the Blackfeet, Crow Foot, down to the smallest chief in the North-West, these will answer without a single exception that they look up to him, and did look up to him, as their father and as their chief. I say this, that from every one, from one end of the North-West to the other, there have been unanimous expressions from the Indians of their confidence in him as the head of the Indian Department, and as Indian Commissioner. Then, with respect to his conduct as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West. Sir, he has been, I was going to say, smothered with roses. All kinds of compliments have been paid to him by those who knew what his conduct was as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, from Bishop Grandin, whom the hon. gentleman quoted, from Archbishop Taché, and Father Lacombe, and all those who knew what his conduct had been—they all, without exception, congratulated him on his appointment to the office he now holds, and which I believe he holds to the satisfaction of the country. Every one knows the straightforward, clear, single-mindedness of the apostle to the Blackfeet, Father Lacombe, and in his letter he says to him:

"I congratulate you on getting your present office because you are the right man in the right place."

And so did Bishop Grandin say; so did the Catholic clergy say; and they were men who at first, before they knew the value of my hon. friend, might have raised an objection to his appointment. They have as one man stated that he was the right man in the right place. In the first place, my hon. friend was thoroughly acquainted with British Columbia, he was thoroughly acquainted with the North-West, he was thoroughly, and is thoroughly, acquainted with the Indian character, and the Indian wants, and the Indian frailties, and the best mode of managing the Indians; and, besides that, he is a man that I, who am responsible for the choice of my colleagues, have every confidence in, and I am quite satisfied that he will justify—aye, and more than justify—his selection. It was of very great importance that there should be a selection made from those portions of the Dominion lying west of the four old Provinces. A feeling of dissatisfaction had arisen, and was being rather loudly expressed, that the four old Provinces should control the whole of this vast continent, and there was no representative man from west of the western boundary of Ontario; and in the selection of my hon. friend, beside his personal qualifications, which, I think, as I have stated, fully justify his appoint-

ment—the fact of his being a British Columbian, the fact of his having had a long experience in Manitoba and British Columbia, and the fact of his coming here as a representative of a North-West constituency—went far to allay that dissatisfaction and to introduce the practice of having all portions of this vast Dominion represented in the government of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may mention that, in my opinion, this debate is somewhat irregular, because there is no motion before the House. Although this is a very important discussion, it would be better to have a formal motion to adjourn so that the debate could be regularly continued.

Mr. MITCHELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to question your ruling, I may remark that, on all occasions on which I have been present, debates arising on ministerial explanations, have proceeded without the necessity of a formal motion being made; still, I daresay, you, Sir, are correct, technically at all events, in deciding that a motion should be before the Chair. Now, with respect to the question, I am bound to say that I think if the First Minister had taken the trouble to examine the newspaper criticisms made on the appointment at the time, he would have noticed one thing at all events, that a very large percentage of the newspapers on both sides of politics regarded the present appointment as a very extraordinary one indeed. But I do not myself regard the appointment as half so extraordinary as some of the propositions that have been put forward by the right hon. gentleman in defence thereof. The right hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that all we have to do is to look to the Government of the day. No doubt he is right this far, that they are primarily responsible beyond all question for the good government and good administration of this country. But I take it that this House and this country, too, have a right to examine and to criticise, with the utmost possible freedom, the conduct of the agents, whomsoever they may be, who may be employed by the Government of the day, and I think I am most strictly in accord, not only with Canadian but with British precedent, in saying that on all occasions, on every occasion, the House of Commons here and elsewhere has reserved to itself the very fullest right to criticise the conduct of agents of the Government, even when, for reasons which have very little to do with the merits of the case, it may have appeared fit to a majority of the Government supporters in the House or out of it to sustain, on the whole, the Government of the day. There is but one point on which I disagree a little with my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, and that is this: the hon. gentleman, if I took down his words correctly, declared he held the present Minister of the Interior to be the man of all others in Canada who was most responsible for the rebellion, for the civil war which lately broke out in the North-West. I differ from my hon. friend. I think the First Minister, for once in his life, was correct: he, and not the Minister of the Interior, was the man who before heaven was most responsible for the lives that were lost, who was most responsible for the mischief done to this country, who was most responsible for the irritation between the two races inhabiting this country which was created. To his negligence, to his scandalous malfeasance of office, to his criminal negligence of the plainest duties which appertain to his office—to those more than to any other thing else was due the late rebellion, and he was right in taking on his own shoulders the chief burden and responsibility for that event. But it does not at all follow that the man appointed by the Government of the day, who was paid a large salary out of the funds of the people of this country to watch over the events occurring in that region, to report to the Government what was going on in the district which he

had in charge, that he is to go scathless because we may hold the Government primarily responsible. Sir, it is altogether beside the question to say that the present Minister of the Interior had no means whatever for seeing that the wrongs said to be inflicted upon the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan or elsewhere were brought to light and righted. It was his bounden duty, whether he had authority or not, on his own proper motion, to recognise those events, to make himself acquainted with the state of feeling from one end of that country to another; it was his bounden duty, if there was any wrong and injustice inflicted on those people, to call the attention of the Government of the day to those wrongs, and to do all that in him lay to have them righted. Some of the statements made by the First Minister do indeed go to show that it is possible—we have no means of judging of that at present—that the conduct of the Government, bad as we know it to have been, was infinitely worse than we had supposed it. If the present Minister of the Interior did his duty as he ought to have done; if the present Minister of the Interior kept the First Minister and the Government of which he was the chief, duly advised of the state of things and of the feeling existing on the banks of the Saskatchewan, if he warned them in good time of the risks they ran, of the danger of a revolt there, if he did his duty as the Premier appeared to imply he did, then these gentlemen opposite were ten times more guilty than any one has supposed them to be. We know they had warnings sufficient, that men of all sorts and conditions had, time after time, times without number, addressed appeals to these hon. gentlemen. Probably it is fair for us to suppose that when they received those appeals they applied to the officer in charge of that territory, that they asked him what he thought about it, what really was the state of the case. Up to the present statement, judging from the evidence laid on the Table of the House, we had a right to suppose, that the hon. gentleman pooh-poohed those reports, that he contributed to deceive and to blind the eyes of the Government. If it was otherwise, if he did his duty, if he warned them, if he corroborated those statements, then I say that the guilt of the Government is very great indeed on that account. Sir, how stands the case? We know this much: that a rebellion broke out three years ago on the banks of the Saskatchewan. We know that to suppress that rebellion we expended \$8,000,000 and, what was very much more important, sacrificed valuable lives, and to-day our pension list is there reminding us that there are many men maimed and disabled from one end of Canada to the other who rue the consequences of the neglect of the present Government. We know, Sir, that the Government had ample warning. But so far as the evidence before us goes, so far as the reports laid on the Table of the House by the Government in reply to the repeated demands made for information go to show, it appears, save only for the statement made by the Premier to-day, that the present Minister of the Interior, the Governor in charge of the territory, sent no warning, gave no notice, did nothing for his part to open the eyes of the Government to the dangers they were incurring. Here we find that after the rebellion had arisen under circumstances which, as I have said, amply warranted us in believing, up to the present moment at least, that the present Minister of the Interior had entirely failed in the discharge of his duties, we find that the man who next to the Premier of this Dominion was responsible in virtue of his office of Governor of that territory, that that man in whose time and under whose eye this rebellion sprung up is especially selected for reward. Sir, one of two things is perfectly clear: either the Minister of the Interior knew the state of the country and knew what was coming, or else the Minister did not know. If he knew it and if he failed to give information to the Government, then, Sir, there is no man here who will say

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that he was not guilty of a very great breach of duty. If, on the other hand, he was deceived, if with all the appliances and means for obtaining knowledge at his disposal, if with every opportunity for information, he failed to understand the state of things immediately under his own eye, I say from that fact alone, he is manifestly and evidently utterly unfit for the important position he now holds. And, Sir, in that case the appointment would be an insult, not only to the intelligence of the House, but an insult to every hon. gentleman who follows the First Minister on the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps there was a third reason. May be it was his reward for keeping his mouth closed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend suggests there may be an explanation for all this, and no doubt not a few parties have suggested the same; that the Minister of the Interior had it in his power at the time, and has it in his power at the present moment, to prove that what we suspect is correct, and what the First Minister has almost admitted is correct, to prove that he gave ample warning, and to prove that the Government sinned against light and knowledge. To prove also, that the Government with wilful deliberation, almost I will say of set malice, brought about that unfortunate insurrection in the North-West. Sir, that is about the only explanation that can be given consistent with the circumstances of the extraordinary step that the hon. gentleman has taken. The one thing, Sir, that is perfectly clear in this matter is, that if the hon. gentleman deserves the encomiums which the First Minister has paid him, and if the hon. gentleman is really thoroughly fitted in all respects for his office, then, Sir, I repeat that it is impossible to over-estimate the misconduct of which the First Minister and his colleagues were guilty, after being warned by that authority, in allowing the rebellion to take place at all. Sir, I would like to know, are we to understand for the future, that the avenue on the part of governors for high promotion is that they should permit a rebellion to spring up in their territory? Are these rebellions the fruit of spontaneous combustion, or do they come from causes pretty well understood in this House? Do they come from the negligence, do they come from the corruption, do they come from the misconduct of the officials who receive our money and are responsible for the administration of the government of the country? Possibly it may be found that there is another lesson which is to be drawn from this remarkable appointment, and from some of the appointments that followed it, and I present it fairly to hon. gentlemen on the other side. Finding appointments of this kind made I would advise them all—and I think they have seen very good illustrations of the wisdom of the advice I am about to give them—I would advise them all to assert themselves, and not to sit down dumbly, and tamely, and allow such things to be perpetrated without expressing their opinions forcibly. I think, Sir, some of those hon. gentlemen have profited by the lesson, and I do think that others in the future will not be found slow to mark, and follow, and profit by it also. Under those circumstances I say this: I say that the Government, by their own act, are condemned; that the hon. gentleman who now sits in the position of the Minister of the Interior, if he be fit for his office, and if he did discharge his duty, if he did give warning, then, Sir, the severest things that have been said by my hon. friend, or any of his supporters as to the misconduct of the Government, are more than justified by the act of the Government itself.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about who moved the adjournment of the House I beg to say that I did, and for harmony's sake I would withdraw the motion, as I consider quite enough has been said about it. I will say, before doing so, that I rather sympathise with the views expressed by the hon. gentleman on my

right here, than I do with the conclusions the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, propounded; not that I disagree generally with his views, but in putting so much blame on the Minister of the Interior as he has done I think that he has made a little mistake. I think the suggestion I made to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is correct, that the appointment of the present occupant of the Minister of the Interior is a just reward for his silence.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:10 p. m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Lieut.-Gen. JOHN WIMBURN LAURIE, Member for the Electoral District of Shelburne, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir John Thompson.

### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

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

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

OTTAWA, 6th February, 1889.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 12) to provide for a regular Ferry between the city of Quebec and the town of Lévis.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Bill (No. 13) to require the owners of elevators and hoists to guard against accidents.—(Mr. Madill.)

### THE FRENCH LANGUAGE ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether any petitions, letters or other documents have been forwarded to the Government, or to the Department of Railways, respecting the appointment of a superintendent, able to speak and write the French language, for that section of the Intercolonial Railway which traverses the Province of Quebec; and if so, by whom were such documents or petitions forwarded, when they were received, and what answer was made thereto?

Mr. BOWELL. No such letters, petitions or documents have been received by the Government or by the department.

### RIVER RICHELIEU SURVEY.

Mr. GIGAULT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the surveying and sounding oper-

ations still required on the River Richelieu, to permit of a chart being prepared for the guidance of masters of vessels navigating that river between the International Boundary line and the St. Lawrence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the Department of Public Works has made no survey of the river with the view of preparing a chart to be put in the hands of the public. The Department of Railways has made a survey from the frontier line to St. Johns, with the view of building a canal. From Chambly down to Sorel there are buoys indicating the channel.

### REPORTS OF HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMULLEN. When my motion for copies of all inspections and reports made by homestead inspectors in Manitoba and North-West Territories from 1st January, 1887, to 1st January, 1889, was before the House yesterday, the Minister of Interior made a statement with regard to the probable cost of bringing down such return. In the face of that statement I am quite willing to withdraw the motion; but I would ask the hon. Minister whether it would be possible for me to be permitted the privilege of examining these returns in the Department of the Interior. If I were permitted that privilege I could gather the information I require.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course I have no objection to that being done by the hon. gentleman. I shall be glad to give him all information in the office. Some of the reports may be at Winnipeg, but any information we possess I shall be glad to give to the hon. gentleman.

Motion withdrawn.

### THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of the resolutions passed at the conference held in 1887, at the city of Quebec, of delegates from the several Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and of all papers and correspondence relating thereto.

He said: In October, 1887, a conference was held at the city of Quebec, composed of delegates from all Provinces of the Dominion, except Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. The matters which were chiefly discussed by the delegates on that occasion were the relations between the Dominion and the Provinces, more especially with regard to their legal powers, their executive functions and their provincial affairs. They arrived at the conclusion, I believe, that our written constitution, embodied in the British North America Act, after 20 years of trial, could be improved in several particulars by amendment. The result of their deliberations was embodied in a series of resolutions, which, I understand, have been forwarded to the Government of the Dominion. The Government have not, I think, yet chosen to lay those resolutions before the House; but they are so important that the House ought to be placed at the earliest possible moment in a position to judge of them, by being placed in possession of the same information as was in the hands of the Executive. If the motion is adopted, I hope the Government will lay the papers on the Table without delay.

Motion agreed to.

### RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the receipts by the Trustees of the various town sites in the North-West Territories, from sales of lands and otherwise; and, also, of all expenditures in connection therewith, since the year 1882.—(Mr. Davin.)

### REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Dewdney.)



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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:30 p. m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 16) to provide against frauds in supplying milk to cheese and butter factories.—(Mr. Burdett.)

### PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved :

That, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Friday, 22nd instant, and the time for presenting Private Bills to Thursday, 28th instant.

Motion agreed to.

### TRADE COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AMERICA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. What has been paid to Simeon Jones, Esq., of St. John, New Brunswick, on account of remuneration or expenses as Trade Commissioner to South America? 2. Is any further sum claimed by or payable to him, or on account of expenses or services rendered by him in connection with said commission?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Jones has been paid \$1,000 on account. This is not the total amount of his expenses. His bill, I think, is in, and is before the Auditor General. Neither does that include any remuneration for services outside of expenses, on account of which nothing has as yet been paid.

### THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to treat the temporary offer made by the British Plenipotentiaries to those of the United States at the time of the signing of the Fishery Treaty in Washington, November, 1888, and known as the *Modus Vivendi*, as still in force, and to issue licenses as therein provided to American fishermen for the fishing season of 1889?

Mr. TUPPER. That subject is now under the consideration of the Government.

### THE ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What is the total amount expended up to date on the preparation, revision, printing, &c., of the electoral lists, in pursuance of the Electoral Franchise Act?

Mr. BOWELL. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to let that stand, as I have not yet been supplied with the figures, I hope to have them on Monday.

### THE DREDGE PRINCE EDWARD.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Government paying Captain Doyle, of the dredge *Prince Edward*, wages or salary during the time said dredge is laid up? If so, what is the amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. In accordance with the rule which obtains on the spoon dredges of the department in the Maritime Provinces, the master and engineer of the dredges are retained in the employment of the department, and are employed in looking after and superintending the repairs which have to be made annually. Mr. Doyle receives \$90 per month.

### PINE TIMBER ON INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BARRON asked, Whether the pine timber on the Indian Reserve No. 6, under the Robinson Treaty, known as Shawanakiskic's Reserve, was sold in 1886 to a Mr. Robillard? Is the said Robillard the same as Honoré Robillard? Is the said Honoré Robillard a member of the House of Commons of Canada; and, if so, what constituency does he represent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Timber was sold to Mr. Robillard in September, 1886. Honoré Robillard is the licensee. Mr. Robillard was not then a member of the House of Commons. He is now member for Ottawa city.

### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1890, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 7th February, 1889.

### THE ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to take this opportunity to enquire of the Government, whether they intend to pursue the practice introduced by Sir Charles Tupper last year, of proceeding forthwith with the consideration of the Estimates before the annual financial statement is made, or whether it is their intention to have the financial statement made before the items are considered in detail?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention of the Government to follow the practice introduced last year in this House for the first time, I believe, and which is followed in England—that is, to go on with the Estimates without waiting for the financial statement. I hope there will be no objection to taking up the Estimates on, say, Tuesday next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I always thought that the English practice was a very good one, and I have no objection in the world on my part to offer to the suggestion of the Minister.

### THE RECENT LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Return showing amounts received on account of loan recently negotiated, together with a statement of the sums (forming portions of the same) placed on deposit with Canadian or other banks since the 1st day of July, 1888, and the rate of interest agreed to be paid on the same.

Mr. FOSTER. I see the hon. gentleman has asked for "statement of sums placed with Canadian or other banks since the 1st of July." That, if I interpreted it literally, would not give him what he wishes. Probably he had better amend it by saying "30th of June, 1888."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well, Sir, "30th of June, 1888."

Motion agreed to.

## ACCOUNT OF D. O'CONNOR.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing, in detail, the account of D. O'Connor for law cases, counsel fees, &c. amounting in all to \$18,890.02, as shown on page A 11 of Auditor General's Account for fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888.

He said: Since placing this notice on the paper, I have decided that I can reach the object I have in view better and more quickly by moving for the return in the Public Accounts Committee. I will, therefore, with the permission of the House, withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

## THE DREDGE PRINCE EDWARD.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Return showing what repairs have been done to the dredge *Prince Edward* during the year 1888, the date of commencement of work, and when finished, with cost of said work; also the amount of work done by said dredge during the year 1888.

He said: I desire to say, in connection with this motion, that I cannot understand the reason why the dredge *Prince Edward* has been kept idle for nearly two years, at any rate more than a year and a-half. It is well known that there are several harbors about Prince Edward Island that require to be dredged; and why the Government are so delinquent in their duty in this respect I do not understand. It appears that, whenever any work is asked for Prince Edward Island, the Government look upon it as part of New Zealand, Newfoundland, England, Ireland, Scotland or some other country, instead of part of the Dominion of Canada. I maintain that Prince Edward Island is part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, and that whatever work is required there is not for Prince Edward Island alone, but for the whole Dominion. In 1887 the dredge *Prince Edward* was at work dredging out Tignish Harbor, where she continued at work until the 27th of August, when she was brought to Charlottetown and put on the stocks for repairs. I was under the impression that on the 1st June last that boat would have been fit for work, and would have been sent to Cascumpec, Victoria, Summerside, or some other harbor, for there are so many harbors requiring dredging about Prince Edward Island that it would take a long time to enumerate them all. I believe it took the whole of the summer of 1888 to repair that boat. Why, Sir, it took four times as long to repair her as it took to build the new steamer *Stanley*, which cost \$150,000. Why the harbors of Prince Edward Island are neglected in this way, I do not understand. I presume the hon. Minister of Public Works will be able to explain why this dredge was left at Charlottetown all winter. I suppose some friend of the Government had to be accommodated with the opportunity to import stuff from the other side, and could not import it in the fall, and the boat had to be left there all winter, while the captain was receiving \$90 a month for walking about with his hands in his pockets doing nothing. I do not know how the Government are going to justify themselves for having done such an injustice to Prince Edward Island. We may be able to see by this return how long it took the Government and their agents in Charlottetown to expend a few thousand dollars to repair that dredge.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to say a few words on this matter. The dredge was laid up for repairs, I believe, in August, 1887, when she was brought down from the north end of the Island to Charlottetown, and ordered to be hauled up in the marine slip there. She remained there all the following fall and winter, and during that time there was not a hand's turn done to that boat, although the captain and the engineer have been kept on full pay from the time she was laid up for repairs until the present time. When the

*Northern Light* was laid up for the summer, her captain was sent off on half pay. It is now going on three years since this dredge was laid up for repairs; and I venture to say that if a commission were appointed to examine into the matter, it would find that four times as much has been expended for the work as was necessary, taking into consideration the time which has been lost while she has been doing nothing; for I consider the loss of that time to be more serious than the amount of money expended on the repairs. Instead of having one dredge for Prince Edward Island, we ought to have four or five, considering the number of harbors requiring to be dredged. If we go on in this way, we shall not have one harbor completed in twenty years. If that boat had been taken to Pictou and put in the marine slip there, I could have had all the repairs done in six weeks, and I venture to say for one-half the money, and the country would have been \$30,000 better off than it is to-day. Hon. gentlemen may clap and make as much noise as they like, but it is the truth, and the truth will stand when your jeering will not stand. I think it is time for the Government to look into these matters. The amount of money that has been expended on this dredge, I am bound to say, reaches three times the amount that has been laid out on Prince Edward Island for all the harbors and piers on the Island this year. I will have something more to say on this subject later on. Indeed I have been waiting to see the hon. Minister and have a conversation with him on this subject before bringing up some matters connected with this dredge, and I do not intend just now to deal with it fully. However, as the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) has brought the matter forward, I thought it my duty to say a few words. I would earnestly urge on the Government to see that some man of practical experience is consulted in the future with regard to the repairs made to this dredge. The Government have a very competent man in St. John's, N.B., who looks after the dredging, and if the matter were left in his hands I have no doubt things would be different. It is a serious matter to the people of the Island to see their harbors neglected and their dredge lying idle. The dredge has not done a stroke of work since August, 1887. The balance of 1887 has gone by, and 1888 has gone by without anything being done. I hope the Government will see that this matter is looked after and the deficiencies supplied.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very sorry the mover of this motion did not let me know he was about to attack my department on this point, as I would then have been ready to answer him. But I will take another opportunity of replying to his strictures. It would have been as well to let the papers come down, and then take up the subject. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman, for, of course, he was within his right in making the strictures he did, but I reserve my right to answer him later on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A great deal of dissatisfaction exists as to the manner in which this enormous expense has been made. I would suggest that the motion of my hon. friend should be amended by adding to it a return for the names of the officers and the amount paid to each of them during the period.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I answered that on a question. I said the captain and the engineer were the only two officers.

Motion agreed to.

## LOBSTER FACTORIES.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Return of the number of Lobster Factories round the coast of Prince Edward Island, the number of fines imposed during the season of 1888, the amount of each fine, the names of parties who have paid the fines, and the names of parties who have not paid the same; also, the nature of offence in each case.

He said: I desire to say that, as far as I can judge, the regulations of the department do not give satisfaction. I am well aware that, last year, application was made to have the close season changed as regards the south shore of Prince Edward Island. Now the close season all around the Island begins the 15th July; that is the time the fishermen must take up their traps, otherwise they are liable to a penalty. I believe there ought to be regulations protecting the lobster fisheries around the coast of Prince Edward Island as well as elsewhere; but I find that when the lobster fisheries are closed on the south side on the 15th of July, there is not a sufficient quantity of lobsters then caught to warrant any man investing capital in carrying on that industry. I have a statement from a lobster packer on the south side, for the summer of 1887, which shows that—though he had a thousand traps out, from the time he commenced to fish for lobsters, on the 26th of May, to the 15th of July—he only obtained 175 boxes of canned lobsters, although he employed 1,000 traps and several boats manned by ten men each, besides a lot of men employed on the shore. Now, from that date to the 17th of August, the same traps and the same number of men yielded 835 boxes, which goes to show that if the close season on the south side of the Island be the same as on the north side, the catch will not be sufficient to warrant the investment of any amount of capital in the business. The reason why the lobsters do not make their appearance early on the south side I do not know, but there must be a reason. I find that lobster fishing from the 1st of May to the 15th of July does not result satisfactorily. Several packers in my neighborhood have been fined because, unfortunately, they allowed lobsters under the regulation size to be boiled. I would ask particularly the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to understand that on the Gulf shore it is impossible for fishermen or packers to see that the lobsters are all up to the size required. It is impossible, where the sea is heavy—and these men have to get the lobsters out of the trap as soon as possible—for them to avoid occasionally bringing three or four small lobsters ashore; and the overseers and wardens, should they detect this, cause these men to be fined. Let me tell you that the imposition of one or two fines on a lobster packer will amount to more than the profit he makes the whole year round. I have also to complain that it appears to me these wardens wear two kinds of spectacles, so that when they approach a factory carried on by a poor unfortunate Grit, the lobsters appear very small, while when they come to other factories the lobsters are magnified in size. I do not blame the department for this gross injustice, but I say that the officers who have charge of the coast—and I speak from experience—are not dealing fairly and justly with the packers. I am sorry to say that they allow political prejudices to creep into their dealings, and I am desirous to find out the amounts which have been paid under the regulations. I know parties in my own neighborhood who have had to pay the full amount of the fines, and I know other persons, belonging to the Tory party, who have not paid the fines yet, and I doubt if they ever will. I know one pet of the Government who has been fined time and again for fishing out of season, and has not paid a cent. I may be wrong, but that is my information, and I have been told that he has appealed. I want to know if the authorities have carried out the regulations in regard to the lobster fisheries on the coast, fairly. I may also say that, although it is wise for the department to have certain regulations in regard to that matter, as they exist they cannot be complied with by the fishermen along the shore of Prince Edward Island; and I believe that it is not right or prudent in any case to make regulations which the people cannot comply with. Such a course tends to make bad subjects. With reference to this regulation as to small lobsters, it may happen that

Mr. PERRY.

a fisherman may bring to the shore a few small lobsters of 8½ inches, and for that reason he must be fined. How could he help it? If those lobsters brought to the shore are to be put back in the water, they might as well be boiled, because they will not live. What we want to see is that there shall be officers who will see that these small lobsters shall be put back out of the trap, and then they will live. I hope the department will take these grievances into consideration and see that these regulations are carried out so well and fairly that they will not injuriously affect the trade. It would be better to close the factories than to allow men to try to make a living in them, with this fine hanging over their heads. It would be better to close the factories than to make regulations which the people are not able to comply with.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course there is no objection to bringing down the return which the hon. gentleman has just moved for. I may say, however, in regard to the remarks he has made as to the regulations in reference to the lobster fishery, particularly in Prince Edward Island, that the regulations of last year were to some extent experimental, and were made for that year only. The regulations for this year have yet to be settled, and I was very much pleased to have the views of the hon. gentleman as to how these regulations might be settled for one of the districts in Prince Edward Island. In reference to the remarks which the hon. gentleman made as to the enforcement of these regulations, I have a word or two to say. He is somewhat vague in the charges, and the very serious charges, which he brings against the officers of the department in that part of the country. I have not heard any charges of that kind before. No specific charges of any sort have been made to the department in reference to any of the fishery boards or other officers engaged in enforcing the regulations in Prince Edward Island; but I may assure the hon. gentleman that if any specific case is known to him, I would be most happy to take it up and deal with it in the most impartial manner. Of course it would be most improper and most reprehensible for any officer to be guilty of the acts which the hon. gentleman states some officers have been guilty of, and I can assure him that if any proper evidence of such actions were brought before me, such an officer would no longer hold a place under the department. Of course the fines are fixed by the magistrate who tries the case, but there is an appeal, and if any party feels aggrieved, he has the opportunity of presenting a petition to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in reference to the matter of fines, or in reference to any other matter, as to whether the fine should be reduced or not imposed. I have never enquired about nor known—though I have had several matters of that kind brought to my attention since I occupied the position I now hold—the political views or opinions of either the magistrate or the party fined, and I never intend to do so. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the regulations are too severe. I am strongly of the opinion that these fines are not nearly so severe as they should be, nor as the corresponding penalties are which are enforced in the United States, particularly in the State of Maine. The hon. gentleman has referred to a warden who allowed political friends to violate the law, and has prosecuted political opponents, who are opponents of the present Government. As I said before, if the hon. gentleman will give me the name of the officer to whom he refers, I will have strict enquiry made into the case. I will have the papers brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KIRK. The Minister has stated with regard to the regulations for lobster fishing in Prince Edward Island, that they were experimental for last year. The Minister is aware that regulations were also made last year for other parts of the Dominion as well. I would like to know

whether he intends to say that there are to be new regulations for other parts of the Dominion as well as for Prince Edward Island, or whether his remarks apply only to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TUPPER. I merely referred to Prince Edward Island, because that was the Province to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perry) referred, but the regulations were experimental in regard to all the Provinces. Those for Prince Edward Island were included in the regulations for the other Provinces. Those regulations terminated at the end of 1888, and at present there are, practically, no regulations.

Mr. KIRK. Are there to be new regulations for Nova Scotia?

Mr. TUPPER. There are to be new regulations for all the Provinces.

Mr. KIRK. That is, for next year?

Mr. TUPPER. This year.

Mr. KIRK. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to lay a copy of those regulations on the Table?

Mr. TUPPER. Of course, so soon as the regulations are made, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of seeing them.

Motion agreed to.

#### HARBOR AT NAUFRAGE, P.E.I.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for :

Copy of Engineer's last report on the feasibility of constructing a harbor at Naufrage, King's County, Prince Edward Island.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to the motion being adopted, but the report has not yet been received, consequently the hon. gentleman cannot complain if some delay occurs.

Motion agreed to.

#### IMPORTATION OF SAWLOGS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

Return showing the amount of importation of pine and spruce sawlogs, board measure, from the State of Maine into the Province of New Brunswick, for the purpose of conversion into lumber in Canadian mills, and subsequent shipment to the United States under the provisions of the American tariff admitting such lumber free of duty, for each year from 1867 to June 30th, 1888, said return to designate the respective amounts of pine and spruce, if possible; otherwise to give the total importation of pine and spruce from Maine without such respective designations.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the motion, but I fear much of the information asked for by the hon. gentlemen will be difficult to obtain; but as far as the information which he desires can be obtained, I will see that the returns are made out. I may state that I have made enquiry as to the feasibility of obtaining the information asked for, and I was told that it was very doubtful whether the statistics would give the information which the hon. gentleman desires, but so far as it can be obtained, it will be produced.

Motion agreed to.

#### RETURNS ORDERED.

Correspondence between the Minister of the Interior and any officials of his Department, and Thomas Sioni, and others, Indians of the Huron Tribe of Lorette.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Return showing: 1st. The full amount of legal and other expenses paid in connection with the suit, "The St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company vs. the Queen," from the commencement of the suit up to the 1st January, 1889. 2nd. The party or parties to whom paid, the amounts paid, and the date of payment.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the quantity of wheat and flour imported into the Dominion of Canada from the United States, and entered for consump-

tion, during the six months ending 31st December, 1888; also the quantity of flour remaining in bond in Canada on the 31st December, 1888.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

Return showing the amount, respectively, of pine and spruce sawlogs, board measure, exported in each year from 1867 to 30th June, 1888; the amount of export duty collected in each year from each class of logs; the rate of duty in each year upon each kind of logs, and the amount of export of each kind of logs, and amount of duty collected upon the same, by Provinces.—(Mr. Charlton.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.5 p.m.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 11th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

FRANK S. BARNARD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cariboo, introduced by Mr. Dewdney and Mr. Mara.

#### REPORT.

Report of the Secretary of State for Canada, for the year ending 31st December, 1888.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

#### SPEEDY TRIALS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to make further provision respecting the speedy trial of certain indictable offences. He said: I may explain that the changes which the Bill proposes are simply to bring the Speedy Trials Act into effect in the Province of Nova Scotia. That Province is now the only Province to which the Act is not extended.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### INCOMES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. ELLIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to authorise the assessment of the salaries or incomes of persons in the service of Canada. He said: The object of the Bill is to provide that where assessments are levied for municipal or school purposes on incomes or salaries, the law shall apply to the civil service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

#### EXPENDITURE ON ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What is the total amount expended up to date on the preparation, revision, printing, &c., of the electoral lists, in pursuance of the Electoral Franchise Act?

Mr. BOWELL. The total amount expended on the first revision, printing, &c., of the electoral lists, before the Government assumed the work, was \$414,574.39. Since the Government assumed the work by the printing bureau, not including plant, the amount expended has been \$21,502.79. The amount of plant required for the printing of these lists, for the present and for the future, is \$63,849.80.

## INVITATION TO VISIT THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has the Government, directly or indirectly, received from any person or company, an invitation to be presented to this House, to visit the principal cities of the United States? If such invitation has been received,—when and from what person or company? And what has been the answer of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not, directly or indirectly, received from any person or company an invitation to be presented to this House to visit the principal cities of the United States. I may say that I got a private note from an American gentleman saying that it would be a very good thing if this arrangement could be made.

## PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY.

Mr. PRIOR asked, Whether, in the event of the Government granting a subsidy, in conjunction with the Imperial Government, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any other company, for carrying the mails between Vancouver, British Columbia, and China and Japan, they will insist upon the vessels carrying said mails calling on both the inward and outward trips at Victoria, British Columbia, the capital of British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangements for mail service between British Columbia and China and Japan have not yet been concluded with the Imperial Post Office authorities, and will depend to a great extent upon the conditions which may be imposed by Her Majesty's Government.

## ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—HOUSE FOR COMMANDANT.

Mr. PLATT asked, Have the Government agreed to purchase a house in the city of Kingston for the use of the commandant of the Royal Military College? If so, what amount do they propose to pay for said house, and at what distance, or about what distance, is said house from the Royal Military College?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government have agreed to purchase a house in the city of Kingston for the use of the commandant of the Royal Military College, for which they propose to pay \$12,500. The house is about 2,000 yards from the college.

## PUBLIC WORKS IN YARMOUTH COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. LOVITT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide a sum in the Estimates for repairing and rebuilding the abutments washed out of Port Maitland breakwater, county of Yarmouth; also a sum for removing the gravel from the inside of Cranberry Head breakwater, in the said county?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry I cannot answer that just now. The hon. gentleman will have to wait, I think, until the Supplementary Estimates come down.

## RATES OF POSTAGE.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce the rate of postage on letters in the Dominion of Canada to two cents?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not at present the intention of the Government to reduce the rate.

## DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill, this Session, amending the Dominion Lands Act?

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That matter is under the consideration of the Government.

## RIVER ST. LOUIS IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue, this year, the works commenced at River St. Louis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

## BEAUHARNOIS CANAL IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to commence this year the deepening and widening of the Beauharnois Canal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That matter is under consideration.

## ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Whether any petitions have been presented by the township councils of the front of Leeds and Lansdowne, front of Escott and the front of Young, praying that the islands in the River St. Lawrence, opposite these townships in the county of Leeds, Ontario, be sold? If so, what action the Government have decided on with reference to the same?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Some representations have been made in the direction stated in the hon. gentleman's question. The Government have taken no action. I propose myself next spring visiting the islands, after which I shall be in a better position to make representations to the Government.

## DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROADS.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) moved for:

Return of copies of all correspondence, reports, petitions or other papers respecting the sale, ownership or condition of the Dundas and Waterloo macadamised road, since the return brought down under an Order of the House dated 17th February, 1885.

He said: I should apologise to the House, perhaps, for speaking for a few moments on a question of this kind. It is a matter of purely local interest to my own county; but I may say that it has always puzzled me to understand in what respect the road in question could be called a work for the general advantage of the Dominion of Canada, and thus constituted a Dominion public work. It is a local highway, built away back, in the early days before the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were united, as a Local Government work, and is confined to the county of Wentworth and one adjoining county. It happens to be one of the two main outlets for the travel of that and the adjoining counties to the two main markets of the locality, the town of Dundas and the city of Hamilton. The larger proportion of the travel in this county is forced, whether or not from local circumstances, to go over one or the other of these two means of access to the city of Hamilton; because those who know the locality, know that Burlington Bay and the canal together give access to vessels going up the valley, past the city of Hamilton, to the town of Dundas, and crossed only at one point on Burlington Heights by a bridge. A few years ago—the Desjardins Canal Co. being involved in financial troubles—we found ourselves suddenly face to face with a difficulty that threatened to be most serious to those who travelled over the only other source of access to the city of Hamilton. Those who know the influences which a large city having two representatives in this House, and which a corporation such as the Great Western Railway and which the Desjardins Canal could wield, know they were much greater than any one representative in this House could hope to control. And these gentlemen, either tacitly or actively, made the endeavor

to shift the expense of the maintenance of the bridge on Burlington Heights, from the shoulders that always bore, and properly bore it, the canal company or the railway, to the electors of that county who were obliged to travel over that road; and the result was they smuggled a clause into the Act, providing that by an Order in Council the Government might at some future time impose a toll for the maintenance of the bridge crossing the Desjardins Canal. With the aid of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), we at that time induced the House to set aside that legislation. In fact my hon. friend (Mr. Blake) had no difficulty in convincing the then Minister of Justice that the whole thing was illegal and unfair, and we were relieved of the difficulty that then threatened us. Since then other legislation was obtained, and this road and bridge passed to a company who kept them in bad repair, but looked after the tolls. After patience had ceased to be a virtue, and they had endured too long the tax which they were forced to pay in the shape of tolls for bad roads and bridges, they finally combined their forces and took the case into court, with the result that they got the parties within the purview of the Ontario Act which regulates road companies, and latterly the road company has been forced to abandon collecting toll over that road to the city until they shall put it properly in repair. The Waterloo road, unfortunately, is in a different position. Being a Dominion work, the powers that control that road cannot be brought under the operation of the Ontario Joint Stock Companies' Act, and there is no other means of redress except by bringing the question before the Department of Public Works here. To enable the House to realise the position in which we are placed, it will be necessary for me to state, briefly, the circumstances under which this work was originated, and how we have remained in a dead-lock for the last three or four years. As far back as the year 1839, the road was built under commissioners appointed by the old Government of Upper Canada. Debentures were then issued to the extent of £25,000 and placed at the disposal of these commissioners to build the road through the county of Wentworth, from the town of Dundas, up through a portion of Waterloo, to the town of Galt. The original road projected was some 25 miles in length. The commissioners, after expending a little over £25,000, found themselves, in August, 1839, in a position to place two tolls on this road, and commenced to collect revenue. In subsequent years, by means of additional aid, the road was completed, and connections made through to the town of Galt. From that time down, whether the road was in good order or in bad order, they have always managed to persistently collect the tolls. The Government of the day, shortly after the road was completed, saw fit to offer it at public sale, and it was transferred into private hands, with the result that, after a few years, it fell back into the hands of the Government, the plea of the purchaser being that the Government having subsequently chartered the Great Western Railway, that railway, when it was opened, took the travel entirely away from this highway, and made it comparatively valueless to the owners, and they also used that plea as an excuse for allowing the road to get out of repair. It was subsequently leased to the two corporations of the towns of Dundas and Galt for a period, in two leases together, of twenty years, expiring in April, 1885. Then the Government, believing, I suppose, that there was no necessity to the Dominion at large for longer retaining this work, put it up for sale at public auction, after duly advertising it and imposing certain restrictions upon the purchaser. At the time it was offered for sale by the Government, the road was 20 miles long—17½ miles with three toll gates being inside the county of Wentworth, and 2½ miles with one toll gate being inside the county of Waterloo. It was sold to Dr. Walker, of the town of Dundas, for

\$21,300, a deposit of \$3,000 being required from the purchaser at the date of sale, and a few months after one-half of the balance, making altogether \$12,150 paid by the purchaser. It was assumed, at the time the sale was made under the Public Works Act, that this road would be transferred to a company, and would be subject to the ordinary rules and regulations affecting road companies, passed by the Ontario Provincial Legislature. But it was found that the Public Works Act, while making provision for the sale of abandoned or unused public works that were no longer intended to be maintained as public works, to private individuals, contained no provision to enable the Government to convey any public work, to be maintained as a public work, to a private individual, and the hon. the Minister of Justice, to whom the matter was referred by the Government, stated:

"It is where a public work is transferred as a work, and with the intention that it should be maintained as such, that section 54 and the following sections of 'The Public Works Act' apply, and in such cases a transfer to an individual is not authorised by the statute."

I may say, with respect to Dr. Walker's purchase, that the difficulty in the way of a transfer to him would be overcome by his procuring incorporation as a road company; and a few days after this information was conveyed to Dr. Walker by the Government in the following very mild terms:—

"It will be necessary that you obtain incorporation as a road company under the Ontario Act, when the transfer can be made to the company, as otherwise it would be necessary for the Dominion Government to obtain special legislation in the matter. It appears to this department that the course suggested by the Department of Justice is the more desirable one to pursue."

I need not say that, so far as the public interests are concerned, we all feel that the line that was suggested by the Minister of Justice was the desirable one to adopt. The House can realise the difficulty that obtains the moment a public highway is vested in a private individual. His finances may become embarrassed, and the public interests may suffer in consequence; or the road may pass into the hands of minors and may be involved in trusts, and, in the meantime, unless the public look sharply after the matter, the result will be that the people will have to pay tolls over a road that is not in such a condition that tolls should be collected for it. However, for reasons which will appear, Dr. Walker declined to become incorporated as a road company. On the 6th February the firm of McCarthy, Osler & Co., solicitors for Dr. Walker, replied:

"Dr. Walker has informed us that you suggested to him that he should incorporate under the statute, and transfer the road which he purchased to this incorporated company. He instructs us to say that for two reasons it is impossible for him to do so. The first is that the property belongs to him solely, and that it takes at least five persons to obtain an Act of incorporation under the Ontario statute; and the second is that, if he did incorporate, he would subject himself to serious loss owing to certain provisions of the Ontario law and to the situation of the road, intersecting as it does with the Brock road."

And with a further eye to Dr. Walker's interest they add:

"We have again to ask that you will permit Dr. Walker to erect the check gates for which we on his behalf have formerly applied."

On the 10th March, 1885, the hon. the Minister of Public Works introduced an Act providing for the transfer of this public work to Dr. Walker, as suggested in the communication from the Minister of Justice. At that time I waited upon the Minister and suggested to him that, as there had been considerable difficulty between Dr. Walker and the people on the question of check gates and changes in the location of the gates on this road, and as the provisions under which the road was sold simply required that notices of application for changing the location of the gates or erecting check gates should be published only in the *Canada Gazette*, the Minister, if he would not place the road under the provisions of the Ontario Act, should require that, when the proprietor of the road made application to the Government for these extended powers,

he should publish his application for thirty days in at least one local newspaper in Galt and in Dundas, where the people resided who paid the tolls and who were interested in the highway, so that they might know that the application against their interest was being made. The Minister declined to take my view of the matter then, and said he thought this might safely be left in the hands of the Government. I told him that, under the circumstances, I felt I would have to oppose the passage of the Act in the House in its existing form. The result was that, in consequence of that statement, in consequence of the long summer Session which those who were in the House at that time will remember we had in 1885, and for various other causes, the Bill was laid over from time to time until, on the 9th June, the Minister withdrew the Bill from the House, intimating that in the interim the Premier of the Province of Ontario had written to him on the subject, putting in a claim to the work as being exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario; and the Minister stated that, until such time as the Government had the opportunity to investigate the original construction of the work and the circumstances surrounding it, he proposed to withdraw legislation on that question. The result was that the Bill was withdrawn from the House in June, 1885, and it has remained in that position ever since. I want to call the attention of the House very briefly to a few other circumstances, so that the Minister of Public Works and this House may realise the difficulties under which the people are laboring in consequence of this extended delay. I am not attaching any blame to the Department of Public Works in this matter, but sometimes the public interests suffer from these very prolonged delays. At the time this road was sold by public auction, the provisions under which it was sold were to this effect:

"That the tolls to be collected on the said road shall not exceed the maximum amount of tolls now imposed and which the present lessees have the right to receive and collect. No toll gate or bar shall, without consent of the Governor in Council, be erected or placed on the road nearer to the towns of Galt and Dundas than the site of the first gate from said towns now erected on said road, nor shall the number of toll gates or bars now standing on said road be increased without such consent. The purchaser and his heirs, &c., shall at all times keep the works in good condition, the efficiency of such order and condition to be established by the inspection of an Engineer of the Department of Public Works."

It will occur to anyone who has had experience in toll roads, that, if this highway had been brought under the operations of the Ontario Joint Stock Road Companies Act, the public would have had much better facilities for reaching the management of the road, if it was unsatisfactory, than they could have in being required to appear before the department at Ottawa in order to have an engineer sent from Ottawa for the purpose of inspecting that road. But the public interest in that road was awakened by another movement which was inaugurated by Dr. Walker as soon as he acquired possession of those roads. The road was sold in March, 1884, and Dr. Walker entered into possession on or about the 25th April, 1884. On the 9th May, although he had been only a few days in possession, we find the road decorated with three check gates for the purpose of enabling the doctor better to collect the tolls on this road. One of these was erected within half a mile of the first gate out from the town of Dundas, and within 200 yards of where another leading macadamised road branched off from this road and led up through the county in another direction. The result was that those who travelled for 200 yards on this road for any other business were required to pay full tolls for travelling that short distance. When the House realises that one of the largest flouring mills in that locality, doing a very large gristing and merchant trade, and having a large number of consumers and purchasers, was wedged in between the two gates, and that its traffic had to be carried on between the two leading highways from which the wheat of the county reached the

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

mill on one side, and the flour was sent to market on the other, and that this condition of things was imposed under circumstances, which, by evading the Ontario Act, enabled Dr. Walker to impose full tolls in these cases, it will realise how great the disadvantage was and why he so soon was anxious to be outside of the Ontario Act and have all the privileges of a road built and owned by the Dominion Government. One of the results of it was that Dr. Walker asserted that the Minister of Public Works had authorised him to put up these check gates; but the late Mr. Webster, the gentleman that owned this mill, an active and energetic supporter of the Government of the day, by the way, and one of that class of Englishmen that does not allow himself to be sat upon without a good and sufficient reason, cited one of Dr. Walker's toll-gate keepers before the authorities to give an account of the ways and means by which he proceeded to collect this additional toll. I think, perhaps, I cannot more concisely put the facts than by reading two short extracts from Mr. Webster's correspondence with the Minister of Public Works, as it states them in his own words and from his own standpoint. It is dated May 3, 1884, scarcely two weeks after the road had passed under the new management. It is addressed to Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works, Ottawa, and states:

"At the late sale of the Dundas and Waterloo macadamised road, Dr. Walker of Dundas became the purchaser from the Government. He is now erecting a check gate at Bullock's Corners, about half a mile above the present toll gate No. 1, near Dundas, claiming to have permission from the Governor in Council to do so. I write this to enquire whether such permission has been obtained. The only object to be obtained by the erection of the check gate, would be to compel all persons coming to my mill to pay toll, and it is the only interest affected. Situated as my mill is, between the two proposed gates, it would be extremely disastrous to my business and unjust to the public. I trust such permission has not been given. I feel assured that if the circumstances of the case were fully known, that such consent would never be obtained. Such a departure from the conditions under which the road was sold, the inconvenience to the whole agricultural community for miles round, the serious, I may say ruinous effects upon my private business, and the absence of any reasonable claim that the road proprietor can have for such an extension of his privileges. I can scarcely fancy that the Government would consent to such a measure."

Again on the 15th June he writes, because this matter was not settled in a day or two; it was subject to several delays in adjudication:

"When I wrote my last letter I was a good deal troubled to believe that the Dominion Government would commit so great an error, and also from my point of view, so great an injustice. Dr. Walker seems determined to carry things with a pretty high hand. Two of his check gates on the Galt end of the road have been burned, and it is said that his proceedings have not only been overbearing but positively dishonest. The feelings of the people are just now under restraint, not knowing how far the Government are justifying him in his high-handed proceedings. I think I may be pardoned in saying that any concessions in his favor would be at the expense and to the inconvenience of the public. After purchasing the privileges of the road at public auction, he can have no right to claim further advantages, and for the Government to concede further privileges would be at the expense of public justice and their own popularity."

This trouble finally culminated in a lawsuit, in which Dr. Walker's gate-keeper was fined, on the 9th of July. But he still kept up the war with the proprietor of this mill; he abandoned collecting toll at the main gate and collected the whole toll at the check gate; and that continued for some time with the result that the public travelling over one of the highways was obliged to pay full toll for travelling on this road, less than 200 yards. You may say that the injustice could be easily remedied, but such was not the case, for the simple reason that the Ontario Joint Stock Road Companies' Act does not apply, and the road being under the control of the Dominion Government is outside of the ordinary Ontario laws that regulate these roads. The correspondence went on between Dr. Walker and the Department of Public Works, and he made repeated applications for an Order in Council to enable him to place the check gates upon the road. But the department refused to take any further action, and the result of the applica-

tion of the Ontario Government claiming the ownership was that it brought the whole question to a standstill, and the Government declining to grant Dr. Walker power to erect check gates, he finally abandoned this check gate, and the other two check gates disappeared in the night—it is supposed by spontaneous combustion. Anyway, they were there at night, and were not there in the morning. Now, with respect to this matter of check gates, one strong reason that I had at the time for opposing the action of the Government and asking them to give notice to the public before even an application could be made for check gates, was simply this, that I find, appended to a memorandum of the Department of Public Works, recommending legislation, a short notice from the chief engineer of the department, couched in this somewhat significant language:

"With reference to check gates, the chief engineer recommends that no action be taken till after the required special legislation has been obtained."

Now, in these numerous applications that had been made to the Department of Public Works for this much coveted Order in Council, and from this recommendation of delay, and from the fact, which every member of this House knows, that there are not half a dozen people in the county who ever see the *Canada Gazette* with notices of applications, I felt that it was doubly essential to the interests of the people who use this road, that some provision should be made by which they would be made aware that application was being made for the purpose of having these check gates imposed. I have no hesitation in saying that, from my personal knowledge of the location at which this check gate, above gate No. 1, near Dundas, was proposed to be placed, that it was simply, in effect, imposing a second toll upon the large class of the community who are helpless to avoid it. The locality is such that people have to go over this highway, because there is no other alternative. By even going around several miles there is no other road by which they could reach the town of Dundas or the city of Hamilton, without going through some other toll gate, and even if considerable expense was incurred, the position was such that no other road could be conveniently opened, and the people were placed in this position that they had to travel this road and the community felt that it was an imposition on the travelling community that used this highway; and it was for that reason there was such a strong feeling in connection with this matter. Under these circumstances I felt it was only fair they should have notice. I am not finding any fault with the action of the Governor in Council; but everyone knows the influences which can be brought to bear, in the absence of representations on the other side, that may secure a coveted advantage, in a case like this, without the public being aware of it until such advantage is granted. I desire to draw the attention of the House, for a few moments, to the condition in which this road has been kept. Away back in 1882, while the towns of Dundas and Galt were lessees of the road, the public felt that it was not being maintained in a condition such as was required, and after asking the mayor of the town of Dundas to take steps to have it placed in a good condition, but without success and without notice being taken of the application, the people petitioned the county judge, in conformity with the provisions of the Ontario Act, with the result that they found that the road was beyond the control of the county judge, the case being dismissed because the judge had no jurisdiction. I find in Dr. Walker's correspondence that, when asking for power to erect check gates, he says:

"I have so far spent double the receipts on repairs of the road and shall have to continue to do so until the end of the season. This year the road has not returned any interest on the investment, as it was in such very bad repair."

Perhaps the doctor put his case strongly in asking for this special privilege from the Government; but this House will

easily realise that when the Government were not in a position to convey this road to Dr. Walker, he naturally spent no more money in maintaining it than was absolutely necessary, and so it has continued from 1885 to the present time, with this result, that the people have been required to pay toll over the road, and, as I have said, if they had the opportunity to choose another highway it would not have mattered so much, but from the contour of the country and the way in which the locality is placed, this road is the great outlet for travel from the north riding of Wentworth, and whether the people desire it or not, they are obliged to use it, in good or in bad condition, in order to reach their market. I have to apologise to the House for occupying the time of hon. members with a purely local matter, but it happens that this road, which is purely a local road, is under the control of the Dominion Government. Whether the fact that the Great Western Railway crosses the road makes this a matter of general interest to Canada I do not know, but we have this result, that there is a bad road which the people are obliged to travel over and pay toll or stay at home. I desire to urge on the Minister of Public Works that this matter should be pressed forward, and the question of the ownership of this road settled, so that we may be in a position to enforce the proper maintenance of the road. At the present moment the condition of the road is so bad that the county council, in its session in January, passed a resolution asking the Government to ascertain who the real owners of this highway are; and since I came to the House I have received a memorial from the reeves of the two townships of West Flamboro' and Beverly, through which the road runs, which I have forwarded to the Minister of Public Works, asking that an engineer be sent to inspect the road in the early spring and ascertain the condition of the road-bed. I have to ask the Minister to press this matter to a conclusion without delay. Personally, I suppose, if there is to be a general election before the questions involved in this road matter are settled, no great harm will be done to me individually by having the question left open, because I can place the responsibility upon the shoulders of the Minister of Public Works, and it may weaken the hands of some of his friends in that locality; but I say, in the interest of the community there, that this controversy which has existed for three or four years as to who are the owners of this road should be settled, and the fact that in the meantime the road has been allowed to run down, to the great disadvantage of the people of the locality, it is but right that some steps should be taken to remove this grievance at an early day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the adoption of the motion, and the papers will be brought down. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and in the last portion of them he certainly brought out the point at issue, namely, the ownership of the road. That point is being investigated, and my attention was called to it by the document the hon. gentleman sent to me the other day.

Motion agreed to.

#### ARTIFICIAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution: "That it is expedient to remove the duty on Artificial Fertilisers and to place them on the Free List."

He said: I may briefly inform the House, and especially those members who are not familiar with the tariff regulations on the subject covered by my motion, that at the present time there is a duty of 20 per cent. on artificial fertilisers. The matter was brought before the House in 1887, coming up on a motion by the then Minister of



Finance to change the duty from the *ad valorem* one of 20 per cent. to a specific duty of \$6 per ton. A discussion took place upon that motion, and a motion was made that, in lieu of the specific duty of \$6 per ton, artificial fertilisers should be placed on the free list. I had the honor of seconding the motion on that occasion, but the Minister of Finance postponed the further consideration of the whole subject by withdrawing his original motion to change the duty from an *ad valorem* to a specific duty. Accordingly, the law is to-day as it was in 1887, and there is an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. upon all artificial fertilisers coming into Canada. Under the circumstances, I think it is worthy of the consideration of this House whether that duty is in the interest of the most important class in Canada, the Canadian farmer. For my part I consider the tax, for it is nothing more than almost a direct tax on the farmer, is wholly indefensible. It is not sound as a matter of political economy, it is not fair as a matter of justice to an already overtaxed people. It is said that we have plenty of phosphates in Canada, that they can be manufactured at home, and are being manufactured here to-day, and, therefore, some will urge perhaps that the tax through the custom house is no tax at all, that it simply excludes foreign competition. I am unable to agree with that conclusion. The Government have in many ways rendered it impossible for the Canadian farmer to obtain cheap artificial fertilisers. They have increased enormously the cost of production. I understand that certain acids enter very largely into the manufacture of superphosphates—sulphuric acid for one—and are necessary in the production of artificial fertilisers. The Government has placed a duty on sulphuric acid necessary for the manufacture of superphosphates and fertilisers, amounting to 25 per cent., or a specific duty of one-half per cent. per pound, which is about one-quarter of the selling wholesale price of sulphuric acid. I am informed that the selling price of sulphuric acid is about two cents per pound, and if so, the custom house duty of one-half cent per pound is one quarter of the actual wholesale price. Of course, not much of this acid will come into the country under those circumstances, but the Canadian manufactured article, which is a by-product of some of our mineral resources, is sold at a necessarily enhanced value. The result is that the cost of production is increased by the cost of protection given to acids. Whatever may be the argument, or whatever may be the reason for this, I hope that the time has come when this duty shall be swept away, in so far as it increases the cost to the farmer, on the agricultural fertiliser. When this matter was before the House in 1887, some hon. gentlemen said we should not make a motion of this kind because there was such a small quantity of artificial fertilisers introduced into Canada. It was stated, and stated correctly, I believe, by gentlemen who opposed the motion, that, in 1886, only some \$1,400 worth of fertilisers came into Canada. That only proves that the protective tariff has become a prohibitory tariff and has placed the cost of the imported article beyond the reach of the farmer. There is no doubt in my mind—and I do not venture to speak for others than myself—that if the Canadian farmers are to keep pace with their great rivals in the United States and in England they must every year, in increasing quantities, resort to artificial fertilisers. The lands have become impoverished in the older districts in Ontario and some of the other Provinces, and they are not now so fertile as they were in years gone by in the production of wheat and other cereals. The farmers have, therefore, to resort to the use of artificial fertilisers to improve their exhausted lands. Every year, in England and in the United States, a rapidly increasing quantity of these fertilisers is used by the advanced farmers of those countries. It is the custom on all occasions in this House, when my hon. friends seek to defend the high

Mr. MULOCK.

tariff which this Government has established, to point to the United States and to adopt its practice as a model. In this case they cannot find any such consolation or defence for their course. According to the law of the United States, fertilisers are admitted duty free, and not only fertilisers but sulphuric acid, also, which enters so largely into the manufacture of fertilisers. Permit me to quote a few items from the American Tariff of 1883, which, I believe, is the last Act of the United States Congress amending the Tariff. On reference to the Act, page 515 of the United States Statutes, Vol. 22, you find the schedule of the articles placed on the free list. These were not on the free list of 1883 for the first time, but although some very considerable changes were made in the United States Tariff in 1883 (some of them nominally in the direction of reduction, but which were rather in the direction of increasing the duties), yet in regard to the important subject of duty on fertilisers the United States Congress in 1883 re-affirmed their former attitude, and held that the class of manufactures to which I refer shall continue on the free list. On the free list of the United States we find the following articles of import shall be exempt from duty:—

“Bones, crude, not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed. Bone-dust and bone-ash for manufacture of phosphate and fertilisers. Carbon, animal, fit for fertilising only. Guano, manures, and all substances expressly used for manure.”

Thus our American neighbors have adopted free trade in regard to articles of this kind; and I think that, in this regard at all events, they have shown a very wise discretion. The result of the policy of the Administration in Canada, in taxing the manufacture of superphosphates (because that is what they have done by making it expensive to the manufacturer to manufacture by putting a high tariff upon the imported acid), has enabled the manufacturer to increase the cost to the consumer of the manufactured article here, and by doing this the Administration has practically placed superphosphates beyond the reach of the Canadian farmers. What is the result of this? A large portion of the natural wealth of Canada which is to be found in the great phosphate deposits of this Ottawa district, and in other parts of the Dominion, instead of being made valuable to the Canadian farmer is being exported in increasing quantities every year for the benefit of farmers beyond Canada. Our natural deposits of phosphates are now being imported to the United States and into England duty free, thus enabling the farmers there to raise grain so as to compete with our grain and at a less cost than we ourselves can produce it. We are preventing our Canadian farmers from using the fertilisers at their own doors and enabling their rivals in the markets beyond Canada to undersell our Canadian farmers, or at all events to make their products so much less in value. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived when we should place those fertilisers upon the free list. If it be necessary that the Canadian farmer shall in any way bear this burden, let the Government, if they choose, take the tax off all the raw material, and then the Canadian manufacturer can manufacture at the cheapest price. Let them take down the barrier against the importation of superphosphates from foreign countries, and then, and not till then will our farmers be on a fair footing to compete with their competitors beyond our Dominion.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if this motion were an attack upon the general principles of the National Policy, I should leave it to be answered by others more experienced, but as it refers to a special industry in which my constituency is largely interested (an industry which owes its existence there to the National Policy), I feel it is my duty to make a reference to the facts of the case, so that hon. members, before deciding on this question, shall have facts on one side as against the theories advanced by my hon. friend on the other. There is at Capelton, within a few miles from Sherbrooke, a

deposit of copper pyrites, which, next to the Rio Tinto mines in Spain, is the largest in the world. The ore carries about three per cent. of copper, and between forty and fifty per cent. of sulphur. Their existence has been known and the mines have been worked for the last twenty-five years. For the first few years they were worked for the copper alone, and to obtain this product the ore was roasted on the surface of the ground, not only wasting the sulphur, but destroying vegetation for many miles around. These deposits attracted the attention, about ten years ago, of an enterprising firm in New York, G. H. Nicholls & Co., large manufacturers of all the ingredients used in fertilisers, principally sulphuric acid. They bought an extensive property, and have worked it vigorously from that time to this. Until within the last year, they took out the ore and sent it in the raw state to New York. As it was from this firm that the principal ingredients for manufacturing fertilisers were imported into this country, I used what influence I could to induce them to place their works in Canada. Their answer was that it was more economical, they thought, for the Canadian farmer to have the fertilisers produced, as they were producing them, on a large scale in the United States, and that it would be more in the interest of the Canadian consumer that the duty should be removed—in fact, just the same argument as that which has been used by my hon. friend in support of his motion. But finding that the Government were firm in maintaining the duty, these gentlemen changed their policy, and during last year they have erected works at Capelton on a large scale, where they are not only making fertilisers for the Canadian market, and shipping them in iron tank cars—manufactured, I am happy to say, at Sherbrooke—but to their own surprise they are receiving orders from and sending their sulphuric acid to New England. Their intention has been from the first to take up the manufacture of superphosphates in this country, and for that purpose they have expended over \$100,000 in the purchase of phosphate deposits at Buckingham, within twenty miles of this city; and the only cause of delay, is the question of the location—whether they will erect works at Montreal, where they could obtain the use of the albumen and other products of the abattoirs, or in the neighborhood of the mines. With this illustration before it, the House has, on the one hand, to consider the actual fact of foreign capital invested in the country in this industry under the policy of protection, and, on the other, the theory of my hon. friend of what the result would be if the duty were removed. Agreeing as I do with my hon. friend on almost all questions of a social nature, it is with regret that I have to differ with him on so many questions of a public character. If he and his friends would give to the National Policy a support as consistent and persistent as both political parties in the United States have given to their tariff, I believe we should soon see in Canada similar results, and a commercial union would be brought about such as we could all agree with—a commercial union, resulting from the application of foreign capital to our native products, on Canadian soil. Entertaining these views, and feeling that the motion of my hon. friend is in direct contradiction and contravention of that policy, it seems to me that it is not entitled to the support of this House.

Mr. CASEY. I do not wish to speak at any length, because my own part of the country is not interested in this question of artificial fertilisers to any great extent at present, whatever may be the case in the future when our land becomes more exhausted. But in this matter, as in others, I feel that we should consider not only the interest of our own neighborhood, but the interest of the farming community throughout the Dominion. It is undoubtedly the case that a large number of Canadian farmers do require to use

artificial fertilisers on their land. I have often heard that, in the Province of Quebec particularly, the use of such fertilisers would be of great advantage and profit to the farmers, a great deal of whose land is in need of those superphosphates which come under the head of artificial fertilisers, and I feel called upon to say something on their behalf. It is quite clear that the existing duty on fertilisers, and on the materials for making them, does increase the cost of those articles in this country else there would be no object in maintaining those duties. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has argued that the duty should be maintained for the purpose of stimulating the investment of foreign capital in Canada. The only way that it can be stimulated is to increase the cost of the fertilisers. Therefore, my hon. friend's argument is that the price of these fertilisers to a large number of Canadian farmers should be maintained at a higher than the normal price to encourage a few capitalists to come in and make money by manufacturing them. His argument was for the profits of the manufacturers at Capelton, against the interests of the farmers who use their product. His argument was that any reduction of the duty would be subversive of the National Policy, and that, therefore, this motion should be thrown out. We remember that when the National Policy was introduced it was urged that it was as much for the benefit of the farmer as anybody else; but now it would seem that, although the name of the National Policy has remained the same, the object of the National Policy has changed. It would appear that it is for the benefit of the manufacturers at the expense of the farmer. I cannot call such a policy a national policy. I will call it a policy of protection to manufacturers; but under these circumstances when the interests of the farmers are held to be naught as against those of the manufacturers, I cannot call it a national policy, seeing that the farmers constitute the largest number of our people, produce the greatest part of our wealth, and pay the largest amount of duties of any class in the Dominion. If my hon. friend's (Mr. Hall's) friends, the manufacturers, have told him correctly about their business dealings, they need not be afraid of the competition which the motion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) would induce. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has said that these manufacturers are able to sell sulphuric acid in New England in competition with the manufacturers there. If that is the case, why are they afraid to compete with them in Canada? He has knocked the bottom out of his own argument in this one admission. Those who send sulphuric acid to New England must pay the American duty on the article, and if they can do that, why could they not compete in an open market here where neither side would have any duty to pay? The hon. gentleman has told us that \$100,000 of capital has been invested in phosphate lands at Buckingham, and I do not know how much in the manufacture at Capelton; and his argument is that because of the investment of these, perhaps \$200,000 or \$300,000, the monopoly should be kept up for the benefit of the foreign capitalists who have invested this money—for the benefit of these Yankees, against whom all loyal men must now feel so strongly. For the benefit of these the farmers of Canada are to be taxed. The hon. gentleman's argument is not sound. The only possible argument which could be made against the motion would be that the owners of the phosphate lands might be injured. I do not know how that would be; I do not know how far they would be injured. I believe that if sulphuric acid was allowed to be imported freely, the manufacture of superphosphates would be largely increased, and the value of phosphate lands be augmented; and that with our cheaper labor in Canada, notwithstanding the admission of fertilisers free, the motion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) would involve a greater manufacture of superphosphates in Canada and an increased value to phos-

phate lands. Even if there was a choice to be made between the two, we should look to the interests of the majority, the interests of the farmer, as against the interest of the comparatively few who are concerned in this industry.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry to have to differ with my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall). I have always admired the candor with which he has always discussed the questions that come before the House, but in my opinion this is the same old story over again—the protection of the few brought about by the taxation of the many. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has put the whole matter in a nutshell when he says what is now miscalled the National Policy means the protection of the few by the taxation of the many. This fact is beginning to be realised by the country. The people are beginning to realise that the farmers, who form seven-tenths of the people of this country, and who pay the great bulk of the taxes, are not protected in any way in any one item. The only thing that the National Policy does for the farmer is to tax him. Now the farmers, in asking for this little concession, are not asking very much. I am a practical farmer myself. I live by it and have obtained all I have by it. What I have to say with regard to the farmers is that they ask for no protection. All they ask is to be let severely alone and be allowed a fair chance in the struggle for wealth and position. That is all they want, and with less they will not be satisfied. So far as this matter of fertilisers is concerned, though apparently a very small matter, it is, when you come to probe it, found to be a very important matter. Every hon. gentleman knows that you cannot protect anything which the farmer produces while you tax everything he uses. The taxation commences with the necessaries on his table, and everything thereon, except what he raises on his farm, is taxed to the very highest point. Take one item, an article in general use and a necessity on the table, the article of sugar. The duties upon sugar are prohibitory. Sugar never was cheaper in the markets of the world than it is at present, and one-half what the farmer pays for what he uses is paid in the shape of taxes. The clothes that he wears are taxed from 30 to 50 per cent. for the benefit of the manufacturers, and for their benefit alone. The implements which he uses are taxed even in a greater degree. Those who know anything about farming know that iron is a large component part in farm implements, and any one who will look over the tariff will see that a prohibitory tax is placed on this raw material—a tax which is paid by the farmer. Is it then too much to ask that this small matter of fertilisers be allowed in free? I need not tell you, Sir, that the great source of the income of this country is the products of the farm, next to which come the products of the forest. First of all the industries of the country is the farming industry, and upon it mainly the country has to depend for the increase of its wealth and the Government for the taxes they collect. How is the high standard of fertility, the high standard of production in farming to be kept up? It is only by correct methods of farming, by scientific methods of farming, and in every successful method of farming the price of fertilisers plays an important part. It is the most important of all considerations in connection with farming. I found out many years ago that the simple question whether farming is to prove a success or a failure depends, not so much on the methods used, not so much on the capital employed, as upon the increased quantity produced from a given surface. If 15 bushels of wheat to an acre will pay all expenses and enable the farmer to live, 20 bushels to the acre will give him a clear profit of five bushels. If he is to obtain that he can only do so by a judicious system of farming and by a liberal use of fertilisers. I may remark that this

Mr. CASEY.

question is assuming gigantic proportions. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that the system we have been pursuing, of exporting so much from the country, has a deteriorating influence upon the soil, that it is gradually exhausting the fertility of the soil. You cannot raise or feed an animal and export it without taking away a portion of the fertility of the soil. That exhaustion is accelerated in a very large ratio when we export in the shape of cereals. You are then rapidly deteriorating the fertility of the soil, and unless that loss is supplied in some way or other rapid deterioration must result. Let me point out how one item affects the farmers. Why is it that Britain is, notwithstanding her comparatively barren soil, the richest and most productive country in the world? The reason is simply that she has largely imported coarse grains and turned them into fertilisers of the soil, in fact has made Britain the feeding ground for the coarse grains of the world. Many years ago, before the year 1879, we had the privilege of importing coarse grains free of duty into this country for that very purpose, and that is the policy that ought to have been pursued in the interests of our farming community. Our farmers imported western grain, fed it to their cattle, shipped the cattle to Great Britain, and made a profit, and were becoming richer all the time. But the farmer had to be taxed, and a tax was laid on these coarse grains, and that trade was completely knocked on the head. If fertility is to be kept up in the soil, we have to employ some other means than merely the products of the soil. Just so long as the produce of the soil is exported, so long will this process of deterioration go on. Some years ago, I went through the Island of Prince Edward, one of the finest farming sections, as far as I can see, in this Dominion of ours. I never saw finer land to work upon. They export from that Island a large quantity of oats and potatoes, and of living animals. What enables them to do it? If it were not for the use of artificial manures and fertilisers, such as mussel mud, that Island would be one barren waste, unless it were for the fertilisers which they scatter over their lands and which keep up the fertility of the soil. The motion now before the House asks for a very small matter, and the parts of the country which import fertilisers the most are those which need it the most. In the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they have not such a rich soil as we have in the West and as they have in the North-West. Their soil is comparatively unproductive, when placed in competition with ours, and it is necessary that they should have some facilities afforded them, that they should have some cheap means of keeping up the fertility of the soil. If you want to assist the farming community and to enable them to compete in the markets of the world, you must remove the duty from the fertilisers and give the farmers a chance. My friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has alluded to the fact that as yet only small quantities of these fertilisers are imported, and he pointed out correctly that the fact results from the existence of a prohibitory duty upon these fertilisers amounting to no less than one-fifth of the price. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend, the member for North York.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am compelled to consider this motion in the interest of the agricultural community. The National Policy was brought into existence, as it was stated, for the particular benefit of the farmers as well as the industrial classes, and yet, notwithstanding all the improvements in machinery and the cheapening of the cost of production in every line, excepting in that of farming, notwithstanding all the improvements which have been made in agricultural machinery, the farmer is not able to produce a single acre of grain cheaper than he was before agricultural machinery was improved. The cost is just as great now as it was before. Allow me to give a statement which is

taken from the returns of the Bureau of Industries of the Province of Ontario, as to the cost of producing an acre of the principal grains which are exported from that Province. This is taken from the report of the Bureau of Industries for the year 1887, and is compiled from the reports of 197 farmers representing all parts of the Province of Ontario. This report shows that the cost of producing an acre of fall wheat was \$19.53. The whole value of the acre of wheat produced was \$17.18, so that it cost \$2.35 more to produce an acre of wheat than the farmer realised from its growth. Barley cost \$14.83 to produce per acre, and the farmer realised \$18.63, making a profit of \$3.80 per acre on barley. To produce an acre of oats it cost \$14.73, and the value of the growth was \$16.95, or \$2.17 more than the cost of production. Peas cost \$15.47 to produce, while the value of the product was \$13.87, or \$1.60 less than the cost of production. So, if a farmer having 100 acres had 40 acres laid out in this way—10 acres of fall wheat, 10 acres of barley, 10 acres of oats and 10 of peas, he would only have a net profit of \$20.20 on those 40 acres above the cost of production. Hon. gentlemen will say that the only safety for the farmer is to increase the product, as the amount of manual labor cannot be reduced, and this must be done by the increased elements of fertility which it is possible to send back into the soil. I believe that the farmers in Ontario, and all over Canada, will not long continue to farm under the old system of raising coarse grains and cattle in order to send them to a foreign market. They must keep cattle at home, and keep and fatten them on the farm, because my experience as a farmer tells me that one of the great wants which we feel in this country now is a sufficient quantity of fertilisers, either natural or artificial, and no farmers who continue to follow the old system can possibly hold their position unless the Government chooses to give them relief in some direction. From the statement of my hon. friend from Middlesex, the result of protection to the farmer has been that it has increased the price of almost every article we sell, and has also narrowed the markets for our products. Between the two we are in a very peculiar position. Since the Government, in their wisdom, have seen fit to follow the example of most other countries by establishing experimental farms, there is no doubt that at the farms they will experiment on fertilisers and artificial manures, as well as on other matters; but it is an impossibility for any farmer to tell by the experiment made on the experimental farm, what the effect of the fertiliser would be on his own farm or on his fields, without making an actual experiment for himself. At one time it was attempted to show by agricultural chemistry what was necessary to use in order that a good crop might be raised, but now it is admitted that it cannot tell the amount of plant-food the soil contains in an available condition. Thus, although the experimental farm may show what may be done there, and what the different parts of the fertilisers may be, still every farmer must experiment for himself on his own farm, and it is only the fertiliser which suits that land which will be beneficial to him. I hold that it is the duty of the Government to give, as far as possible, every facility to the farmer for obtaining cheap production, and that can only be done in regard to fertilisers by removing the duty upon them. Some people may say that the only fertiliser to be depended upon is what the farmer produces on his own farm. It must be remembered, however, that a large number of the products of the farm are sent to foreign countries, and it is necessary that we should supply the want of those by the use of artificial manures. I hold that the Government should give this relief to the farmer by taking this one duty off. It may be said that a small amount is used. So long as we had practically a virgin soil, artificial manures were not

required; but now, in many older parts of the Dominion, it is found an actual necessity for the farmer to use every means in his power to bring the fertility of the soil back as nearly as possible to its original condition, and that can only be done by using all the manure he can make upon his own farm, and getting in addition all the artificial manures that he can afford to pay for. I was astonished to hear the hon. member from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) proposing to keep on these duties, particularly when he said that these manufacturers could compete successfully with manufacturers of artificial manures in the United States. If they can compete successfully with the manufacturers of the artificial fertilisers in the United States, why impose a duty? Why compel the farmer to pay an increased price? I hold that it is the duty of the Government in this matter to do everything they possibly can to lessen the cost of the production to the farmer. I have been very much astonished at certain members in this House who have been interesting themselves in behalf of the farmer; they have been doing everything they can to relieve the farmer and protect him. I am sorry the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) is not in his seat, because I notice that he made a motion the other day for a committee to be renewed to enquire into the frauds perpetrated upon the farmers of this country by certain individuals. Well, Sir, I saw a little item in the *Mail* to-day stating that this hon. gentleman was one of a deputation who went before the Minister of Customs to see that the duty on fertilisers is not taken off. I think he has been running with the hare and hunting with the hounds, because all the other benefits that he asked extend to but a very small portion of the agricultural community. There may be a very few farmers who have been imposed upon by these individuals, but they are a small minority. The majority of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada are well able to take care of themselves and to protect themselves from frauds. Now, when it comes to a matter of imposing a duty upon one of the principal elements of success for the agriculturists, we find that hon. gentleman supporting the duty; he is doing everything that he can to have the committee continued, but he is not willing to give the farmer that relief he is entitled to. I like to see consistency, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite who have been getting up committees to enquire into the combines that exist throughout the country and into the frauds perpetrated upon the farmers, will see their way to assist us in getting the duty on fertilisers removed, believing, as I do, that the success of Canada depends upon the success of the agricultural community, and the success of the agricultural community to-day depends on cheapening as far as possible the cost of production, and that can only be done by making an acre of land produce a greater amount. We cannot in any shape reduce the amount of labor that we have got to give to an acre of land; for the longer land continues to be worked, and continues to yield, the more labor you have to put upon it in order to put it into proper condition, and the only way to do that is by increasing its fertility.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat feels that he has been doing a great good to the interests of the farmer, and I believe that the farming community in general will come to the same conclusion to which he has arrived, providing they accept his reasoning as correct and conclusive. But, unfortunately, there is something even behind this that is of more importance to the farmer than taking the duty off. At present we have upon our statute-books a law passed in 1884 that compels the analysis of artificial fertilisers offered for sale in Canada, as a guarantee that they must contain a sufficient percentage of those elements which are necessary to replenish an exhausted soil. That is, to-day, a guarantee that when a farmer buys a fertiliser it shall contain in itself

something of absolute value. If the duty were taken off many people would buy their fertilisers in the United States, they would bring them here, and after wasting the money they had paid out for them, and the labor expended in cultivating the soil upon which they were to be put, they would only find by experience that the money was virtually thrown away, and they had received no value for it in return. Now, that would be the condition of the Canadian farmer were the duty taken off to-day, because I know of my own personal knowledge that fertilisers of this character have been brought from the other side. I know that they are manufactured very extensively and were sold to the farmer here as being valuable, before the duty was imposed which now keeps them out, when in reality they contain no value for the purpose for which they are intended. If the duty is kept up no person will offer these inferior articles for sale, because, before doing so, he must have an analysis; but if the duty is taken off the Canadian farmer will make his purchases on the other side and will find these fertilisers to be of little or no value. It is a fact to-day that the Americans are importing leached ashes from Canada, are taking them over to the States and sending them back to Canadian farmers as valuable fertilisers, when in reality we have them at home and would not use them at all. Now, were it not for the fact that this Act was upon our statute-book which compels the analysis of these fertilisers, I believe a much more extensive fraud would be perpetrated upon the agriculturists of this country. We have in our own country all the chemical elements that are necessary to make up the most beneficial fertilisers for our farmers, and I believe with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) that it only requires this protection to bring capital into the country to start up these manufacturing establishments, and to have made in our own country valuable fertilisers that will be a benefit to our farmers, who, when they purchase them, will find that they have received some value for the money expended on them. Until we have some means of stopping frauds it would be a detriment to the Canadian farmer if we allowed these fertilisers to come in free. I think if we could devise some means to increase the value of fertilisers that are being sold, and some means of bringing into operation manufacturing establishments that would use the material in our own country, we would be doing that good which the farmer is so anxiously looking for much more effectually by extending the duty than by taking it off these fertilisers. I can only say, from the knowledge I have of the use of these articles—because they have been used in our country and found to be practicably worthless—that I believe it would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmer that this duty should be taken off. It is true that exhausted farms require something to recuperate them and bring them up to their former condition. The agriculturists of the country are raising more stock and by that means they are bringing back to themselves some practical return; but if the duty is taken off fertilisers, every dollar expended on them, in nine cases out of ten, would be squandered for a worthless commodity, and they would be wasting their money upon something that would bring them back nothing in return.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to see that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat this afternoon, in order that he may give the views of the Government on this question. I have no doubt, however, that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has practically given the official view upon this point, and that the supporters of the Government are conducting this discussion on the principle that it is necessary to build up the manufacture of artificial manures in this country, and that therefore we must retain the duty on these manures in order to prevent outside competition

Mr. SPOULE.

with this home industry. The hon. member for Sherbrooke, in the argument he made, as my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) said, has practically given away his whole case. Already allusion has been made to the fact, which he himself stated, that the firm manufacturing sulphuric acid in his neighborhood have been able to sell it in the Dominion and the United States, to be used for the manufacture of fertilisers. It is very evident that one of two things must be the case: either that the firm does not need protection against the manufacturers of sulphuric acid in the United States, or else that they are making of the United States what is commonly called a slaughter-market for goods which we help them to make in this country at our expense. It has been stated, not very long ago, that when our manufacturers exported articles to other countries they sold them to foreigners at lower prices than they sold them to our own people, and that, practically, we were called upon to aid and support them in manufacturing goods in this country, while at the same time they sold them abroad to foreigners at lower prices. I can hardly believe that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) can be so unpatriotic as to maintain and support a firm which would adopt that course, but at the same time I can hardly conceive any other satisfactory explanation of the fact that those gentlemen alluded to require protection against the manufacturers of sulphuric acid in the United States, in order to be able to manufacture sulphuric acid in this country, and at the same time are able to send it into the United States and pay the duty imposed by the American Government upon it.

Mr. HALL. There is none.

Mr. FISHER. Still they would have to pay the freight to the United States and other charges. And yet they are asking protection in their own market on the ground that without it they cannot carry on the manufacture of sulphuric acid in this country against the competition of manufacturers in the United States. It seems to be a most unreasonable proposition and one I cannot understand. But I believe the true facts are that, at the present time, sulphuric acid is not so cheaply manufactured here as in the United States, and were it not for the duty placed on sulphuric acid the farmers of this country would be able to obtain artificial manures at a much cheaper rate than they do to-day, and that is the real reason why the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has made this motion and why I support it. Even supposing for a moment that the abolition of the duty would hurt the manufacturers of sulphuric acid or of artificial manure made here, I contend that ultimately, in the interests of the manufacturers of such manures, it would be of great advantage to them to have the duty removed, and I will explain my reasons. In this country, and especially in the Province of Quebec, the use of artificial manures is not widespread. In fact there is very little used, because our farmers are unacquainted with their merits and have not made the experiments which the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) alluded to as being necessary. Such experiments are expensive, and it is almost impossible for the poorer farmers to make the experiments which would lead to the use of artificial manures, and it will be only at such time as they can be made more cheaply than at present that it will be possible for our farmers to make them. I contend, although I advocate the use of artificial manures under certain circumstances, and I know well that the use of artificial manures to a large extent, without previous experiments having been made by a farmer on his own land, is a dangerous and risky undertaking. It is an experiment, and I would not advocate it to be tried on a large scale; but the farmer must make experiments himself, and accordingly if each farmer was able to buy manure as cheaply as possible, he would be called upon to incur no greater risk than was necessary. I regret

to know that, in consequence of certain regulations made by the Customs Department, the importation of artificial manures has been rendered more difficult than the duty alone would lead one to suppose it would be, and that practically to-day the duty, taken in connection with the customs regulations, renders prohibitory the importation of artificial manures. But, were the duty removed, and were artificial manures allowed to come in from the United States and other countries, I believe such an effort would be made by the great manufacturers of the United States to extend the sale of their wares here, that farmers would be able to make those experiments to which I have alluded, and would be enabled to purchase artificial manures almost too cheap I might say, that is, obtaining the manure at a lower price than the manufacturers would be justified in exporting it with a profit for the purpose of encouraging experiment, and in that way our farmers, especially in the Province of Quebec, would be led to utilise artificial manure and would be induced to rush into the market for artificial manures and so greatly increase the market which the manufacturers of this country have at their disposal. The Government also are responsible, to a large extent, for the need of these manures; and I say this advisedly, because to-day the Government are imposing a heavy duty on feeds which the farmers formerly imported for the purpose of stock-feeding and for improving their barnyard manure. Instead of buying artificial manures our farmers prefer to buy feed and thus obtain a double profit, not only the profit obtainable from making beef, milk or cheese which the feed would produce, but the greater profit lying in the improvement in the manure made by the cattle thus fed. But, in consequence of the higher duty placed upon corn and other feeds, which were formerly imported from the United States, our farmers are debarred from buying them and consequently are not able to improve their manure heaps. The result is that under the present condition of our farming, which must necessarily be at the present stage of our progress more and more scientific, and more and more carried on under a thorough system, our farmers are driven into the experiment to which I have alluded, of using artificial manures, and, eventually, the widespread use of them. The hon. gentleman who spoke from the other side of the House, in alluding to this question, spoke of the protection we have given to our farmers with regard to the testing of artificial manure manufactured here. The same test and analysis could very easily be made, as they are to-day, if the duty were removed. The duty does not analyse the manure, as my hon. friend beside me suggests. The analysis has to be placed on every package imported, and the analysis is tested by our Customs Department or by our Inland Revenue Department, as the case may be, and every such package imported is analysed. That is one of the difficulties I pointed to, and one of the troubles which importers have had to contend with, and to which I alluded when I spoke of the Customs regulations. But the fact of the matter is that our farmers have got to-day that protection under the Fertilisers Act and under the Customs regulations. This motion does not pretend or intend, in any way whatever, to do away with that protection, but it is introduced with a view to enable the farmer to obtain those artificial manures more cheaply than they are able to obtain them to-day, and anyone who knows anything about the principle of protection knows that the duty is imposed simply for the purpose of enabling those parties who could not otherwise manufacture them to be able to manufacture them. I do not wonder that members of the Government and members on that side of the House consider this is a blow against their protective policy, knowing that such an action as this, if it were adopted by this House, would be a condemnation of the whole protective policy. I do not wonder that they object to it, and that, knowing the weakness of the arguments which they would have to lay before this House,

they prefer to meet this motion by a vote instead of answering it by argument or by showing that they are right on the question. I know very well that they cannot answer it by argument, and I also know very well that they will not attempt to do so, but I fear greatly that by their party discipline they will be able to vote the motion down, notwithstanding that I and others on this side of the House have supported it by argument and will endorse it by our vote.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, as the author of the notorious Fertiliser Bill of 1884, it may be perhaps necessary that I should say a few words on this subject. I may say that my object in introducing that Bill was not to protect the manufacturer of either superphosphates or fertilisers, but to protect the farmers of the country from imposition and robbery at the hands of their American neighbors. If those gentlemen who have spoken on the other side desire to protect the farmer they must protect him by either prohibiting the importation of artificial manures which are entirely valueless, or by analysing all those imported. This is the only protection you can give the farmer. In my own county, which is situated close to Buffalo, the farmers were in the habit of buying a great many kinds of manure from manufacturers in the States. After investigation I found that the laws in each one of the States imposed an analysis on the manures which were sold in the State, but manures intended for exportation were not to be analysed at all, so that all the refuse from American factories was imported into this country. I found that the law to analyse fertilisers was passed in South Carolina, Georgia, and other States, and that nearly every State of the Union, for its own protection, passed the same law to prevent and prohibit the importation of worthless fertilisers from an adjoining State. It is important for this House to know that by the laws of each State of the Union an examination by a chemist is imposed on all those fertilisers, and the article is made to answer to a certain standard. The fertilisers manufactured in the United States and which is intended for exportation, has not to be analysed at all. This was my object in introducing the Fertiliser Bill, and it was also the object of an import duty upon such commodities. I may say that fertilisers which cannot be manufactured in this country, such as guano and some others, are now allowed to come in free of duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is that? Why is duty imposed?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). You will find that a great many fertilisers are allowed in duty free. I am not prepared to name them now, but I think the Minister of Customs will be able to give the list.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do they collect duty then?

Mr. BOWELL. They don't.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Those fertilisers which are exempted are known to be pure and of good quality. In support of the position which I hold here, I may say that not one of the American fertilisers examined by our analysts came up to the standard. They were all of inferior quality and unfit for use by the farmers of this country. Permit me to say again (and I do not intend to prolong the discussion) that the object of every member of this House who is interested in the welfare of the farming industry—the most important industry in this country—ought to be to protect our farmers against imposition and fraud at the hands of his neighbors of the United States. This is the object of the duty upon fertilisers. And if we had not that duty upon fertilisers we would have all kinds of inferior stuff sent over to be purchased by our Canadian farmers.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not your Act apply to the imported articles?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Analysis might be had of those imported articles.

Mr. MULOCK. It must be had.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). You might apply analysis to those fertilisers, but until some further legislation is had to prevent imposition and fraud upon the farmers of this country by our neighbors across the line, and to prevent them sending spurious stuff over here, I do not think we can do any better than we are doing now in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say whether the Act of 1884, which he had passed, does not require the imported article to be analysed the same as the manufactured article?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss whether the protective policy is for the benefit of the country or not, or whether the system of protection is, or is not, for the benefit of people engaged in commerce, in manufactures, or for the benefit of the agriculturists. That question has been imported into this debate, and I may remark that it has been decided long ago by this country that the policy of protection is for the benefit of all classes.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, it is acknowledged to be, at any rate, and it will for a number of years, I venture to say, be the policy of this country. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite has introduced a motion by which he points out that it bears particularly hard upon a certain class of the community to impose a duty on manufactured manures coming into this country. What are mineral manures? They are principally composed of two ingredients. Phosphate of lime and sulphuric acid. The whole value of them to the agricultural community depends upon the quantity of the superphosphate of lime in them. In this country, strange to say, we have the largest deposits of phosphate of lime in any part of the world, and that in its purest and best form. It has been exported continuously from this country to Great Britain and Germany and other parts. We have the material for the manufacture of such an article, with the greatest percentage of phosphate of lime lying at our very doors. The other ingredient necessary to make superphosphate of lime (as is known to every individual who has studied the question) is sulphuric acid. We were in the habit of importing that and manufacturing it out of the sulphur found in Sicily and in the southern part of Italy. It has been found that we have lots of material in our own country—iron pyrites and copper pyrites, which contain sulphuric acids—which can be extracted cheaper than by bringing the sulphuric acid from Sicily to this country. So much is this the case that American capitalists have invested largely in the copper mines which abound in the neighborhood of Capelton. They had been in the habit of working those mines and carrying the ore to New York, there extracting the sulphuric acid and returning it back to this country. By the policy of the Government we have compelled them to erect sulphuric acids works in Canada. The sulphuric acid is now being manufactured here out of material found in the country, and it can be manufactured cheaper than any imported from a foreign country. We have, then, all the materials in this country necessary for the manufacture of the commodity. We have the raw phosphates and the sulphuric acids in our country in abundance. We send them to foreign countries—to Germany and Great Britain. Is not the policy which would develop that trade and cause the manufacture of that article in this country not one for the benefit of the country? Is it one that would increase the value of the article to agriculturists? It is the same as any article manufactured in this country which is native to the country, and which it would be to the benefit of the country to start the manufacture of. The consequence

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

of this policy will be that in a few years we can manufacture superphosphate cheaper than it is possible for it to be imported from any foreign country. We can supply not only our own demand, but we can send superphosphates to other countries. The result will be another illustration of what again and again has been repeated, of the benefits which the system of protection will confer on this country.

Mr. WELSH. The question of fertilisers is a question in which I have always taken a deep interest, and it is one which I consider to be of great importance to the farmers of this country. Looking over the *Hansard* for 1887, I find that the Minister of Finance introduced an item imposing a duty of \$6 per ton on artificial manures. I objected to it at once, and made a motion to have it taken off, and, after considerable debate on the question, it was taken off. I see that that motion was seconded by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) who has brought up a motion to-day to remove the duty of 20 per cent. altogether. I have much pleasure in supporting that motion. The agricultural interests of this country are, I suppose, of greater importance than any other interests in the country. My hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said that the manufacturers are able to manufacture these fertilisers in this country more cheaply than they can be manufactured in any foreign country. If so, what is the use of keeping on a duty of 20 per cent. a ton? The people of this country are not fools enough to import fertilisers and pay 20 per cent. a ton more for them than they could get them at their own door. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) speaks of the quality of the imported fertilisers. Well, I do not see what that has to do with the duty. You can analyse these fertilisers if you like, and see that no inferior quality comes into the country; but that is no argument for the duty. My hon. friend from Wellington said that he had visited Prince Edward Island, and he had never seen a finer farming country, but that if we had not the resource of the mussel-muck to apply to our land, we would have been in a very poor condition. I quite agree with him, and I hope those decayed oyster-beds, commonly called mussel-muck, will continue to provide the farmers of Prince Edward Island with a fertiliser. There is no doubt that as time goes on, we shall need to import fertilisers more largely for the improvement of our land; and I do hope that as the late hon. Finance Minister thought proper to withdraw his proposition to place a duty of \$6 a ton on fertilisers in 1887, the Government will see their way clear to removing the duty altogether in the interest of the farming community of this Dominion. I hardly know what amount of revenue has been received from this duty, but I decidedly recommend the Government to take it off. I have not studied the subject very much, but when the subject comes up in committee we shall be able to bring further proof of the necessity of removing the duty.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). To those who are interested in the farmer's occupation, I think one thing must be patent in listening to the discussions from the other side of the House, that is, that hon. gentlemen opposite think that the farmers are a class of people who specially want to be taken care of. If there is a patent agent, or a seed wheat agent to be looked after, there is a committee appointed to look after the farmer's interest to see that he is not imposed on. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) comes out on another line. He says the farmers in his neighborhood are so innocent and green that they buy those bad superphosphates made in Buffalo which are below the grade made in Canada, and he supports the Government in keeping the duty on, because those farmers do not know enough to buy the better article; and when my hon. friend the Postmaster General took the field, I was reminded of the ancient history of the early discussions on the National Policy. Again we had golden promises of what was going to happen in the

future, how we were going to manufacture sulphuric acid more cheaply than it could be manufactured in Sicily or anywhere else, and how we were going to develop our resources and send it all over the world. In the meantime, the farmer has to pay the price that a few manufacturers impose, and wait a little longer for the good time that is said to be coming. Now, Sir, I think it is time we faced this question on a different basis. If we have these great undeveloped natural resources in this country, as I am proud to think we have—and I agree with the hon. the Postmaster General in every statement he has made with respect to the value of our beds of phosphates, and our pyrites from which we manufacture sulphuric acid so cheaply—I wish to ask the House where the distinct protection of the National Policy to the farmer comes in? When this subject was discussed in the early days, we found that almost every product of agriculture was placed in a schedule, in which we invited a free exchange with the United States; and we have left that invitation there, so that if the United States allowed our products to enter that country duty free, we should be bound to do the same with respect to their products. Is that the protection the National Policy gives to the farmer? We, on this side, have said that that would be good for the farmer; but we ask the principle to be extended a little further. We say, if the farmer is to sell in competition with all the world on even terms, give us a chance to buy on even terms, and then we will ask no favor, but take an open field. It struck me, when the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) spoke on this question, that he gave away the whole case of the manufacturers of sulphuric acid, and I will tell you why. He says that their business has so developed that, to their own surprise, they were able to send the sulphuric acid into the United States, to compete with the article manufactured there. Would it not be better for the Government to place that article in the list of free exchange with the Americans with the products of the farmers, and let us have competition? The Americans are talking about retaliation pretty lively just now, and suppose they just clap a duty on that sulphuric acid going into the United States, what would be the result? These manufacturers in my hon. friend's county, who, I am glad to hear, are manufacturing sulphuric acid so cheaply, would suddenly find their American market gone, and the result would be that their market would be limited to Canada. Everyone knows that the initial difficulty is that when you place the cost of these manures parallel with the price the farmer gets for his products, their cost is too high to enable him to use them successfully and profitably in his general agricultural crops. But if you will give him a chance to get those artificial manures at the lower rate, but still containing a fair and honest percentage of valuable manurial agent, they will immediately go into general consumption, but this waiting upon and protecting the manufacture of superphosphates or anything else, and keeping up prices is, in the meantime, an obstruction to the general consumption of those articles. Everyone knows that the farmers of this country have to take the advantage of every conceivable mode of cheapening production, as they cannot look forward to a continued range of the high prices which heretofore have existed in the markets of the world, and they will have to bring their ingenuity to bear in the production of every article, both to cheapen the cost of production and increase the production per acre. There are only two ways of doing that. With the advantages of labor-saving agricultural machinery they are able on that side to reduce the cost of production, but every farmer knows that the protection given by labor-saving machinery is a limited protection. If, by any means, you can supplement that by the use of cheap agricultural fertilisers, with a fair share of fertilising ingredient in them, you place with-

in reach of the farmer another means by which he can increase the income from his farm, because if you can increase the production per acre from 15 bushels, which may be just a paying quantity, to 20 bushels, that means a clear profit of 5 bushels to the farmer. I ask the Government to take these matters into consideration. I ask them: Where is the protection to the farmer to come in, assuming, as the hon. the Postmaster General has said, that the National Policy has come to stay? If it has come to stay, give the farmers a fair chance along with other people. Do not make them the field upon which every man who has a particular interest to advance shall march to the Government and ask that another 20 per cent. be added to the farmer's taxation, and so much more money be taken out of his hard earnings. Let the blessings of the National Policy be extended to the farmer as well as to those who invest their capital in manufactures. So far as I am personally concerned, I deny the charge that we, on this side of the House, are hostile to the manufacturers. But I say that there are other interests that deserve a fair share of protection at the hands of the Government, and I ask the Government, in the interests of four-fifths of our population, that they should not be asked to pay tribute exclusively to the other fifth, but should have a fair chance to share in the benefits of the National Policy. Do not ask us to wait for a good time to-morrow. The artificial fertiliser business may be a small one at present, and I am free to say it is a small one, but we know that the farmers are slow to change their ways; and supposing you took off the duty to-morrow, I do not say that the consumption of fertilisers would go ahead by bounds, or that they would immediately become to the farmers all that some parties claim they would. But I say that if the Government persistently continues this course of repression towards the farmers and leaves him at the mercy of every individual who thinks he has an interest to advance, and which can only be advanced to his exclusive benefit and their detriment, the farmers cannot be expected always to wait, and that the position of the agricultural interests to-day is such in this country and everywhere over the broad face of the world that we are face to face with an era of low prices without the probability of any immediate change; that the markets of the old country, though they are free to everybody, are not so favorable to us as they were ten years ago, because to-day the facilities for distributing supplies are such that the mother country draws her supplies from the ends of the earth. I ask the Government whether it is not pushing the National Policy too far, and whether it might not be wise and fair for them to take into account the position of our agricultural population and do something to show that their vaunted policy is not worked exclusively in the interest of the manufacturer, and to the detriment of our agricultural population.

Mr. FOSTER. The debate has taken a wide range, far wider than the specific subject which called it forth would warrant. The question has been very exhaustively treated on both sides, and I imagine those who are in favor of the resolution have brought forward their best arguments and put them in their best manner. I cannot help saying that, so far as their presentment of the case is concerned, I do not think it has been strong enough to induce the Government to change its policy with regard to this matter. In the first place, a great deal has been said with reference to the large amount of duty which the farmer has to pay. Well, I find in looking over the returns that the whole amount of duty paid last year was the immense sum of \$2,491. That certainly is not a very large burthen. But hon. gentlemen say that the import would be greater if the duty were taken off. Yet in the next breath they say, and it is a strong argument, that artificial manure is a thing which it is dangerous to experiment with, that it should be experi-



mented with in very small quantities and upon a very limited area, and that of all manures, the natural manures, so to speak, are by far the best, and are most largely consumed. It has also been shown upon this side of the House, and shown very conclusively, and I think it will be patent to the experience of those who are practical men in the matter, that the fertilisers which come from the other side have been of a poorer quality than the excellent material we have here, and which is now about to be worked up in large quantities, gives warrant of being produced here. Then again, I think it has been shown conclusively that there are few countries in the world, if there are any, which have such magnificent deposits of the natural raw material for the making of artificial fertilisers as the Dominion has. Not only is that known in this country, not only is that being utilised in this country, but I find that last year we exported of phosphates alone to the value of about \$400,000. My hon friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) read a list of the articles which were allowed in free by the United States. If he will turn to our tariff he will find that those same articles, with almost no exception, are let free into this country, which go into the manufacture of artificial fertilisers. Sulphuric acid is not admitted free; but, on the other hand, as was conclusively shown, sulphuric acid is being more largely manufactured in this country. The facilities for manufacturing it are of a very superior kind, and we are manufacturing it now so as not only to supply our own market but also to export to our neighbors. Hon. gentlemen say if sulphuric acid can be made here and sent to the New England States, why is it necessary to have a duty upon it? And why not, on the same argument, take away the duty upon fertilisers? There is a great difference between the starting of an industry and the industry after it has had years to grow to a large state of development, and the whole argument in favor of the protection of industries is based very largely upon the recognition of that distinction. Therefore, taking these things into consideration, I do not think, as far as the case has been made apparent to the House, that any ground has been made for the passage of this resolution or for any change in the tariff law in accordance with this resolution. I am not going to take up the time of the House in debating the matter further. I thought it had been debated thoroughly before I arose to suggest these few considerations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The position taken by the hon. the Minister of Finance is precisely what we would have expected he would take on this question. The hon. gentleman is a pronounced protectionist, and, as a pronounced protectionist, he finds it necessary to extend the same protection to those who are undertaking to engage in this business as has been extended to others, altogether apart from the interest of the consumer. The hon. gentleman has, in this question, done precisely what hon. gentlemen on that side have for a series of years. They have altogether overlooked the interests of the consuming population of this country, and have confined their attention exclusively to the interests of those who have been engaged in initiating these enterprises. The hon. gentleman tells us that the producers of sulphuric acid and of other things which enter into the production of these artificial fertilisers are the promoters of infant industries, and that it is necessary to extend to them now a protection which will not be necessary when they cease to be infant industries. It is a remarkable fact that, in this country as well as elsewhere, all the industries which are fostered as infant industries remain fostered whether they are infant industries or not; and, if the hon. gentleman should remain Finance Minister for a long time to come, I have no doubt that he would find at the end of his time the same necessity for the care of the Government being exercised over these infant industries as at the present day. The hon. gentleman has repeated here, as

Mr. FOSTER.

the Postmaster General did, an argument used by Mr. Mills in the first place, but misused by the hon. gentleman, and misused by his colleague—that such industries may be entitled or may require to receive from the Government consideration which, after they have been established, after the experiments have been performed, after the parties who are employed in them have acquired the necessary skill, they would not be entitled to claim. Well, the hon. gentleman has not shown that there is any special skill, that there is any long series of experiments, that there is any necessary knowledge to acquire here that has not been already acquired wherever these manufacturing industries have been carried on. The hon. gentleman has not taken the first step to satisfy the House that in this country, in order that these industries may be properly established by securing persons of the necessary skill in their employment, they should be supported in the way which the hon. gentleman mentions. I think that all the information the House has had before it on this question, and the information given by the press in relation to these manufacturing establishments, show that they are as competent to carry on, with due economy, industry and capital, these manufacturing works to-day as they will be in a quarter of a century hence, altogether apart from any further discovery or improvement which may be made in the appliances of the manufacture. These people have not to provide any new kind of machinery—that is, any new process of manufacturing the particular articles from which these fertilisers are obtained. They have all the necessary information to-day, as well as the results of what has been accomplished elsewhere, as if they had a quarter of a century for their experiments. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman overlooks altogether the interest of the farming population. In the interest of the manufacturers, he permits the raw material to be brought into the country free of duty; he permits the cotton manufacturer to import raw cotton free of duty; he permits the woollen manufacturer to import the wool free of duty; but he will not permit the farmer to have the same opportunities; he will not allow him to import what he requires, in order that he may obtain the largest return from the smallest expenditure of money. No; he imposes a protective tariff on the raw materials, which are necessary to the farmer for the production of his crop. The farmer's crop is a manufacture as far as the farmer is concerned. The fertilisers which he uses, the agricultural machinery and so on which he employs are the appliances by which that manufactured article is produced. And yet the hon. gentleman will not permit the farmer to have the same opportunities as he grants to other classes. He will not apply to the farmer the same policy which he applies to the manufacturer. He applies to the manufacturer a wholly different policy from that which he applies to the farmer, and, that being so, I say he is not consistent in his policy when he undertakes to impose on these articles duties which he would not impose if the same articles were being imported in the interest of the manufacturer. The hon. gentleman overlooks the fact that the farmer has something to learn, that he does not always adopt what is immediately best in his own interest, that it is in the interest of the Government not to put impediments in the way of the improvement of agricultural methods, that it is against the interests of the country that the Government should adopt such a policy. Yet, whenever the Government imposes a duty on anything which tends to make the farm more productive and more fertile, it must be aware that it is discouraging the use of fertilisers to that extent, and that in that manner it is injuring the advanced style of farming. Look at the number of persons who are engaged in agriculture in this country. Look at the amount of capital in real estate which is represented by the agriculturists of this country; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes,

in the interest of the smallest fractional part of the population, to put burdens on all the farmers and to put impediments in the way of improved agriculture in order that one or two manufacturing establishments should represent larger profits to their shareholders than they would otherwise do. The fair amount which they should derive is that which they would obtain by the sale of their products in a free market. If you, by the interference of the Government, increase the price which they have to pay, you take from those who consume the article some portion of that additional price, and you hand that over to those who never earned it. That is what the Government are doing to-day; and it is in the interest of agriculture, and in the interest of every man who sits either on this side or that, representing an agricultural constituency, to defend the people against any one who undertakes to do this, in the interest of a few men about whom we know nothing, who do not belong to this country, whose interests we are not specially concerned in promoting. If the Government and the supporters of the Government adopt a policy of that sort to increase the price of the production of these manufacturing establishments at the expense of the farming population, there is not a representative of a farming constituency in this House who supports that policy who will not be a marked man at the next election. The farming population are becoming awake to this. Their lands have been diminished in value, and they have been impoverished by the operation of this policy. Their farms have not increased in value in consequence of the policy which they accepted. In fact, there is no portion of the country with which I am acquainted in which farming lands have not diminished in value since the adoption of the National Policy. They have diminished in value during the past five years at least 30 per cent.—

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I challenge the hon. gentleman to appoint a committee and to bring before this House representatives of the various loan companies of this country, and I can establish to a demonstration the fact that agricultural lands during the past five years have diminished at least 30 per cent. in value. They have diminished in consequence of the policy which the Government has pursued, a policy that has been inimical to the interests of the agriculturists of this country, and it is of the first importance to the people of this country that these men should be unburdened so far as it is possible to unburden them. I see before me the Minister of Agriculture; the hon. gentleman knows well that what I state is a fact with regard to the value of real estate. Why, Sir, let him consult the Erie Company, let him consult the Dominion Loans and Saving Society, let him consult any one of the large loaning companies of the city in which he resides, he will receive but one answer from them, and that answer will be in accordance with the statement I have made. Then, I say, that being the case, it is of the first importance to the interests of the farming population that whatever enters into the consumption of the agriculturists should have the duty diminished. To take the duty off these fertilisers is the first step towards the relief of the farmer, and it will be the first step towards securing a better system of agriculture, and encouraging a better system of farming than has hitherto prevailed. And if we have those natural fertilisers in this country, and if they can be produced as cheaply as has been said, they do not require the interference of the Government in order to secure their protection. Capital will be attracted in that direction, capital will be invested in working these phosphate mines, and in the preparation of the material for the use of the farming population of this country. Men will devote their money to that which will pay best if they are let alone; all the Government has to do is to leave these parties alone, and they will invest their

money wisely, if the hon. gentleman is correct, it will be a wise investment. Let them manage their business economically, but let not the Government impose a burden upon the farming population in order that the manufacturers may reap a profit which they could not obtain otherwise on account of extravagant and improvident management.

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

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:55 p. m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 13th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Hawkesbury Lumber Company.—(Mr. Labrosse.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Dominion Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act to incorporate the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Brown.)

### OTTAWA AND MONTREAL BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. GIROUARD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Boom Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain that Bill?

Mr. GIROUARD. Certain gentlemen ask for power to purchase or acquire any wharves, piers, slides, dams, booms, or other improvements in the River Ottawa, from the Chaudière Falls to the north-western end of the Island of Montreal, and to construct any dam, slide, wharf, pier or other work necessary to facilitate the transmission and towing of rafts, timber, railway ties, cedars and sawlogs, down the Ottawa River, and to blast rocks, dredge, or remove, shoals or other impediments, or otherwise improve the navigation of the said river, upon payment of compensation to any individual injured thereby.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. RYKERT moved:

That the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888, the report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the same year, the statement of the Governor General's warrants issued and expenditure made on the same since last Session of Parliament, and a statement of the expenditure on account of miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses from 1st July, 1888, to 31st January, 1889, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

## SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that the hon. gentleman can make that motion. When the hon. gentleman read the Message from His Excellency the Governor General on the Estimates the other day, he did not give any notice that he would move the House into Committee, or that these Estimates should be referred to the Committee of Supply. Without such motion it is quite impossible for the hon. gentleman to now move that the House go into Committee of Supply. The hon. gentleman will see, on looking at *Hansard*, that no such motion was made.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I made that motion. I remember that it was agreed upon by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that there would be no objection to our going into Supply to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There would be no objection if the hon. gentleman had made the necessary motion, but he did not. I was giving special attention to the hon. gentlemen's statement at the time, and I heard no such motion made.

Mr. LAURIER. This question involves a point of procedure which should be at once settled. It must be admitted, as a matter of fact, that no such motion was made at the time, though it is entered in the Votes and Proceedings as having been made. I understand that the Clerk of the House entered the motion as having been made as a matter of course, taking it for granted that it was made. I do not know how far the Clerk will be justified, though I do not wish at all to censure him, in entering such motion. As a matter of fact it was not made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule is laid down in Mr. Bourinot's work as follows:—

"The answer to the Speech having been agreed to, a Minister of the Crown—always the Minister of Finance when he is present—will propose the two following resolutions in accordance with the Order of 1874: 'That the House will in future appoint the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means at the commencement of every Session.'

1. "That this House will on ..... next resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty;

2. "That this House will on ..... next resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

"Before the House goes actually into Committee of Supply, the Finance Minister will bring down the Estimates by Message from the Governor General, and when the Message has been read in English and French by Mr. Speaker, or by a clerk at the Table, the Minister will move 'that the said Message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.'

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find by the records of this House that, on Friday last,

"On motion of Mr. Foster, the said Message and Estimates were referred to the Committee of Supply."

This appears in the Votes and Proceedings, and, if any objection is taken, it should be taken the next day. The Votes and Proceedings are furnished to every member for the purpose of enabling him to make objections if he desires, and, if no objection is taken, the Votes and Proceedings of the preceding day are taken as being read and approved of. That is the usual practice, and it seems to me necessary to ask what object the hon. gentleman has in interrupting the proceedings in the manner he is doing. The hon. gentleman knows that the Clerk of the House, for the convenience of the House, prepares a series of motions which are intended to put the House in working order. I cannot recollect, myself, whether this particular motion was made or not, but I find here on the records that it was made, and I think the House will accept the report laid before it and not objected to at the time on the ground of inaccuracy.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) has no object in this matter other than to see that the law is perfectly observed, and for that, of course he must have an authority greater even than that of the Prime Minister himself. But the Clerk informs me that he has followed the practice who has been adopted for five years past; that the motion has never been made, but that it has been taken for granted that it has been made. That is a sign that the Government has been falling into very loose habits, and, if we have referred to this matter, it is not to interrupt the business, but to see that the law is properly carried out for all parties, including even the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to learn that the Opposition have been able to find one fault on the part of the Government, and I am sure the House will agree that it is a very small fault, if it be a fault at all. It was understood, however, that this was according to the ordinary rule, and that we would go on with the Committee of Supply to-day.

Mr. LAURIER. We are quite willing to go on to-day; but I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this point before we go into Committee of Supply. As we are following the English practice in this matter of going into Committee of Supply before the Budget Speech is delivered, we should also follow the English practice and go into such items only which are matters of administration, and leave all those items which entail principles or policy until after the Budget Speech has been delivered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Any very important item which does not immediately affect the administration of affairs will stand over, not of necessity, but as a matter of convenience, and because it is expedient that it should be so.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will admit that it would be very inconvenient, before the Budget Speech is delivered, to go into matters involving general policy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is quite true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My point of order was that the Rules of the House required this motion to be made first.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the point of order is withdrawn?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wants a decision, it places me in a very awkward position. I must take as correct the *proces verbal* which is laid before the House. It was laid before the House as early as yesterday, and the attention of the Speaker or of the House not having been called to this irregularity, I must take it that the *proces verbal* is correct. It is now alleged that the motion was not proposed or put, although entered by the clerk *pro forma*, as it has been done for four or five years past. I do not think it advisable to stop the proceedings of the House on this alleged irregularity. In the meantime I hope that this incident will be taken notice of, and that in future members will be more careful in following the strict rules laid down in the Rules and Orders of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of Management..... \$184,283 18

Mr. LAURIER. In the absence of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I would ask the Minister of Finance to allow this item to stand.

Governor General's Secretary's Office.....\$9,950

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this item, there is nothing but four statutory increases of \$50 each, making a total increase of \$200.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there any change in the staff of the office?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change in the staff.

Privy Council Office..... \$26,492 50

Mr. FOSTER. There is a decrease in this to the amount of \$100. There are eleven statutory increases at \$50, making \$550; one statutory increase at \$30; and a promotion provided for, making an increase of \$300, or, in all, \$880 in increases. The decreases are shown in the difference between Mr. McBride's salary and the vote of last year, making a difference of \$180, and the transfer of one messenger, making the total decreases \$980, or a net decrease of \$100.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose that is the effect of the change in the management of the finances of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. We will take it so.

Department of Justice..... \$20,707 50

Mr. FOSTER. In this item there is an increase of \$652.50—three statutory increases at \$50, \$150; one at \$37.50, a broken term; one at \$15, broken term; a promotion from first class to chief, that of Mr. Fraser, from \$1,650 to \$1,850; and one from the third to second class, Mr. Blakader, \$1,700, making in all the sum I stated. In the Penitentiaries Branch there is one statutory increase of \$50.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like some information in regard to the expenses under this item in connection with the suit with the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. I notice that a considerable amount has been spent upon that suit, and I would like to have some information on that point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has moved for a return on that subject. It is nearly prepared, and I suppose it will be down to-morrow. It has nothing whatever to do with the business of the department. It is outside litigation, not conducted by the department, and is placed in the hands of counsel.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot help remarking that we are getting to be a very litigious country. We are here charged with something over \$80,000 in legal fees and expenses. In the Province of Quebec we are called a litigious people because we are descendants of the Normans. We have the reputation in the Old Country of being fond of litigation; and, to my personal knowledge, I am satisfied we have not gone back upon the tradition of our ancestors. But I am afraid that spirit is becoming contagious, and is extending to other parts of the Dominion, because \$20,000 in one year for fees and legal expenses is certainly an enormous amount. I suppose the largest part of the money went into the pockets of the lawyers, and, therefore, being one, I cannot complain; but perhaps the ratepayers of this country will find that it would be advantageous to the country if somehow or other these expenses were curtailed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt there has been a good deal of litigation within the last few years in the conduct of the Government, arising mainly from the expropriations necessary for public works, and defending claims arising therefrom. The whole amount, however, has been saved seven times over by the defence of the single suit that has been mentioned, that of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to make one remark in relation to these legal expenses which the country has had

to pay. There is a litigious spirit growing up in the Department of Justice. In the good old days of Colonel Bernard we never had any appeals taken out of the highest courts of Canada and decided adversely to the Government. But in the present days I find the Government are not satisfied with judgments given by the highest court in Canada; and if the newspapers are to be believed, they do tell the truth sometimes.

Mr. LAURIER. The *Herald*, especially.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, it tells more truth than some people like. But what I would observe is this: that there is a tendency to appeal almost everything after the courts have decided against the Administration of the day. Now, it strikes me that the people's money should not be used to test the people's rights after the highest court in the land has decided that the individual should get his money. I simply call attention now to the growing tendency. It grew under the deputy-headship of Mr. Lash; it had been growing under the deputy-headship of Mr. Burbridge; and I am very much afraid it is not going to fall off in its character for litigation under the present deputy-head. They are all clever men; I do not pretend to speak in the slightest manner disrespectfully of them, but it seems that a policy of litigation is pervading the department which I think is unfair to the people of the country. I think an individual bringing a case against the Government, or if the Government brings an action, and parties have been put to a great expense—as in a case that I could name, if necessary—and to a great deal of delay, I think, when the highest courts in the country, like the Supreme Court, has decided in favor of the people, that it is a gross injustice to the people—except in case of fraud—for the Government to resist. I think the individual should get his money without any further litigation, because, when it is carried to the Privy Council, when the country is put to an enormous expense, the Government is found to be fighting the people with the very money of the people themselves. Now, there is another feature about this. I do not know whether any hon. gentleman referred, while I was out, to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. It appears to me there is a case that the Government ought not to have taken up, of which they ought not to pay the expenses, and that in a case like that we should let the litigants fight it out themselves.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the past year, I may explain that only one case has been taken to appeal by the Government from the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada—that is the case which the hon. gentleman mentioned—and the appeal has resulted in establishing the right of Canada to be recouped a sum of money at least seven times as large as the cost of the whole litigation of the year.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that the case to which I referred was one that I saw mentioned the other day in the papers, a case in which a claim has been made against the Government for years past. The hon. gentleman will have it in his mind's eye; I do not care to name it here—although I can name it, if required—but in that case I know, for a certain fact—it was a case arising out of the Intercolonial Railway affairs—Mr. Frank Shanly was appointed arbitrator, and he decided against the Government. The Government refused to pay it, as they refused to pay a great many other cases, under similar circumstances. Then the person, after some years, got a fiat, and within the last two or three months, the Supreme Court of Canada—Mr. Justice Fournier, I believe, was the judge—decided against the Government, and gave the litigant a verdict of \$120,000. Now the papers say that that case also is going to be appealed. I do not know that it is different from any other case, but

unless there is some grave injustice in it, I do think that, as a matter of principle, the money of the people ought not to be used to litigate individual claims that are made against the Government when the courts of the country have decided against the Administration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, if I am right in understanding his reference, has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. It came before one judge sitting as an Exchequer Judge; there has been an appeal from him to the Supreme Court itself. The appeal has been taken not only because the amount involved was a very large one, but because it depended entirely upon the construction of a statute; it was a question of law, and it involves not merely the sum in litigation in that suit, but millions besides. In a matter like that I think I am bound to advise the Government, as I would a private suitor, to appeal, if the Government has a fair prospect of success and large amounts depend upon the litigation. We have decided to test the question in the highest court in the country, before submitting to the decision.

Mr. MITCHELL. I take exception to the illustration that the hon. gentleman has given. He says that he would feel bound to advise the Government in the same way that he would advise a private suitor. Now, there is a distinction between the two. In a matter in which the Government is involved the Government are fighting individuals with the people's money which they contribute in taxes; but in the case of a private suitor he can take any course he likes, as he has to risk his own money, and that is the distinction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We use the money of the people simply to defend the people's rights.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not fully comprehend the answer to the objection raised by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). It is understood that any party who has a case against the Government is placed at a great disadvantage. In the first place, he has to obtain the consent of the Government to the appeal being taken. In the next place, when the case is adjudicated upon by the first tribunal, it is very often taken by the Government to the Supreme Court. The hon. gentleman said that only one appeal was taken to the Supreme Court. That may be true, but I believe there have been several appeals taken, not only last year but in several years previously, from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court. In nine cases out of ten, almost invariably, the Government have not been successful, and the awards granted by the Exchequer Court have been maintained. It seems to me that when a suitor has the misfortune to be compelled to go to law with the Government, when he has had to undergo the ordeal of obtaining from the Government the right to proceed, and when the court of first instance has decided in his favor, unless there is a clear and manifest error, no appeal should be taken; in fact, if there is only an error which can be waived, *pro* and *con*, as to whether the decision should be maintained or reversed, there should not be an appeal from the decision of the court, and if the decision is in favor of the litigant it should be acquiesced in by the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no ordeal undergone by any citizen in obtaining a petition of right. He has simply to file his petition, stating the cause of action, and, if he is entitled to a *fiat*, according to principles perfectly well recognised and established in all parts of the Empire, he gets his *fiat* as a debt of justice from the Crown to him; it has never been refused, and there has never been any difficulty in getting it unless it has been in consequence of some previous litigation in which the party's right has already been exhausted. As regards appeals from the Exchequer Judge, the hon. gentleman is entirely misinformed, if he is informed that

Mr. MITCHELL.

almost invariably the decisions of the Exchequer Judge have been affirmed on appeal;—more especially during last year, in regard to which I suppose this discussion is taking place. In a number of the cases the appeals have been successful, and I say it without any disrespect whatever to the gentleman now exercising the functions of Exchequer Judge, or to any one who exercised them in times past. Error is a thing of which any human being may be capable, no matter how high his skill or how eminent his attainments in his profession. As regards what the hon. gentleman said with respect to cases nicely balanced, and where the decision may be one way or the other, I may say that in such cases we generally advise against appeal; but to limit appeals solely to cases of manifest error would be impossible, because it would be presumptuous in us to say that a manifest error existed after trial by a tribunal such as the Exchequer Court, and judgment there given. We exercise in that regard precisely the same judgment that a private counsel would do in considering the interests of his suitor.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is where you do wrong, I think.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to learn that no ordeal has now to be passed through by a suitor in seeking his *fiat*. It was not so in former times, for, to my personal knowledge, a party would be kept waiting six or seven months in order to get it. I am glad to hear that such is not the case now.

Mr. McMULLEN. This item of law costs is annually increasing. I have been watching it ever since I took my seat in the House, and it is quite evident that the lawyers are exercising too much influence on the Minister of Justice, and that, whenever there is a little matter of litigation to be attended to in the interests of the country, the lawyers of that particular section exercise influence in order to get a job and then charge an enormous fee. It is time a stop was put to this state of things. It is not in the interest of the country that every law firm should look upon itself as a barnacle on the State, prepared to suck what advantage it can out of the people and draw upon the resources of the country from time to time for payment for legal services. In looking over the list of legal expenses I notice that there are sixteen law firms which drew last year \$58,438, or equal to \$3,666 each. I cannot believe that litigation to such an extent is necessary in the interest of the country, or that the Minister of Justice is so overcrowded with his duties as to make it necessary to employ sixteen law firms at a cost of nearly \$60,000 a year. Last year the situation was not quite so bad; the year before it was not so bad as last year; this year is the worst yet. Then I notice that there were employed 179 other law firms, throughout the country, to do petty work, for which they drew sums from \$2,000 down. Altogether, the country paid \$83,000 for law expenses. If the Minister of Justice and the Government were disposed to consider the interests of the people, they would be satisfied that we have reached a time in our history when it devolves upon us to cut these items down seriously. I hope we will not have any more such cases as that of the St. Catharines Milling Co., or any more such quarrels to fight. We are tired of that kind of thing. It has been hanging on our hands for three or four years, and a very large sum has been paid under that head. I am glad to know we have reached the last court; if there was another court of appeal open it would, no doubt, be taken there, but we have reached the summit and can go no further. Let us hope this item will now be dropped from our annual report. I earnestly hope, too, the Government will quit the present system. It is absurd to have sixteen law firms drawing nearly \$60,000 and 179 other small firms drawing the balance of the \$83,000. I am not a lawyer, but I begin to think that the lawyers on the other side of the House are exercising altogether too much influence on the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are infant industries.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they are infant industries, they are growing up very rapidly, and last year assumed vast proportions.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are young lawyers.

Mr. McMULLEN. No doubt; we are paying very highly for brains employed, perhaps far more than would be paid under ordinary circumstances. But, joking aside, this has become a very serious matter, and it is the duty of every hon. member to set his face against the influence exercised by lawyers on the Government to obtain suits, and I hope, if hon. members on this side of the House get into power, they will put a stop to the practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not exactly agree with the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who censured the Deputy Minister of Justice for these very large and increasing expenses. My opinion is that the responsibility rests elsewhere. The Minister of Justice has referred to the justification for the suit against the Province of Ontario, incidentally raised in the St. Catharines Milling Co.'s case, and the hon. gentleman said they were amply justified in the appeal because they are entitled to be recouped by the Province for the moneys expended in connection with the treaties made within the limits of the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman made one important admission when he gave utterance to that statement, namely, that the Province of Ontario, as represented by its Government, always expressed willingness to pay that sum. In every instance when the question was before the courts, the Province of Ontario informed hon. gentlemen opposite, or their counsel, that they were not disposed to dispute the right of the Dominion to compensation for the moneys expended in extinguishment of the Indian title. But that is not the question. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, is the gentleman who is primarily responsible for all the expenses which arise in connection with that case. The hon. gentleman, in 1882, I think it was, informed the people of York, and informed the people of the city of Toronto, that there was not one pound of mineral, there was not a stick of timber, there was not a lump of earth north of the watershed that did not belong to the Dominion of Canada, and that it was not the property of Ontario. If the hon. gentleman had always entertained that view there might have been some justification for the position taken by him; but, Sir, at the time that British Columbia was admitted into this Union, the question as to the right of property in the soil, whether it was in the Crown or whether it was in the Indian's in occupation, was raised, and the hon. the First Minister, who was then responsible for the negotiations with British Columbia, recognised the right of the Province of British Columbia to the soil. He recognised the fact that the property in the soil was in the Crown and not in the Indian occupants, and he dealt with the Province of British Columbia upon that assumption. Now, the hon. gentleman sold the right to cut timber over a very large area, and for a very small sum of money, to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. The Province of Ontario enjoined the Milling Co. from cutting this timber, and the company, rightfully I think, under these circumstances, called upon this Government to defend the title which they had given. The Government did defend the title, and they did not only defend that title before the Chancellor of the Province of Ontario, but before the Court of Appeals there, before the Supreme Court, and before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. In every instance judgment was given against this Government. I suppose that the Minister of Justice looked into this matter and that he formed an opinion upon the subject. I dare say he knew what the Indian title was in the Province of Nova

Scotia, and he knew that the Indian title would be in every Province precisely the same character. We all recognise the Minister of Justice as an able lawyer, and as one who is thoroughly conversant with the law of the country and the principles of jurisprudence, and as one not likely to make a mistake in forming an opinion. I am inclined to think that if the Minister of Justice would deal frankly with us in the committee here, and tell us the conclusions at which he arrived, that we would discover that the Minister of Justice himself was not individually responsible for those appeals, but that he was overborne and governed in the matter by his chief, the First Minister, who insisted upon the Province of Ontario being fought in every court before which it was possible to put this claim in issue. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman has referred to a case in which he says they have been recouped, or will be recouped in consequence of the judgment that was given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman will see that there are a number of other items in connection with these legal expenses which it is important that we should have explained. For instance, here we find Mr. Ferguson, during the past year, receiving upwards of \$3,000. I am not aware that there were any important matters in litigation which Mr. Ferguson was called upon to conduct on behalf of the department. Was Mr. Ferguson engaged in doing work that properly falls upon the Law Clerk and upon the clerks of the department or the Deputy Minister of Justice? The hon. gentleman can tell us what Mr. Ferguson has done for this sum of money. Then, again, we find that D. O'Connor has received nearly \$19,000 for law expenses. What important services has Mr. D. O'Connor, or his firm, rendered to the Government and to the people of this country for this large sum of money which he has received? I think, Sir, in looking over these legal expenses, we will find that there are many large items that require explanation. As regards the item for the case of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co., we understand that. The question has been discussed before the House and the country, and it has been discussed in the newspapers, but that large sum of money which has been paid Mr. O'Connor has not yet been explained. The large sum of money paid Mr. Ferguson has not been explained; and the very large sum of money that was paid to the partner of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not been explained. We find that Mr. Wallace Graham has received, during the past year, \$7,360 odd. I think, looking at the relation which that hon. gentleman stands to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that we are entitled to a very full explanation for this expenditure. We are entitled to know what important services he has rendered the country for those moneys. Is this expenditure in connection with that unfortunate American vessel that was tied up so long for violation of our fishery regulations and which was not judicially dealt with, I think, up to the time that we parted here last Session. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice, will be able to tell us about this matter, and what the hon. gentleman cannot say upon the subject I am sure the Minister of Finance can. Really, when we look, Mr. Chairman, at these legal expenses one will see how gigantic the character of the Department of Justice has become. Why ought not a number of those gentlemen be taken into the Department of Justice. If the Department of Justice were really discharging the duty that pertains to it in the same way as every other department of the Government does, instead of letting out by contract those professional duties, what would be the character of that department? The hon. the Minister of Justice knows that he cannot defend his department on the floor of this House, even though it be constituted as it is through the agency of the Franchise and the Gerrymander Acts. I say that the committee is entitled to full explanation from the Minister of

Justice with reference to each of those large items that are found in the report of the Auditor General.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) does not expect me to follow him in the attack which he has made, from a political point of view, or to answer his criticisms in this respect. He does not expect that I should quite agree with him in the observations of that character which he has made, and I shall only attempt to answer him in so far as the business of the vote is concerned, and in regard to the observations he has made in reference to the expenses. The hon. gentleman has again alluded to the case of the St. Catharines Lumber and Milling Co. for the purpose of telling the House that the Government had not the justification for appealing to the Privy Council which I thought it had, because the Ontario Government had signified its willingness to refund the amounts which the decision of the Privy Council decided the Government of Canada were to have. I can only say to the hon. gentleman, without disparagement to the sources of his information, that there is no such information in the possession of the Government or of any of its members. I have heard to-day for the first time, the statement that the Ontario Government was ever willing to repay the Government of Canada a dollar of the money paid in relation to the expenditure to which he referred. The hon. gentleman has desired that I should state frankly whether I had formed an opinion as to the probable result of this litigation, and state to the House what that opinion was. He has been good enough to intimate that I might be guided by my knowledge of the Indian title in Nova Scotia—my own Province. I did not require any such source of information as that to induce me to make up my mind that an appeal to the Privy Council was an expedient course, because I found that two of the most eminent judges on the bench of the Supreme Court decided that question, as far as they were able to decide it, in favor of the view put forward on behalf of the Federal Government. This was decided by two judges, more eminent than whom do not exist in this country, and who come from the Province of Ontario themselves. The hon. gentleman will, I am sure, acquit me of any want of candor as to expressing an opinion formed on the state of the Indian title in Nova Scotia, which never existed, when I had such eminent authority as to what the law of Ontario was, and it was the law of Ontario that was under consideration. I submit to the hon. gentleman, that while I am perfectly willing to give him at all times, as regards any matter in my department, the fullest information in my power, it would be unreasonable for him, in the discussion of the vote for Civil Government to ask me to go into an explanation of the thousands of items which appear in connection with the litigation of the various departments of the Government and which are very incidentally only under my control. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the other day, in relation to the account of Mr. O'Connor, moved for a return, and with perfect propriety he stated afterwards that it was inexpedient to press the motion because he would have an opportunity in the Public Accounts Committee to make a fuller investigation than he would get by a return. For this reason I laid aside the preparation of any memorandum upon that subject. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also, what the practice is as regards the employment of counsel, for they both seem to think that counsel are employed under pressure from themselves, either as professional men or political friends. Such is not the case. I have no communication whatever from professional men as to any litigation which is likely to take place on behalf of the Government. The information that litigation is desirable, or that defence is desirable, comes from the departments immediately concerned, and all that devolves

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

upon me is the task of taking the instructions from the department as I would from a client, and instructing our agent in the Province where the litigation takes place, and entrusting the case to him under such supervision as is possible at headquarters. I do not remember the items of Mr. Ferguson's account. I do not remember the services which he rendered, excepting services in connection with a protracted arbitration which took place for the purpose of settling the amount which should be paid for the expropriation of several pieces of property for the Experimental Farm. If the hon. gentleman desires to know the other items, they will be laid before him as soon as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. While there may, perhaps, be some reasonable ground for employing persons to attend to litigation at a distance from Ottawa, I cannot see how the Minister of Justice can justify the expenditure of such a large amount of money as has been expended in Ottawa itself. If the hon. Minister, with the aid of his deputy-head and other officers in the department, attended to these duties in Ottawa, and relieved the country of the enormous expenses that have been incurred during the last year, we might reasonably expect that some little expenses would be incurred at distant points where the hon. Minister or his assistants could not conveniently attend. But we find that here, in the city of Ottawa, right under the nose of the Minister, the firm of O'Connor & Hogg drew \$18,800 for legal expenses—\$60 a day. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice himself does not draw \$60 a day for the eminent services he renders to the country. If it is necessary for the Minister of Justice to increase his staff, the country would certainly save money by employing a lawyer with as much legal ability as Mr. O'Connor for less than \$60 a day. We have not only paid Mr. O'Connor that amount, but other firms in the city of Ottawa—Mr. Ferguson, Pinhey & Christie, and several others—have been employed and paid large amounts. If the Minister of Justice finds that the duties devolving upon his department in the city of Ottawa are so large that he or any of his assistants cannot attend to them, let him increase his staff, and save the country a great deal of this money. With regard to the suit of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co., very large fees have been paid out in connection with that suit. The objectionable feature of it is not altogether that it was defended by the Dominion, and that large law fees have been paid out to lawyers outside of the Department of Justice, but the fact, which I think will not be denied, that an hon. gentleman who occupies a distinguished position on the other side of this House has been drawing, no doubt through his firm, large fees in connection with this suit. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) may be, I have no doubt he is, a very eminent lawyer, but I say it is decidedly objectionable that a man occupying that position should be allowed to use the influence which it affords him to draw from this Dominion enormous fees for litigation services. I think it should not be permitted; I think the people of this country are not prepared to endorse a course of this kind. I hope the discussion which has taken place at this time will have a beneficial effect. If the Minister of Justice feels that the duties devolving upon his department in the city of Ottawa are so enormous that he has to parcel the work out among the legal firms of this city, he will have any number of law firms in this city. When the Conservative friends of hon. gentlemen opposite see these accounts in the Auditor General's Report, they will say that Ottawa is a good place to come to and open a law office in; the hon. gentleman will have them hanging around the department like leeches, and the fees will continue to increase year by year. I think there should be a stop to this thing. I think the Minister of Justice, if left to himself, would stop it, but I think the influences exercised to get the work for these law firms are perhaps too much for him. But this course will cause considerable trouble in the future if it is persisted in.

Mr. CASEY. The explanations of the hon. Minister of Justice, I think, will prove rather astonishing to the larger portion of the public; I mean his explanations as to his duties as Minister of Justice. It has been generally understood that he stood in the position of legal adviser to every department in the Government, and to the Government as a whole in regard to all legal action they might take, and that he had supreme control of the management of all litigation directly conducted on behalf of the Government. Now, his statement is different from that. He says that in regard to official litigation, he is not in direct communication with the lawyers employed to conduct the suits; that he is merely advised by this or that department that certain litigation is necessary on its behalf, and he takes instructions from that department as he would from any private client, and in turn instructs the provincial agents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is entirely different in every particular.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend hazards the statement that his explanation is entirely different in every particular as I have given it, from the one he has already made. I will leave that question to be decided by reference to *Hansard* to-morrow, and I think it will be found that what I have said expresses, though perhaps in different words, exactly the hon. gentleman's statement. I remember perfectly, the hon. gentleman said he was advised by the department whether litigation was required or not, and that he in turn advised the provincial agents as to the conduct of the suit, and that he had no personal communication with the lawyers who actually conducted the case. I am positive that that is the statement conveyed by the hon. gentleman's remarks. Everyone has hitherto supposed that when litigation was proposed to any department, that department must first consult the Minister of Justice as to whether it was judicious and proper to take action, as to whether it would pay to go into litigation or not; and everyone supposed that the hon. Minister would go over the case with the head of the department in question and come to a decision. That is what was always supposed to be his duty. Now, if the hon. gentleman's interpretation of his duties as Minister of Justice be applied to other Ministers, let us see how it would work. If the Minister of Public Works was to say: I merely act as the mouth-piece of other departments, and when any department says they want something done I give instructions to have an item put in the Estimates for that work, without consulting whether we can afford it or not; if the Minister of Finance said he merely responded to the calls of the other departments without considering the *pros* and *cons* of each proposal, such a system would soon lead to a state of chaos. We certainly must think it very strange that the Minister of Justice should assert he is merely a solicitor to instruct some lawyer who actually conducts the case. Our understanding of his duties and rights is different, and the hon. gentleman will be held responsible for any litigation unwisely entered into, for any costs unnecessarily incurred, and for any distribution of patronage in connection with litigation that seems to us to be contrary to public interest or contrary to the Act concerning the Independence of Parliament. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. McMullen) has already called attention to the peculiar position of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is at the same time a member of this House supporting the Government, and a lawyer employed under the directions of the Minister of Justice—or rather not employed under the direction of the Minister of Justice, but employed by a company whose legal expenses in this matter are borne by the Government. It is in the hands of Mr. McCarthy, the lawyer—I am not speaking of him now as the member of Parliament—to dictate what steps shall be taken and what costs shall be incurred in connection with the suit.

The Dominion Government is obliged to pay whatever costs Mr. McCarthy the lawyer incurs, to Mr. McCarthy the member of Parliament and his firm. This places that hon. gentleman in a peculiar position. I do not mean to insinuate anything against his character, but I say his position as a member of this House would be improved if he were not connected with Government patronage, if he had not a double who is a member of a law firm which is paid so heavily by the Government. The firm of Mr. McCarthy the lawyer does not appear in this list, but the entries are made against the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co., under the head of legal expenses and taxed costs. I do not see the object, except to leave out the name of the hon. gentleman, because no legal expenses can be paid to a company which is not composed of lawyers; and it would be better to enter the name of the lawyer who conducted the case for them as the recipient of those legal expenses. Another gentleman's name appears here, Mr. Graham, of Halifax, who is also so nearly connected with an hon. member of this House, being the law partner of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that we can hardly suppose that political considerations were not taken into account in appointing him as Government lawyer in these cases. All these matters of patronage justly come up for consideration under this head. I quite agree with the hon. the Minister that he could not be fairly called upon to give all the details of the legal expenditure under the head of the present discussion, but his exercise of patronage in retaining this or that lawyer or in instituting suits does, I contend, come up under the head of Civil Government. I think the hon. gentleman's explanations have been in the highest degree unsatisfactory to the House, and will be so to the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman must have very much misunderstood what I said, or I must have been very unfortunate in expressing myself, if I gave him to understand at all that I was not bound to exercise my judgment upon matters of litigation which pass through my hands.

Mr. CASEY. That is the impression I had.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not intend to give the hon. gentleman to understand that I was only a medium of communication. I was distinguishing between taking instructions from a department as I would from a client, and taking instructions, as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has put it, from professional men. In taking instructions from the departments, I mean instructions with reference to the facts of the cases which come before us. True, in every matter that passes through my department I am bound to exercise judgment, and give the other department advice as to the propriety of litigation before giving instructions. As regards the observations made with reference to Mr. O'Connor's account, as I said before, I think the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will have more light on that subject when he has the account in detail, and I would have been happy to give it to him if he had not dispensed with its production. But he will find it includes services in other places besides Ottawa, and, besides very considerable amounts for disbursements which Mr. O'Connor had incurred, and his reward for professional services is nothing like the sum the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The hon. gentleman is mistaken also as to the number of firms employed. He has been misled in that particular by taking it for granted that all the names of firms which appear in the Auditor General's Report are firms employed by the Department of Justice. In many cases they are firms employed by private clients against the Crown. For instance, an expropriation of land for a public work takes place in a distant part of Canada, and the Department of Railways and Canals, or whatever department may be concerned, is advised by its valuers on the spot as to the amount which should be tendered as



compensation for the property. A tender is made and refused. Litigation results, necessarily, either before the arbitrators as referees or before the Exchequer Court, or perhaps before the court on appeal; and if the amount is increased to any considerable extent, the costs of both sides are paid by the Crown, and such charges appearing in the Auditor General's Report, have been mistaken for items of expenditure by the department in the exercise of patronage. That accounts for the number of firms to which the hon. gentleman has called attention. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken as to the nature of the duties which devolve on the department and the extent of those duties when he supposes that either the Minister or the Deputy Minister can undertake to manage the litigation which takes place even in the city of Ottawa. To do that would employ the whole time of the Minister and his deputy, and they would be fortunate if they were able to accomplish that work, even by expending their whole time upon it. In any case, that would involve an entire neglect of the duties required to be performed for Parliament, of the necessary attendance at Council, and of the necessary discharge of the duties of the department and the advice which has to be given to other departments. As to my conducting litigation, I will submit to be put in the wrong if any member of the House will investigate the duties I have to perform, and will then say that I have time to attend to litigation as well; but I think that I discharge, and that my deputy discharges, the duties of the department by the expenditure of all the time that any two men can give to them; and the work done outside must necessarily be given, as it always has been given, to others, even when the work of the department was not more than one-fifth of what it is to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. The explanation which the Minister has given shows very clearly the way in which the \$32,000 has been spent. It is quite clear that the Department of Justice is not referred to in regard to all matters of litigation, but that the several departments carry on their own expenditure in connection with litigation, and then the Department of Justice is supposed to account to the House and the country for the expenditure of this money. I do not think it is right that the Minister of Justice should be held directly responsible for all these items, if they are expended by the different departments. The Minister of the department should be prepared to offer explanations as to the grounds on which he felt it necessary to expend that money. The Minister of Justice, however, appears to assume the responsibility, and we ask for the information from him as the head of the Department of Justice, and we are entitled to that information. Now, the hon. gentleman evades the point and does not give us the information asked, on the ground that he does not superintend the expenditure of all the items, but that the different heads of departments expend money for litigation where they find it necessary, and then it is all presented to us under the head of the Department of Justice. With regard to this item in connection with D. O'Connor of Ottawa, I cannot but affirm, as I have already stated, that, if litigation is to be conducted from year to year and it is necessary to have men to discharge the duties of counsel in the interests of the Dominion, it would be better to extend the Department of Justice and to secure the best services that can be possibly had in the Dominion, and to pay the men so employed a respectable salary. We would save money by the adoption of that course, because I do not believe there is any other firm in this Dominion, or any man in the legal profession except the most eminent counsel that we have—and I have never heard that Mr. O'Connor was an eminent counsel—who has an income of \$19,000 a year in one line and from one client. The Minister says I am mistaken as to the number of firms employed by the

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Minister of Justice, which I have shown by the Auditor General's account. We cannot come to any other conclusion than that which I have stated, from the manner in which the statement is brought before us. I must still insist that there should be a method adopted by which a very large amount of this money could be saved. I think, if the Government would alter the system entirely and have all the duties that can possibly be performed in Ottawa discharged by the department here, even if it is necessary to increase the staff, it would be very much better. I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that the duties devolving upon him in his position are very onerous and require all his time, without his undertaking any duties outside. At the same time, he has a number of assistants, and if necessary they could be added to so that the duties required in the city of Ottawa could be discharged by himself and his subs; and, if any were required outside of Ottawa in places which his assistants could not reach, the bills should be subjected to rigid taxation: and that is all we should be asked to pay.

Justice Department, Penitentiaries Branch..... \$6,200

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should like to ask how much expense was incurred by the Department of Justice for law costs in reference to the protection of fisheries. I see that a very large sum was paid to the gentleman who represents the Minister of Justice in Halifax, and I presume it must have been largely in connection with the services which he rendered in regard to the fisheries, because the amount paid to him is disproportionately large as compared to that which was paid to the representative of the Minister in New Brunswick.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not prepared to state the amount at this moment. No doubt there was some expense in connection with the fisheries in Mr. Graham's account, but that does not amount to a very large sum, because in the detail he will see that the total amount for legal expenses in reference to the fisheries is only \$3,831. A large part, no doubt, of Mr. Graham's account is in reference to the extension of the railway in Cape Breton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that \$3,831 mean all the legal expenses in connection with the seizures of vessels during the year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All payments made, certainly. There may be others which have not been paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There may be a large amount outstanding, as far as the Minister knows?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not a large amount. It would be a very inconsiderable amount, but I cannot say at present how much.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister cannot say how much was incurred in reference to the detention of the *David J Adams*, which was subsequently released?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say how much that came to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps before getting through Supply the hon. gentleman will tell me.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Department of Militia..... \$42,500

Mr. FOSTER In this there is a net decrease of \$100. The increases are occasioned by nine statutory increases at \$50, two new clerks at \$1,000, the promotion of two third class clerks, and one second class, making in all \$2,750. The decreases are made by a difference between the salary estimated to be paid for a third class clerk, \$150; the difference in the salary of a second class clerk, \$300; and a chief clerk off, \$2,400; making \$2,850, or a net decrease of \$100.

Mr. McMULLEN. We desire to present our sincere congratulations to the hon. gentleman for having reached a turning point in this department. There have been enormous increases in the past, and now we are happy to learn that the pruning knife has been applied to the extent of \$100.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister will explain to us the very large item for travelling expenses which I see charged here, between \$1,400 and \$1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that we discuss these items under their appropriate heads. We are now dealing simply with salaries; we will come afterwards to deal with contingencies, and the hon. gentleman will have full opportunity at that time.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a new appointment I see here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The new appointment is that of Mr. Ardouin, who has been transferred from the Department of the Interior to my department. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the work of the department has increased very largely for the last eight or nine years, and from the report of the deputy and the heads of the various branches, it was considered indispensable to increase the staff by the appointment of one extra clerk. However, I am glad to say that that increase was made without increasing the total for salaries—indeed it was made with a decrease of \$100, in so far as the general estimate is concerned.

Mr. LAURIER. There can be no great fault found when you increase the staff by diminishing the expenses. But I am astonished to know, and to know for the first time, that the work of the department has been increasing very much of late. I hope we are not following in the track of Germany and Russia, and the continental powers, who are always adding to their army; I hope we are keeping our army on a peace footing. I am astonished that the work can have so much increased.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully concur in the hon. gentleman's peaceful disposition. I know that, as a rule, he is not anxious to embroil himself in a foreign war. The increase in the department has not been caused at all, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, by the peace footing of the Canadian army having been enlarged; and if the hon. gentleman had given a little of his valuable attention to matters connected with the Department of Militia, he might have known that whereas eight years ago there were only two permanent corps in the whole Dominion of Canada, today we have in the various Provinces: Infantry Schools, a Cavalry School, a Mounted Infantry Corps, each of which, *quoad* the work of the department, take as much time as a full regiment would do in the regular army. The correspondence, the clothing, looking after the discipline of the corps, involve a great deal of hard work. The hon. gentleman must consider that whereas we had at one time only "A" and "B" Batteries, numbering about 300 men, we have today 1,150 composing the permanent corps. Now, in various other ways the work of the department has greatly increased. A portion of the repairs which were carried out by the department so ably presided over by my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, have been transferred to the Department of Militia; and I think, if the hon. gentleman will look into the matter, he will agree with his friend behind him in congratulating the Minister of Militia in having been able to carry out those reforms without increasing the expense.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, the Canadian army at present numbers 1,150 men.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, the permanent corps.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, the peace of Europe will not be disturbed by that. But I am surprised that it requires

such a large amount of money as is here asked for from the Canadian taxpayers to maintain an army of 1,150 men only. It is a warning to us to keep as far as we can from building up a standing army, and I hope my hon. friend, as long as he remains at the head of the department, will see that the army is not increased beyond its present number.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose that the increase of work arises from the fact that the battery in British Columbia, composed, at one time, of Sergeant Kinsella and one man, has now its full complement of men, and therefore the services of an extra chief clerk is necessary to correspond with the battery. I would like to ask one question about this chief clerk. What was his rank in the department from which he came?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend calls my attention to the fact that the question put by the hon. gentleman across the floor was in reference to a chief clerk. I understood that it was a second class clerk. I explained by saying that Mr. Ardouin had been transferred from the Department of the Interior to my department. The chief clerk who is now created, is Mr. Sulte, who has been made chief clerk in lieu of Mr. Wright, whom it is contemplated to superannuate. Mr. Sulte will take the position which Mr. Wright now occupies in the military branch of the department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not quite see that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Militia Department is entitled to the credit which he takes to himself for increasing the standing army of this country from 300 men to 1,150. I do not see the necessity for that. I think we ought not to encourage the establishment of a standing army—for it is a standing army. I can understand encouraging volunteer corps throughout the country, and giving them every aid and assistance. It is said that my hon. friend does not give them the aid and assistance which they claim they are entitled to; I know nothing about the merits of these complaints. But I do protest against a standing army in this country. The hon. gentleman, in eight years, has increased it from 300 to 1,150, and if he goes on in the same ratio, increasing it in the future, we shall be in the position described by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in which to-day we see Germany, Austria, Italy and France—a world in arms. Does he propose to do the same thing on this side of the Atlantic?

Mr. CASEY. It is an infant industry as yet.

Mr. MITCHELL. Seriously speaking, I wish to protest against this increase of a standing army. We do not need it. We ought to give every encouragement to the volunteers, give them every aid and keep up their skeleton organisations, or their practical organisations—whatever you like to call them—but I protest against the increase of a standing army in this country; I protest against a standing army at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should like to ask the Minister how many appointments have been made to the Imperial service from our Military school?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Imperial Government give four commissions to the successful candidates; those who obtain the highest number of points receive commissions in the different branches of the Imperial service. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know the number of those who have accepted commissions in the Imperial service, I shall have to refer to the records of the department to give him that information, but I can do so at any time when the hon. gentleman wishes to have it.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the number of commissions allotted by the Imperial Government only four? Has it been reduced from that of former years?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have the appointments been made strictly upon the conditions named by the Imperial Government, as rewards of merit given to the candidates having the highest number of marks?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; altogether. The commissions are given after the examinations are passed. The commandant of the Military College makes his recommendation, and the names are sent to the Imperial Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's statement is not in accord with the information I have received and with representations made to me, which are that the appointments have not been made with regard to merit at all but with regard to favoritism. I should like the hon. Minister to submit to this House, for its information, the standing of the various parties who have been appointed, as compared with the standing of other parties who have been passed over. I understand that those who would be entitled by merit to appointment have not received appointment, and that the hon. gentleman has recommended for commissions those who were barely able to pass their examinations; that those who stood at the very bottom of the lists in the examinations are among those who have received commissions, while those who were entitled to them from the manner in which they passed their examinations, have not received them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I saw the statement. I can tell the hon. gentleman that those commissions have been given absolutely according to merit. In no way as Minister of Militia can I interfere in the granting of those commissions. I am prepared to bring down, if the hon. gentleman wishes it, the report of the commandant of the Royal Military College upon whose recommendation every commission was given, and, I repeat, I never interfered in any case.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. Minister should not wait for any expression or desire on the part of the House to be made before bringing down the reports referred to. An impression has gone abroad, although of course it may have been erroneous, and I hope it was, that there has been favoritism, and that favoritism and not merit formed the basis for the appointments. I hope that impression is wrong, and the hon. Minister would do himself justice by bringing down all the information in his possession with regard to these appointments.

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest that the Minister bring down a list of those who have been appointed, showing whether they have been graduates or not, because it has been asserted that some were not graduates—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some were not.

Mr. CASEY—and their position in the classes, in whatever year they were.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. I understand that the four cadets passing the highest examination are entitled to receive the Imperial Government's commissions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Suppose they do not accept the positions, are there still four cadets appointed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. The next highest take the commissions?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. There was one year when there were more than four appointed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. One year, just about the breaking out of the Soudan war, or shortly afterwards, the  
Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Imperial Government, requiring a larger number of officers than they had at their disposal at that particular moment, gave us six more commissions, or ten—I am speaking merely from memory and I am certain of six and think there were ten more—and asked us to recommend some men, not men who were graduated, but men who had been in the Royal Military College. In that case I followed the same rule in so far as the cadets were concerned. I asked the commandant of the Royal Military College to make out his list, according to what he considered to be the merits of those cadets. It was sent over to England and was accepted. The Order in Council was passed, and the gentlemen who had been recommended received their commissions; but, in regard to that matter again, I am quite prepared to bring down a statement and give all the names.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite sympathise with any effort made to prevent any unfairness in regard to dealing with candidates who may be graduates of the Royal Military College. I think it is exceedingly important in the interest of that institution that the Minister of Militia should be particularly careful to see that in no way favoritism creeps in. A short time ago it was publicly stated in the press of Canada, in a certain portion of the press, that a special examination was held in the Kingston College for the purpose of enabling a formerly unsuccessful pupil to pass an examination and thus obtain promotion. I dare say the Minister knows quite well the case to which I refer; it would not be fair to the parties concerned to more clearly indicate it on the floor of Parliament. I believe there can be no doubt of this, that a candidate—I am not saying he shall be prejudiced by it, but he has the political favor of the Administration—being unsuccessful in passing the regular examination at the Military College and being extremely desirous to obtain a commission in the Imperial army, a special examination was held for him. He succeeded in that second examination, passing, and received his commission. Is that the case?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; I am not aware of any such case.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman is not aware of it he is probably the only person of the five millions of inhabitants of Canada who is not aware of it. That can be readily understood, considering he is presiding over the department. If he is not aware of it perhaps he will be good enough to ask the first person he meets on the street if it is so or not. I had an opportunity of discussing the matter with a person who is aware of it—a person who took a part in passing the gentleman at that examination—I will not say unfairly. It is, however, a fact, if the Minister is not aware of it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not aware of it.

Mr. MULOCK. I can understand the hon. gentleman not being aware of it. It is convenient sometimes for people not to know things. That has taken place, however. I will not say the Minister is wilfully innocent of the fact, for I must accept his explanation. I regret that it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to give that attention to the service for which he is engaged. If that is the case, if the fact is so, a very serious injury has been done to the reputation of the institution; anyone can see that. Anyone can understand that if the public lose confidence in the fairness of the examination and consider that the rewards are to depend, not upon merit, but upon influence or favor, we had better close up the Military College, or, at all events, let us not hold out to the youth of Canada the idea that preferment goes with merit. Let us state that, as in the Civil Service and many other branches of the service at the present time, rules are to be made to exclude objectionable applicants, but they are abandoned when it may suit those who have the control of those rules.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would like to know whether the reports current in Quebec, that the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence is going to be superannuated this year, to be replaced by a gentleman of most distinguished position in the Local Legislature of Quebec, have any foundation? Those reports have been in circulation and they have not been contradicted even in the ministerial papers. I suppose the Minister would not tell me as to the appointment, but he might say whether it is the intention to superannuate the present Deputy Minister or not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am very happy to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that this question of superannuating the Deputy Minister of Militia has not yet even been considered. He has fulfilled all the duties of his office remarkably well, and I see no reason why he should be superannuated even to be replaced by a distinguished member of the Local Legislature.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia, are there any fixed periods for holding examinations at the Military College, and if so, by what authority are they fixed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does the hon. gentleman mean the graduating examinations?

Mr. MULOCK. Or the examinations for promotion to the regular service? Take the regular examination, for example.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, there are fixed periods for holding them.

Mr. MULOCK. By what authority are they fixed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. By the commandant, who makes his report. It is approved of by the Minister of Militia, and the period has never been changed.

Mr. MULOCK. Can an additional examination be held in one year without the consent of the Minister of Militia or the Government?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The examinations are yearly.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, but has the commandant authority to hold a special examination without the authority of the Minister of Militia?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I repeat again that I am not aware of any such case.

Mr. MULOCK. If an examination was held at an irregular period it must have been with the sanction of the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It must have been, of course.

Mr. LAURIER. I am delighted to hear from the Minister that the country appreciates the services of the deputy head of his department, and that it is not the intention of the Government to superannuate him. This statement refers only to the action of the Government, and I suppose the Minister would hesitate to say that the appointment of a distinguished member of the Local Legislature has not been discussed elsewhere. As this is not a public matter we can afford to let it stand for the present. I will ask if the hon. gentleman will, in the papers which he will bring down, include also the correspondence which must have taken place with the Imperial Government in regard to those appointments?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Could the hon. gentleman give information to the House as to the statement made a few days ago with regard to the purchase of a house for the superintendent of the Military College at Kingston?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I answered the question yesterday which was put to me in reference to this very matter of which the hon. gentleman now speaks. I stated that a

house had been bought, that the price paid was \$12,500, and that the distance between the house and the college was 2,000 yards.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman must agree that this is a very bad feature of the bargain that the house should be at such a distance from the department. The rules of discipline would require that the superintendent should be within easy distance of communication with the college. Being at such a distance as 2,000 yards it would be hardly possible for him to have over the students confined there that care and that exact supervision which is so very necessary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have acted in this direction. The present house is much closer than the house occupied by previous commandants. The other commandants of the college lived at a greater distance than the present one does in the new house.

Mr. COOK. Does the hon. gentleman propose to buy another building next year? He says he is working in the direction of bringing the house nearer the college.

Department of the Secretary of State .....\$34,972 50

Mr. FOSTER. In this department there are 17 statutory increases of \$50, one statutory increase of \$50 not estimated in 1888-89, two statutory increases at \$30, a messenger, transferred, at \$450, estimated at \$300 last year; making a total increase of \$1,110.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just like to call attention to an item in the Auditor General's Report, page C 32, in connection with this department. I notice that arrears for eight years, amounting to \$400, have been paid to one man. Now, I cannot understand how it is that we have arrears to pay to some of our officials.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his name?

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Brousseau.

Mr. FOSTER. I will enquire into the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand how it is that these arrears are brought up from time to time. Once the principle is admitted that a man, after serving a number of years, can go back and trump up accounts for the purpose of making claims like this, we shall have no end of them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I see a charge on page C 32 of the Auditor General's Report, "P. Pelletier, from March 1, \$600." Can the hon. gentleman say what he is appointed for, and whether he went through the Civil Service examinations? I am instructed, if he is the man, that the chief service he rendered was at the Hull election here, in which a slight row occurred. Will the hon. gentleman get that information too?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the hon. gentleman to what class Mr. Morgan was degraded last year, and whether he has received his statutory increase during the past year?

Mr. FOSTER. He was a chief clerk at \$2,400, and was made a first-class clerk at a maximum salary of \$1,800, a reduction of \$600. He has not received any statutory increase.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery. \$21,310

Mr. FOSTER. The increases are seven statutory increases at \$50, one at \$62.50, estimated short in 1888-89, and two at \$30; making a total increase of \$472.50. The decreases are caused by the difference between Mr. Young's salary of \$2,100, and the salary of Mr. Bronskill, which is \$1,850;

two third-class clerkships not filled, and now dropped, \$1,300; one promotion provided for in 1888-89, but dropped, \$100; a packer and messenger dropped, \$900; a first class clerkship for eight months, not filled, \$933.32; making the total decreases \$3,483.32, leaving the net decrease \$3,010.

Department of Interior..... \$128,512 50

Mr. FOSTER. The increases are caused by 31 statutes at \$50, one at \$37.50, one at \$25, one at \$30, an increase to Mr. Hall of \$400, an increase to Mr. Deville of \$225, a promotion of Mr. King from first-class clerk to chief clerk, \$50; a promotion from second to first, \$25; two other seconds to first, \$100 and \$125 respectively; five thirds to seconds, \$1,012; an additional messenger, \$500; and two new third class clerks, \$1,050; making the total, \$4,910. The decreases are \$1,650, consequent on the transfer of Mr. Pope from that Department to the Privy Council; and \$1,275 from one death. The total decreases are \$2,925, the net decrease being \$1,905.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Department of Indian Affairs is embraced now in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, they are under the same Minister.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the Geological Branch?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I see there are two officials of a new kind in the Department of the Interior, one called geographer of the Department of the Interior, and the other astronomer, at \$1,800 each. I would like to have some explanation of who they are and what they are needed for, because it seems to me the business of the Department of the Interior must be much less now than it was a few years ago, when the real estate boom was in progress in the North-West, and vast tracts of territory were being surveyed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. On the recommendation of my deputy, Mr. Johnston, who is the chief draftsman of the department, who has been in the service since 1874, and who was originally selected by Col. Dennis for his admitted skill as a draftsman and geographer, was appointed a technical officer with the title of geographer of the department of the Interior, without any increase of salary. It was Mr. Johnston who prepared the standard map of Canada which, I have no doubt, hon. members have all seen.

Mr. CASEY. The Estimates show an increase.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A transfer from the first class. He was a first class clerk at the maximum.

Mr. CASEY. His duties are as draftsman to draw maps?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; entirely.

Mr. CASEY. Then it is merely a change of name?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A change of name.

Mr. CASEY. Is the same true with regard to the astronomer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. King, who is one of our best astronomers, is transferred in the same way. He is a very able man and has been doing good work. We are carrying out trigonometrical surveys, and he having been recommended by the deputy to be put in the same position, I saw no objection to it.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see the object of changing the name unless it was with the view of establishing a position in which these men would be better paid afterwards.

Mr. LISTER. Were any additional appointments made at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. One messenger.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to page 9 of the Estimates, where the expenses of the Department of the Interior are estimated at \$128,512.50. That, I presume, includes what he calls Department of the Interior on page 13, and also the Geological Branch on page 14. Then the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs are entered on page 9 as a separate item, amounting to \$42,415. Will the hon. gentleman tell why these are put as two separate items on page 9, and why they are three separate items on pages 13 and 14?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The only reason I know of might be that the Geological Survey and the Interior Department may be nominally connected with each other under one deputy.

Mr. FOSTER. These two, I believe, have always been under the one Minister, while the Department of Indian Affairs has been under a different Minister, the Minister of the Interior; and I followed the same order, in making the Estimates, that has been followed before. They are all virtually one department now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has dealt with them as if they were three in the one case and two in the other. This is confusing and calculated to deceive the House, I do not say intentionally. The hon. gentleman says there is but one deputy of the Department of the Interior and the Geological Branch taken together. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the director of the Geological Survey is continued in the rank of deputy head, and is obliged to have all his affairs supervised by the deputy head of the Department of the Interior, properly so-called? Is it the case that in sending out his exchanges and in doing everything he is obliged to consult the deputy and cannot act directly—that he cannot consult directly the Minister, but must consult the deputy?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is really only one deputy; and Dr. Selwyn, the director, is deputy head. When I took charge of the Department I found that such had been the practice, and there was considerable friction, and I have been endeavoring, for some time, to bring about an arrangement to correct it. The practice has been that the work of the deputy head has been done directly through the deputy of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to make a suggestion for the hon. gentleman's consideration, regarding parties that go on surveys in connection with the Geological Survey. I understand this branch is never able to make up parties or to enter on surveys until after the House has voted the moneys, and it sometimes happens that the vote takes place at a late period of the spring, so that these surveying parties are all the summer getting started. It would be very much better if you could know at the earliest possible moment at the beginning of the year how many you are going to put into the field, and that they should be able to take the field at the earliest possible moment. In some parts of the Dominion they could be in the field the whole year round, but in other parts, where the season is short, it is necessary for them to be in the field as soon as the season opens. I do not think we get full value at all for the cost of fitting out expeditions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and the question was brought to my notice by the director himself a short time ago; and we are at once going to take up the question with regard to the different parties going out the coming season, in order to have them in a position to get to work as early as possible.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you intend adopting some general scheme whereby, at the earliest possible moment, irrespec-

tive of proceedings in Parliament, these surveying parties will be able to take the field?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the intention.

Mr. LAURIER. I observe the staff of the department is very large. I could understand how such a large staff would be necessary at the early days of Confederation, or even quite recently, when large surveying parties were in the field, and the reports were coming in to be investigated and maps had to be drafted; but I do not see why such a large staff should be required at present. Are the surveys still going on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; every year a certain amount of surveys are going on. But the staff of surveyors is not anything like as large as it was a few years ago, and the hon. gentleman will notice that the amount voted for this purpose is much smaller than heretofore. With regard to the department itself I made enquiries, and found it impossible to cut down the staff. All the officers are kept steadily at work. I would have been glad to be able to reduce the staff, but my deputy informs me that it would be impossible.

Mr. LAURIER. What I say is not with any view to criticise the department, as I have not the necessary knowledge at hand to do so. It may be that the staff, although it is a very large one, is not too large for the proper discharge of the business of the department; but it seems to me, as the hon. gentleman has admitted that there are fewer surveys in the field than formerly, that the work of the department must be consequently much less onerous than it was a few years ago. The hon. gentleman says it is impossible to diminish the staff. The work of the department must have grown, therefore, in some other direction. Can the hon. gentleman give us information in regard to that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have reduced work in the survey portion of the staff, but not in the general staff of the department. All the surveyors, as the hon. gentleman knows, are employed during the summer months, and when the work is completed they are paid off. In that part of the staff there has been a reduction.

Mr. LAURIER. Last year there was a very important investigation going on in the other branch of the Legislature, by a committee of that Legislature, as to the basin of the River Mackenzie. Have any steps been taken to have a thorough investigation made of that important part of the Dominion?

Mr. DEWDNEY. None, with the exception of getting reports from Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. McConnell, who have spent nearly two years in the far North-West. They have just returned, and I hope I shall get valuable information from them.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I suppose the reports of these gentlemen will form part of the next report of the Minister of Interior, next year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; but as these gentlemen have only lately returned, they could not prepare their reports in time to get into the blue-book this Session. I shall be glad, however, to bring their reports down as soon as they are prepared.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman has erred in his statement with regard to the astronomer and geographer. In looking at page 13, I see that, in the number of parties employed, there is a deputy head, one each year; chief clerk or secretary, one each year; chief clerk or surveyor general, one each year; chief clerk of patents, one in each year; chief clerk, accountant, one in each year. Then you have these two officers to whom there is no one corresponding in 1888-89.

Mr. FOSTER. They were first class clerks in that year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The number of first class clerks is the same in each year, and there is only one increase in the number of second class clerks. The difference is in the third class, of whom there were thirty-seven in 1888-89 and are to be only thirty-four in 1889-90. That makes three less.

Mr. FOSTER. Those three went up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that there has been promotion.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There have been third class clerks made second class clerks, and possibly there have been second class clerks made first class clerks, so that, although the number of clerks has not been increased, the ranks have been very greatly changed. These two gentlemen may not have received any higher salary or rank than before, but in that case somebody else must have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. I read the information on that point to the House at first, and my hon. friend cannot have caught the statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think some reasonable effort should be made to cut down the expenses of this department. The number of clerks and the amount of the expense is at present unreasonable. No doubt, the opening up of the North-West and the very arduous duties which fell upon the head of this department at that time increased the necessity of hiring a number of clerks, but we are all aware that the duties now devolving upon this department cannot possibly be as great as they were a year or two ago; but, notwithstanding that fact, we find the expenditure increasing. We reasonably expected this year to find a reduction instead of an increase, but the amount is still increasing. I hope the hon. gentleman who has been placed at the head of that department, when he has obtained some experience in regard to its working, will be able to report to the House next year that he has very materially cut down the expenses. There must be room for a considerable reduction, and, though he may not have seen his way to do that yet, we hope that he will see that the expenditure is reduced. In connection with the Board of Land Commissioners in Winnipeg, there is an enormous expense, and there is a very large staff of officers that I could never see the necessity of keeping up at all. The duties which devolve upon that board should be discharged by the officials here. It is absurd to keep two boards, one at Winnipeg and the other at Ottawa, to deal with these matters. I think that board at Winnipeg could be wiped out altogether and the duties performed by the department here, and this would save an enormous expense. There are items to which I think the head of the department should devote his personal attention at once. I have been through the North-West, and I am satisfied, from what I gathered when I was there, from officials of the Government and others, that there is ample room for a very serious reduction in the expenditure on the whole official staff there, and here as well. It is our duty to press this matter upon the Government, and we take this opportunity of saying that we think the time has come to make this reduction, and we hope the Minister will realise before next year that very serious reductions ought to be made.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has nothing to say in reference to what has been stated by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McMullen). Apart from the question of expenditure, the hon. gentleman must know that a great deal of annoyance is caused by the existence of the two boards, one in Winnipeg and one in Ottawa. Settlers have been sent from Pilate to Herod and Herod to Pilate—from Winnipeg to Ottawa and from Ottawa to Winnipeg—

and in consequence a good deal of discontent, as far as my knowledge goes, has been aroused among the settlers. The hon. gentleman knows—probably better than anyone else—that the working of the Act in regard to the Department of the Interior, as far as the settlement of the North-West is concerned, is not as satisfactory as it should be. Instead of facilities being given to settlers, the settlers have been hampered by regulations upon regulations, and by officers upon officers, until some of them have given the thing up in despair and have gone over to the other side of the line. The hon. gentleman is new to his present office, and he will find that he can occupy his time very profitably and valuably by using it on this question in the way which I indicate.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad this has been brought before the House. I was under the same impression as my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Laurier), that a great deal of evil resulted from the settler being sent from Pilate to Herod, and being hurled back again from Herod to Pilate, and I went into the question with the late lamented Mr. White, and he showed me how completely my idea was a misconception. As a fact, nearly  $\frac{3}{10}$  of the ordinary business of the settler is done in the office at Winnipeg, without one word being heard outside. Occasionally, in the case of here and there a settler, correspondence does take place which is protracted, and in such cases there would appear to be an advantage if we communicated directly with Ottawa; but when once I saw that the whole of that part of the business was done in Winnipeg, I saw it was clearly an advantage to have an officer so near, because if you were to aggregate the business in Ottawa, you would have still to have the same number, or very nearly the same number of employés, for the work is a vast one. What would be the result? Instead of the settler being able to get an answer to his enquiry in a single day, or two days at the furthest, he would have to wait five or six days. I was entirely under the same impression as my hon. and learned friend, because, naturally, the only cases which came before me, or which created trouble, were those in which the man was irritated. I thought, if it is necessary that I should write to Mr. Smith, and, if I am not satisfied with what he says, I am to write to Mr. White or to the Minister of the Interior, why should I not have the communication direct? That was the impression made on me, and the impression which naturally would be made on anyone who looks at the question from a superficial standpoint, as I had done; and, as I say, with great respect to the hon. gentleman, every member must look at it who is not engaged in the question from time to time as the members from the North-West are, or who is not in the department managing the matter as the Minister or the Deputy Minister is. I said to him: "Is not this too bad, that we should have the two offices? Would it not facilitate matters if we were to deal directly with Ottawa?" He smiled and said "yes,"—just as I say now—"it is a very natural idea." And then he said: "Now come and look at the way the thing stands." He showed me that the great bulk of the business was done at Winnipeg, all the ordinary business was done at Winnipeg, and that we only hear of those cases that created a difficulty. As I am speaking, I may be permitted to say, that there is a step that I should like to see taken, and it would still further advance the efficiency of the department—I would like to see the office removed further west.

Mr. LAURIER. Will you kindly tell us where?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I should not object to Regina. But I should like to see it removed further west, for this reason: that henceforth the bulk of the business will be done in the Territories, and, in proportion, as there is an advantage in having the office at Winnipeg, as now, on account of postal facilities, in the same proportion there would be an advantage in having the office removed further west.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. McMULLEN. I just want to say a word in reply to the hon. gentleman. In my experience, a double duty has been performed by the Department of the Interior in dealing with cases at Winnipeg, and then dealing with them here. I have had several letters myself from parties who had settled in the west complaining that in cases of disputes about land, they came first before the Board in Winnipeg, and as the party who lost was dissatisfied with the decision at Winnipeg, he writes down here to some member of Parliament who brings the case before the department in Ottawa. In that way there are practically two courts in connection with the Department of the Interior, one at Winnipeg, which first decides the case, and afterwards there is an appeal here, and all the papers are ordered down here and gone over the second time. Now I say that is not at all necessary. The proper course would be to have one court, as it were, from which there would be no appeal. You cannot prevent men from writing and complaining when they think an injustice has been done in the matter of disposing of the claims for land. I have had several cases. At the time of the lamented death of the hon. gentleman who presided so efficiently and so ably over the Department of the Interior, I had in my possession no less than six different complaints in regard to claims that had been brought before the court at Winnipeg and there disposed of; but the parties who had been disappointed in their efforts to get claims, wished their cases to be brought before the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, in order, if possible, to get a reversal of the decision that had been given in Winnipeg, or some other change in the decision, so that they might be placed in possession of what they considered their rights. Now here is one of the evils of the division of the Department of the Interior: one portion sitting in Winnipeg and one portion sitting in Ottawa. The sooner that system is done away with the better, and then, when people reach a decision with regard to disputes in connection with the settlement of the land, they will know that there is no further appeal, and will save themselves a great amount of trouble and annoyance. I know of two or three cases myself that were brought before the hon. gentleman the late Minister of the Interior. The papers were sent for from Winnipeg; it took a considerable time before these papers could be brought here; it was some two or three weeks before all the necessary papers could be produced in Ottawa in order that the disputes might be looked into. After they came here they were investigated, and after looking the matter over we felt satisfied that the decisions that had been given by the board at Winnipeg were about correct—everything straight. At the same time the trouble had to be gone through with, and it will continue to be a trouble year after year, so long as people are not satisfied with the decisions at Winnipeg; they will give up their papers and documents, which will be sent down here and a re-investigation will be held before the Minister of the Interior. I say that state of things should be dispensed with at once, and the whole business in connection with the department should either be transacted up there or else be transacted here, and we should quit this division of responsibility and the continuous agitation that is carried on whenever a party there is not satisfied, or another party here is not satisfied.

Mr. LAURIER. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks which fell from my hon. friend, the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Now I am not the man at all to grudge any favor that has been shown to any man here, friend or foe, and I congratulate my hon. friend that he was so lucky as to get himself disabused of a false impression which at one time he entertained as to the working of the Interior Department. But the Government gave him a privilege which has hitherto been denied to the House.

He is not the only man who labored under the delusion that two offices were too many, that one would have done better than two. There are thousands of others, I may say millions of men, in this Dominion, who are now of the same mind that he was formerly, before the late Minister of the Interior took him into his confidence and gave him the explanations which were, unfortunately, given to him only. If the Minister of the Interior had taken the House and the country also into his confidence, and given publicly the explanations which were given to my hon. friend and which completely satisfied him that two boards were necessary, and that, in fact, one of the two boards was not far enough west, then the Minister of the Interior would have disabused, probably, the mind, not only of the hon. gentleman himself, but of the entire public. For my part, my confidence in the Government is not great; it might be greater, and if I were to speak my own mind, I would say that I think they have erred and are erring in many ways. Now, if the Government wish to show that the public was in error, if they wish to do themselves justice, I would ask that some hon. gentleman opposite should now give the explanations on the floor of the House which were given to the hon. member for Assiniboia, and which completely satisfied him that the criticisms, which were general at that time, were not well founded.

Mr. DAVIN. I will give them with the greatest pleasure to my hon. and learned friend. I will give the explanations which were given to me, viz.: that 95 per cent. of the work passed quietly through that office at Winnipeg without creating any irritation; and my hon. and learned friend, who speaks with so much charm whenever North-West matters are introduced, is under a complete misapprehension as to the Department of the Interior. He supposes there are two boards. There is no such thing. You have got a board at Winnipeg and then you have got the Minister here to whom you may appeal. But the Land Board at Winnipeg is one thing, and, of course, whether you have a board here or whether you have it at Winnipeg, you still have the Minister to whom the decisions of that board may be appealed. Now, I will ask my hon. friend, in view of the explanation that the Minister gave me, viz.: that 95 per cent. of the work is done quietly at Winnipeg—will he say for one moment, if that be the case, that it is not a real advantage to have the office near the settler, and not to have it far away? The hon. gentleman is a lawyer; he knows very well that one of the things that characterises a good government is to bring the law near the people, to bring it within easy reach of them.

Mr. COOK. It comes too mighty near, sometimes.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say it does. I know you have been in the Election Courts.

Mr. COOK. I have always had enough to pay the costs.

Mr. DAVIN. Don't get angry or I will cook your goose. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hold that in my way, as a funnel, so to speak, conveying what information was given to me, I have conveyed it to my hon. and learned friend.

Mr. MILLS. Balaam.

Mr. DAVIN. What is Balaam? What has that to do with it?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is just in the same unfortunate position. The hon. gentleman says he is the funnel through which this information is conveyed to the House. Balaam had a funnel also through which he conveyed views.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is completely astray. He is ass-tray, as an hon. member said. I had to point out last year the want of biblical knowledge on the part of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). The ass in

the scriptural story was not the funnel of Balaam; on the contrary, the ass recognized the angel which Balaam could not recognise, and so he did not convey any views that Balaam entertained, and was, therefore, in no way Balaam's funnel. I am sorry to have to give the hon. gentleman, which I had occasionally to do last year, a little scriptural instruction. But turning away from the ass, I will come to the subject in hand. I say that in view of the explanation that 95 per cent. of the work is done in Winnipeg without any noise, you have only to take the geographical fact that it is nearer the people and you occupy a position that is simply unanswerable, and no silvery eloquence on the part of my hon. friend, whom we are always glad to hear, can affect it, although just now he thought there were two boards; and, last year, he thought we had no municipal system. I advise hon. gentlemen opposite, and in doing so I speak against my own party, and I am now saying the worst thing I can say against my own party—

Mr. MITCHELL. Be careful.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, yes, I am very careful. I know that I am speaking not only in the presence of the two parties, but also in the presence of the third party, which for the moment is the most formidable.

Mr. MITCHELL. The most independent, at all events.

Mr. DAVIN. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to make any impression on this House and to lower the numerical strength of the Conservative party, the first thing they will have to do when dealing with the North-West question is to study facts. They are really in a state of deplorable ignorance on the subject, and silvery eloquence and loud rhetoric such as is sometimes used is but as the idle wind.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will supply the fiction if they supply facts.

Mr. DAVIN. I will, with pleasure, if they will pay me for it.

Mr. WATSON. I am sure this side of the House will be very thankful to the Minister—not the Minister but the funnel of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is the coming Minister.

Mr. WATSON. He was looking for the position. It will astonish anyone coming from the North-West to learn that the work of the Department of the Interior is administered with such great diligence, especially that part which has reference to claims in the North-West. The hon. gentleman must have been more fortunate than is the case with others in the North-West. I know of many persons in Manitoba who, day after day, corresponded with me on the subject of getting their patents; in fact, people are constantly writing to me to get patents issued and land matters adjusted that cannot be adjusted in Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman says that 95 per cent. of the work has been done in Winnipeg. I believe it was a good move on the part of the Government to establish a land board in Winnipeg, but if 95 per cent. of the work is now done there and only 5 per cent. done in Ottawa, this being the more difficult work, I fail to see why the whole administration of the department should not be removed to Winnipeg, and the department be administered by a responsible individual in Winnipeg or some point in the North-West—I do not care if it was Regina. I believe if we had responsible men there to deal with the individual claims of settlers it would be better for the people at large. No doubt great delays occur in the Department of the Interior in connection with claims of people who have entered for homesteads and desire to prove their claims. Delays occur not only in these cases, but also in cases where there has been some little irregularity, not altogether on the part of the applicant, but also on the part of the



department, and I should like to see a responsible individual located in Winnipeg or some portion of the North-West who would be in a position to deal, and deal finally, with all claims coming before him for adjudication. If I visit the Department of the Interior to obtain information, or with reference to any application for a patent, the case is referred to the Land Board in Winnipeg; they have to report and send their opinion here, and I then get an answer. That proceeding, of course, involves delay. The Land Board in Winnipeg should be entrusted with full power to issue patents.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who are they?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Smith is the head of the Land Board in Winnipeg. He is from Peterboro', I think. I believe the gentleman who presides over that board is giving satisfaction and is doing all he can under the powers given him as Commissioner of Dominion Lands in the North-West. There is undoubtedly great dissatisfaction in the west on account of the trouble involved in getting the machinery in motion for the issuing of patents and the settlement of claims. I know claims that have been hanging over for the last ten or twelve years under the promise that they would be investigated. Such, for instance, are the old settlers' claims in the city of Winnipeg and throughout the old Province of Manitoba, claims in regard to land to which the people declare they are entitled under an agreement made with the Hudson's Bay Company before the transfer of the North-West to the Dominion. The Interior Department and the Government have been deaf to the demands of these people, but I hope before the Session closes, the Government will appoint a commission to enquire into their claims and grievances and report on them. If the people are entitled to any recompense in connection with their claims then they should be dealt with fairly and the matter settled; if not, they should be so informed and the agitation be allowed to drop.

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

#### After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I regret very much that the Minister who has charge of the department, and whose special interest it is to give the House information on this subject is not present.

An hon. MEMBER. Here he is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I refer to the real Minister and not to the hon. gentleman who has dignified himself with the name of the funnel.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment, Mr. Dewdney is not here, but I believe it is through no fault of his own in one sense. He has an engagement which he is obliged to keep and which was entered into beforehand. This item was pretty fully discussed, and the discussion can be brought up again on succeeding votes which are intimately connected with this department. It might be that the hon. gentleman will allow this item which is simply for salaries to pass. When the vote comes for the Land Board at Winnipeg and other services we can resume the discussion. I throw that out as a hint.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It may be that the Minister of the Interior could not be here, but it is rather an unusual thing that when the estimates of the Minister's department are under consideration he should not be in the House to give information upon the subject. I do not suppose that any observations that I would make would alter the policy of the department, but, notwithstanding, I think that it is  
Mr. WATSON.

only right and proper that I should express the views that I have formed in reference to this Land Board in Winnipeg, the office of commissioner, and the duties that the commissioner has to discharge.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I might make one more suggestion. I think the Minister will be in, in the course of a little while, and we might let this item stand for a moment and proceed to the next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. MILLS. Very well, we will do so.

North-West Mounted Police..... \$3,860

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this item, Mr. Chairman, the only increase is that caused by the statutory additions. There are three statutory increases at \$50 each, and one at \$30, making \$180 in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That officer is now in residence in Ottawa, is he not?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean the comptroller.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has there been any change in the regulations in reference to the force in the North-West?

Mr. FOSTER. I have been informed that there has been no important change. An opportunity will be afforded to discuss that subject in the general estimates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a point I wanted to bring out. I suppose it is better to wait till then because I think the Minister of Finance might not be in possession of the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We can take it on the other items.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is to be regretted that the First Minister who has charge of the administration of the affairs of the Mounted Police is not here for the purpose of giving us some information on the subject. The force is very much larger than it was a few years ago, and it was increased at a period when the country was much agitated, when a civil war had broken out, when a rebellion had occurred and when the recurrence of that rebellion threatened the country. This force is, in fact, a part of the expenditure in connection with the Indian branch although it is really separate, for the main duty of the force is precautionary duty, relating to the maintenance of peace and order, so far as the Indian population is concerned. Now, I understand that the Indians have remained contented upon their reserves, that there has been no indication of discontent, amounting at all events to rebellion, and it would be most important that the expenditure in connection with the maintenance of this force should be diminished, if this can be safely done. If 300 mounted police were sufficient in the early period of the administration of the affairs in the North-West, when the means of communication were very different from what they are at the present time, it seems to me that this force could be very largely reduced without any risk to the peace and the good order of that section of the country, and if so it would certainly be to the public interest that a reduction should take place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I might say, Mr. Chairman, that, perhaps, the Minister has observed in the public prints, even in some that are favorable to the Administration, that there have been rather serious complaints about the way in

which matters are conducted at what I might term the head-quarters of the force at Regina. I dare say that the Minister will have seen articles bearing upon that question. I have in my hand a paper in which a very serious charge is made against Commissioner Herchmer, who is in charge of the force there. It is alleged that a canteen has been established in the barracks, and that beer of sufficient strength to produce intoxication is being sold; that that canteen has special surroundings, that it is a monopoly for beer drinking, that its result is demoralising to the force; and, altogether, speaking in such a way in reference to the matter I think it would be well for the Minister to be able to give some explanation in reference to it. For instance, I have a short article here dated the 29th September, in a paper entitled the *Regina Leader*—I think a paper that is favorable to the Administration—in which it says that this canteen is demoralising the force. The article is headed, "The Canteen must Go," and it goes on to say:—

"It is an outrage, savoring of boodle for those who brought it here, and demoralising, ruining, debauching the men it pretends to serve. A correspondent writing from the barracks gives particulars which none but an ass or a ghoul would deny were reasons sufficient for wiping it off the face of the earth. But the latest outrage who will defend? Here are the facts: one of the corporals—T. B. Wright—fell under its temptations. He has been drinking heavily since New Year's, spending at the canteen all his money, and the bulk of his time, and generally indulging, like many of his fellows, in a prolonged spree. He is a married man; his family living at the barracks. His wife, an excellent woman, has endeavored by her own work to add to the pittance he gave her. On Friday he was missed. A search party of 20 men scoured the country but could find no trace of him. It is supposed that hearing he would be punished for his offence of drinking to excess the strong beer which those in authority aided in placing under his nose, he deserted—leaving a weeping wife and children. His deserted wife is not alone in condemning the canteen as a curse. Before the canteen came the men had the healthy outing of a run down town. Here they could take a drink, but the temptation was not constantly before them and there was but a fraction of the amount of drinking which goes on now."

I think, Sir, when a statement like that appears in a paper—

Mr. LANDERKIN. What paper is that?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The *Regina Leader*—known to be favorable to the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What subsidy does it get? Possibly the subsidy was stopped at the time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know of my own knowledge who edits it, but it is commonly reported to be a gentleman in this House, and I have no doubt he will say something on the matter. I have seen articles in other papers on the same subject, and I submit that it is of such importance that some explanation should be given. In another article it is insinuated, if not openly charged, that the commissioner himself is benefited by the existence of this institution, which is said to be demoralising the force. I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Finance will have taken some interest in this matter, and will be able to say whether it is true that a canteen has been established there under Commissioner Herchmer, whether it is true that he actually profits by it himself, and whether, as is charged in another place, a car load of beer which he was having taken in was seized. This is the point on which I wanted to get some information.

Mr. FOSTER. All that has been stated in the newspapers will not, I suppose, be taken for granted even by my hon. friend. There may be some truth in it, or there may be not. I am not the responsible Minister of the department which has control of the force, and the vote we are taking now is for the officers of the department who are here. I have no doubt at all that the First Minister, who has it under his care, and who is not here to-night, because he is feeling unwell, will be quite able to give the hon. gentleman a full answer when we come to the item which provides for the maintenance of the force in the North-West. These matters have been, no doubt, brought to his attention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This department is intended for the special direction and surveillance of this force, and, therefore, my hon. friend's remarks are in the strictest sense pertinent. The comptroller is bound to see, if such irregularities exist, that they are repressed at once. I think the hon. gentleman had better suspend this item until the officer properly in charge is here to offer explanations, and he might revert to the Minister of Interior's Department, which he asked to stand on the score of his absence.

Department of the Interior.....\$128,512 50

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must apologise for not being here when you took the Chair, but I had a little dinner party, and was able only to get as far as the fish, and I left as soon as I could. Before I arrived I believed an explanation was asked in reference to the Land Commissioner's office at Winnipeg. Before I took charge of the department I had somewhat similar views to those expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that office. I had not given particular attention to the matter in the North-West; it was not until it was intimated to me that I was coming here that I went into the matter particularly, and the more I have seen of the administration of this office the more I have become satisfied of the necessity of it. Shortly after I took office, a large number of applications were made to me from different parts of the Territories in reference to land matters and I thought from what I saw and knew then that there were a great many matters which appeared to me to be grievances on the part of the settlers—so much so that I wrote to the commissioner to ask him who, if anyone, had sufficient discretion, or any discretion, to settle those grievances. He replied to me that there was no discretion in the matter at all—that the law was very clear in regard to all land matters. I then found that no patents could be issued without the certificate of the Land Commissioner at Winnipeg. It was his duty to get all the information he could from his officers with regard to the occupation and improvements of the different settlers; and until the Government had a certificate of course no patent could be issued. Some parties in the North-West thought that was unnecessary, and it was intimated to me that it would be better if the application was made direct to Ottawa, and the patent issued from here. But since I have had the honor to administer the department, I have come to the conclusion that such a course would place the Minister in a false position, and for that reason, if for no other, I think it was a very wise measure to place the office of the Land Commissioner at Winnipeg. I may say that while I have been in the Territories up to the day I left I have not heard any intimation from the settlers themselves that they wished to have the land office removed and the whole of the business done here at head-quarters. In fact, quite the reverse was the case. I do not know if the hon. gentlemen are aware that, during the last meeting of the Local Assembly, a resolution was passed expressing the opinion that the land office should be removed further west in order to be nearer the people who have now the principal amount of business to transact with the Land Department. In regard to the advice extended to me by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I take it in the spirit in which it was proffered; I have no doubt it was given with good intention. I am sure no one is more anxious to reduce the expenditure of the department than I am, when it can be done without impairing its efficiency; and, so far as my experience goes, I find all the Ministers anxious to reduce the expenditure as far as they can. We have a Finance Minister of a very economical turn of mind and who is anxious to make a good showing. I think you will find, when the Estimates are down, that they are not excessive, at any rate as far as my department is concerned. But I fear that the wishes of the hon.

gentleman cannot be fulfilled, because it appears to me that, in a young country like ours, the business in the North-West instead of decreasing must increase. Therefore, I cannot hold out any hope that in the course of a few years the hon. gentleman's wishes will be realized.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must say that I regret the hon. gentleman has arrived at this opinion. In my opinion a very large reduction might be made in the expenditure connected with the department, and at the same time the efficiency of that department might be greatly increased. The hon. gentleman asks for an expenditure of \$128,000 connected with his department here; the expense of the Indian branch will exceed \$120,000, and there is in connection with the commissioner's land office at Winnipeg a further expenditure of \$185,000, making an expenditure connected with that office for the mere administration of public affairs of upwards of \$300,000. I can point to figures in the history of the Illinois Central Railway, whose sales of lands were double that of the department which the hon. gentleman has in charge, at any time during the last ten years, which show the expense of the administration of those lands was not ten per cent. of what the Interior Department costs at present for the same purpose. The hon. gentleman knows that the expenditure of his department, which was about \$50,000, including the expenditure of the branch at Winnipeg in 1876 and 1878, has increased four-fold, and there is no corresponding increase in the public service to warrant this very large expenditure. The hon. gentleman will find, if he looks at the expenditure connected with the land office at Washington, no such cumbersome machinery in connection with that office as that which the hon. gentleman thinks necessary in connection with his department here. I think we might profit by the experience of our neighbors, and avoid having a second Department of the Interior stationed mid-way between the plains of our North-West and the capital of Canada. The hon. gentleman, in my opinion, proposes to perpetuate a useless institution by the maintenance of the commissioner's office at Winnipeg. When that office was first established, there were serious difficulties in the way of rapid communication with the central office here. There were no telegraph lines and no railways, and no means of communication for a very considerable portion of the year, except through the adjoining republic, and the facilities often through that country were far from being great. In consequence of the isolation which existed for a considerable portion of the year, it was found necessary to establish an office at Winnipeg, which was intended to serve as a temporary expedient, and to dispose of those simple matters about which there could be no dispute, in order to facilitate the issuing of patents to the settlers and to facilitate the settlement of disputes that might arise between conflicting claimants, by taking the evidence of the parties. In my opinion, if the Government would retain the land offices which are easy of access to the settlers and intending settlers in the various portions of the country, there is no public business that requires intervention between the Department of the Interior and those land offices by the means of such an institution as that of the Land Commissioner at Winnipeg. If the hon. gentleman has land offices easy of access in various portions of the Territories—and I judge from the large sums asked for the payment of salaries of public land agents in various parts of the North-West that such is the case—why should such an institution as the Land Office at Winnipeg be perpetuated? If there be serious difficulty or dispute between claimants, one of the parties will not rest content with the decision of the commissioner. There will be an appeal to the Minister, and the sooner that appeal takes place—with all the facts communicated that may be furnished by the agent in the

Mr. DEWDNEY.

immediate locality, to the Minister—the sooner the affair will be disposed of, the patent issued to the party entitled, and the dispute settled. Now, there is nothing which this commissioner has to do that the Minister himself could not do quite as well. This commissioner must act upon information and evidence. The commissioner at Winnipeg is, in many cases, 500 or 1,000 miles away from the disputants in the Territories. In but few instances can he be visited by the parties whose case is in controversy. They must communicate with him through the mail, and those communications might just as well come directly to the Minister of Interior here as reach him indirectly through the commissioner, whose decision is not accepted. Then I know that the fact of having a commissioner often tends to delay matters. The commissioner will say that he is waiting for the decision of some matter at Ottawa. The Minister at Ottawa finds that the papers which the commissioner represents as having been sent to him are in the office at Winnipeg, and so the parties whose case is in controversy find that months are allowed to elapse before either the commissioner or the Minister is heard from. Now, it is to my mind perfectly evident that the present means of communication, the facilities of mail service and telegraphic communication, do away with the necessity for such an office as that at Winnipeg. Look at the expense. You have a commissioner with a salary of \$5,000 a year; you have a superintendent of mines with a salary of \$3,200; an inspector with a salary of \$2,200; secretaries with salaries of \$2,000; seven homestead inspectors. Why, the amount paid to these homestead inspectors is almost as much as has been derived in some years from the payment of fees and the issuing of patents. You find that the sum is increased up to \$54,000, and that this does not cover all the expenditure in connection with the service there. I am convinced from what I know that, without any increase whatever in the staff here or in the expenditure incurred in connection with the department here, this office at Winnipeg could be disposed of by substituting for it a local land office there, such as there are in other portions of the North-West. Certainly the people who have disputes with regard to lands, and who are anxious to have their patents issued, are not likely to favor the continuance of this office. It simply serves to diminish the responsibility of the Minister and to enable him to charge, and in many instances justly charge, the delays that are incident to such a cumbersome system, upon the officer connected with the office in that city. When you look at the question of the North-West Territories, it is perfectly apparent that the office at Winnipeg, unless the seat of Government were removed there, can be of no advantage to the people who are settled hundreds of miles away from the capital of the Prairie Province, and so I think it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman should, at so early a period of his official career, have come to the conclusion that this office should be maintained in that city. I am satisfied that neither efficiency nor economy is promoted by the maintenance of the office there; that if, in a country so large as the United States, with territories extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the 49th parallel, it is not found necessary to have such an institution, it cannot be necessary to have it in the much more limited area which we find it necessary to administer in connection with our Federal Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to one particular item. I find that the receipts during last year from the North-West on account of Dominion Lands, from all sources, amounted to \$217,083.07, including homesteads, pre-emptions, improvements, general sales of lands, map sales and office fees, inspection fees, cancellation fees, &c., fees for change of entries, surveyors' examination fees, timber dues, grazing lands, stone quar-

ries, mining fees, hay permits, &c., miscellaneous and Rocky Mountains National Park. All these put together amount to \$217,033. Now we find that the item which the hon. gentleman is asking the Committee to pass, including the cost of the Land Board at Winnipeg, is \$180,000, without contingencies. When you add the contingencies, you virtually swallow up every dollar received from the North-West from every source in connection with the department here and the Land Board in Winnipeg. The contingencies will be over \$22,000, making a total of \$202,000 for the expenditures, while the receipts from all sources are only \$217,000. Can it be necessary to keep a board at Winnipeg and a large staff of officials here for the purpose of doing business which results in a total receipt of \$217,000 with an expenditure of \$202,000 and only \$15,000 left? I think there is a great deal of force in the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that an immediate step should be taken to abolish the office in Winnipeg with its large staff. I believe there are seven or eight homestead inspectors in the North-West. I have been trying to get at the bottom of the duties performed by them. Certainly those duties are not as great as they were a year or two ago, but the same staff is kept on. We have dispensed with one officer, it is true, in connection with the inspection of colonisation companies.

An hon. MEMBER. He is employed in another way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, it is good to have got rid of him in some way, because his salary would have added at least \$3,000 to this estimate. I do not think the Minister can defend the enormous expenses in connection with the management of this department when he looks at the receipts and expenses. Certainly it shows that everything is not sound in Denmark.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not able to verify the figures which the hon. gentleman has just quoted, but, if he will allow me a little time, I think I can make a better showing than that. I know that the sum he has just mentioned does not fairly represent what we have received from the North-West lands, because I think the hon. gentleman has not taken into account the amount of scrip paid in for lands, which I think amounts to \$300,000 or \$400,000, but I am not at present able to say how much. With regard to the homestead inspectors that the hon. gentleman thinks are too numerous, I can only say that the people of the North-West are calling out for more; that their duties are at times very onerous, and that they may be called upon at any time to report on the homestead of any gentleman who is anxious to make application for his patent. So far from there being too many, what I hear is that there are not enough to do the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statement of figures which I gave was taken from No. 18, page 48 of the Public Accounts of this year, and I have enumerated all the sources from which the revenue has been obtained. I am not to blame if the Public Accounts are not correct.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the cash receipts, and no doubt it is correct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At page 103 of these Estimates, it will be seen that the amount the hon. gentleman asks for the Winnipeg office this year is \$185,748. I may inform him that I purpose asking for the opinion of the House on that estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Over and above these various sums, which make up nearly \$300,000, there is an amount of \$100,000 asked on capital account for Dominion Lands. Altogether the result is this: That we received in the year 1888, in actual cash, \$217,000 from all sources. The scrip to which the hon. Minister alluded is, I presume,

simply in payment of obligations incurred to half-breeds and others. That is the case, I think?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not cash in any sense. When you add together these sums of \$185,000 for the Commissioner's Office in Winnipeg, and \$82,000 on the page we are now considering, and \$18,000 for contingencies, and \$7,000 for the Minister's own salary, and \$100,000 charged on page 110 for capital account, you have a total of \$392,000 which the hon. gentleman requires for the service of this department, while we had net receipts last year of only \$217,000. I desire to ask the House this question: Only one year and a half is to run until the \$58,000,000 which we were promised as the net receipts from the lands of the Dominion to defray the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be due, and how is that to be met by receipts of \$217,000 a year as against an annual expenditure of \$392,000? I think the House would like to have some explanation on that point, and, if the hon. gentleman cannot give it, then the House would like to have the explanation from the First Minister, who promised us this result on—I think it was—the 1st of January, 1891.

Mr. WATSON. In some instances, the inspectors do not do their duty. Last season, I know that the Crown Timber Inspector, who has to do with charging dues for cutting hay on the Government lands, in many cases duplicated the permits, and granted permits over the same ground two or three times, and in one case I know there was almost bloodshed as the one set of men drove out the other with pitchforks. The name of the inspector is Gunn. It has been the same on timber land, that permits granted for cutting wood on Government land have been often duplicated. I call attention to this fact in order that the Minister may instruct his inspectors to be very careful and not to grant more permits for cutting hay or wood than the country will bear.

Department of Indian Affairs ..... \$42,415

Mr. FOSTER. The net increase is \$1,517.50. There were twenty statutory clerks at \$50, one at \$30, one at \$25, one promotion of a second to a first class, Mr. Scott, \$50; and three additional third class clerks at \$400. The decreases are: differences in salary of third class clerks, one at \$850, one at \$612, one at \$600, one at \$450, allowance to solicitor, \$400.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There was an appropriation taken last year for a solicitor. Was a solicitor employed, and what were his duties?

Mr. FOSTER. That sum was paid to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and has been paid to him for years as solicitor for Indian Affairs. It has been dropped this year. I believe he is to have it, but it is to be paid out of the Indian funds. I think it is now paid out of the Consolidated Revenue for the Provinces, and then recouped from the Indian Fund. I am not quite certain about that, and I will look into it further.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was formerly given to the Deputy Minister who acted as legal adviser to the department?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he was heretofore paid out of the Indian fund. Does he mean that the Indian fund in the old Province of Ontario bore the whole of this expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the full answer to that because I have not looked it up; but it has been paid in some way out of the Indian fund.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister will see that it is very unfair to charge it against the Indian fund of certain of the Provinces. For instance, he might wish to consult with regard to Indian affairs in British Columbia. There is no Indian fund there out of which any portion of this salary could be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that in the earlier part of the item of statements here, it is stated that part of this is paid from Indian Affairs. I do not know whether it is the whole \$400, or whether it is payment for part of the year or for the whole year. However, I will get full information on that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there has been a superannuation in connection with the Indian Department last year. Will the hon. gentleman give us some explanation with regard to the appointment that has been made to fill that vacancy? I have noticed that in cases of superannuation, as a rule, the salary given to the incoming servant is not equal to the amount that had been given to the party who was retired. But the rule has not been followed out in this case. I would like to know, first, where was Mr. McPherson, who has been superannuated, located as Indian agent, and how this officer, who has come after him, has been placed in an office at the same salary that Mr. McPherson had when he retired and was put on the list as a superannuated officer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry to say I am unable to give the explanation now. It occurred before I took charge of the department. If I had known that the hon. gentleman had wanted the information I could have obtained it for him. Mr. McPherson was superannuated, and I think Mr. Pither was appointed in his place. I will get the information in regard to salaries. Mr. Pither had been an old agent, and, therefore, I presume, he was appointed at the same salary he had been receiving previously. He had been agent at Fort Francis.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have noticed that, as a rule, when superannuations take place a reduction is generally made, and the Government claim that in that way the country saves considerable money. That rule should have been followed out in this case. A man is given a retiring allowance, and another man is put in his place at the same salary.

Mr. FOSTER. But the officer who took the place may have been an old officer at another place, and he would receive the same salary he had been receiving at the place from which he was taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What promotions have taken place in the department here?

Mr. FOSTER. Only one promotion, from second to first, Mr. Scott.

Office of the Auditor General. .... \$25,825

Mr. FOSTER. There has been a net decrease of \$325. There were ten statutory increases, \$500; one statutory increase at \$25; two second class clerks have been transferred from this department, and two others are to be promoted from the third class at lower salaries to take their places, making in all an increase of \$2,175. The decreases are: two second class clerks transferred, making \$2,700; one third class clerk, \$1,000; less transferred to Audit Office from the Post Office Department, one at \$725 and one at \$675. Difference in Mr. Patterson's salary, \$200.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board... \$53,597 50

Mr. FOSTER. In this department there has been a net decrease of \$382.50. The increases were, 21 statutory at \$50, one \$30, total, \$1,080. The decreases are, difference between the salaries of Messrs. Stanton and Jenkins, \$187.50,

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. Stanton having been transferred to the Fishery Department when Mr. Jenkins, who was private secretary to the Minister, was transferred to the Finance Department. Difference, salaries, Messrs. Nash and Coffin, \$275; one third class clerk dropped, \$1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What superannuations occurred in the department?

Mr. FOSTER. Only that of Mr. Nash.

Department of Inland Revenue..... \$40,960

Mr. FOSTER. In this department there is a net decrease of \$415. The increases are represented by thirteen statutes at \$50, one at \$25, and two at \$30. Additional to Mr. Gerald's salary, \$300; additional to Mr. Quain's salary, \$200, making \$1,235. The decreases are represented by a first class clerkship being omitted, Mr. Lamotte having been superannuated, \$1,450, an allowance to Mr. Himsforth, \$200, making a total of \$1,650. The net decrease is \$415.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of that superannuation?

Mr. FOSTER. I think ill-health.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was his age?

Mr. FOSTER. I will ascertain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is he returned in the superannuation list brought down the other day?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Another important superannuation has taken place in that department, that of Mr. Aubin, inspector of gas, with a salary of \$2,000. He is given a retiring allowance of \$560. The person appointed in his place receives \$1,200.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The late inspector of gas was receiving \$1,600 a year, and he received a further salary as consulting inspector of \$400 per year, making a total of \$2,000. He was upwards of 70 years of age, and for the last year has been thoroughly unfit, from illness, to attend to his duty and other officers had to be paid for discharging it. Accordingly he has been superannuated and his place has been filled by an officer with a salary of \$1,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister can furnish particulars with regard to the superannuation of Mr. Lamotte.

Mr. COSTIGAN. His superannuation arose from the fact that his health entirely failed. He was quite a young man, and his chances for promotion were not only good but he might have confidently expected to have been promoted to a first class clerkship within a short time. He was, however, compelled to leave and to give up his prospects on account of the total failure of his health.

Mr. LANGELIER (Québec). I do not complain of the superannuation of Mr. Aubin who was a very old officer, but I understand that he failed to obtain any addition to the number of years of his service. He was a man of extraordinary ability, being perhaps the most competent man, as regards the inspection of gas, in America. He happened to be appointed in 1876 or 1877 when the law for the inspection of gas was first put into operation. Ever since that time he has fulfilled his duties very efficiently, but on account of old age he could no longer attend to them. I understand a request was made to have done for him what was done in other cases of the same kind, that is to say, on account of the exceptional nature of his service, it was suggested that the Treasury Board might add a number of years to his service in order to give him a larger superannuation allowance. This was not acceded to, and the

superannuation allowance is so low that he cannot live on it; I know he has not sufficient to live independently. I should like to know why the addition could not have been given to him as it has been given to other officers not so deserving.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will have the means of satisfying the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the retiring allowance is not too high after all. It is quite true that Mr. Aubin represented that he had a fair claim to come under the clause of the Act which provides that, in certain cases, an additional number of years may be added to the actual service of an officer about to be superannuated. The law provides that when a man has attained a certain age and who was taken into the service for special qualifications, that point may be taken into consideration when he retires from the service, and any number of years, not to exceed ten, may be added to his years of actual service in order to increase his retiring allowance. Mr. Aubin had his case considered by the Treasury Board. It is true that years ago a number of years were added to the time of service of certain retiring officers, but I can assure hon. gentlemen that during the last few years the cases in which additions of that kind have been made to retiring officers have been very few indeed and under very exceptional circumstances. Mr. Aubin claimed that he was taken into the service on account of possessing certain special qualifications. That was quite true. On the other hand, the ground on which the Treasury Board based its decision was the very liberal salary paid to this officer during his time of service.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I contend that the fact should be taken into consideration that, when this officer was first appointed, it would have been next to impossible to have organised a system of gas inspection if he had not accepted the position. He left a very lucrative business as an engineer to be useful to the Government. I know, from personal experience of some cases in which he saved a good deal of money. He was an exceptionally competent man, not only for that particular line of business, but for other lines, and he was one of the best mechanical engineers in America. He was an inventor; he was the inventor of a system of gas which bears his name and which, I think, is very largely used in the United States. I believe he deserves some consideration on account of the peculiar circumstances that, when he was appointed, his services were almost indispensable to the Government. I am not far wrong when I say that he went into the service more out of friendship for the gentleman who was then in charge of the department than for any other reason and in order to assist him in the carrying out of the new law. It was not to make profit that he entered the service of the Government, because he was making more money in his own profession than the salary he got from the Government.

Department of Customs.....\$35,650

Mr. FOSTER. There are sixteen statutory increases at \$50, two promotions from third to second class, \$200, making an increase of \$1,000 in all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice in the report of the Auditor General some rather peculiar revelations with regard to this branch of the service. I see a list here of 115 officers of this department who have largely supplemented their salaries by sharing in Custom house seizures. Six of those gentlemen have received from this source of revenue a larger sum than their salaries amounted to, I will give you a few of those names, with the amount of salaries received by each, and the amount of their emoluments derived from this source of profit in the Custom house. J. D. L. Ambrose, Appraiser, Montreal, salary \$1,700, share of Custom house seizures \$1,360.83. C. Baker, Appraiser, Toronto, salary \$1,400, share of Customs seizures \$587.28.

C. Banting, landing waiter, Woodstock, Ont., salary \$600, share of Customs seizures \$1,280.63, somewhat more than double his salary. Mr. Benson, collector of Customs at Windsor, Ont., salary \$1,800, share of Customs seizures \$838.04. J. D. Bonness, special preventive officer, salary \$900, share of Customs seizures \$841.53. Wm. Cowan, Customs clerk, Windsor, Ont., salary \$1,200, share of Customs seizures, \$573.25. J. Douglas, Customs surveyor, Toronto, salary \$2,000, share of Customs seizure, \$321.41. A. Drouillard, landing waiter of Windsor, Ont., salary, \$500, share of Customs seizures \$644.53. George Frye, Customs surveyor, Victoria, B. C., salary \$1,800, share of Customs seizures \$1,529.01. A. Girard, Customs clerk, Montreal, salary \$800, share of Customs seizures, \$1,307.75. J. A. Gross, special Customs officer, salary \$1,200, share of Customs seizures, \$1,902.23. T. A. Heffernane, collector of Customs, Guelph, salary \$1,200, share of Customs seizures, \$507.50. R. Hunter, sub-collector of Customs, Stickeen, salary \$1,600, share of Customs seizures, \$457.11. H. Jokish, Customs clerk, Montreal, salary \$900, share of Customs seizures \$712.02. J. W. Laing, preventive officer, Windsor, Ont., salary \$550, share of Customs seizures, \$284.17. C. W. Lewis, landing waiter, Fort Erie, salary \$600, share of Customs seizures \$417.18. A. R. Milne, Customs appraiser, Victoria, B. C., salary \$1,600, share of Customs seizures \$5,555.54. S. W. McMichael, Customs financial inspector, salary \$1,600, share of Customs seizures \$6,020.84. J. C. Newbury, Customs clerk, Victoria, B. C., salary \$1,000, share of Customs seizures \$500. W. J. O'Hara, chief Customs clerk, Montreal, salary \$2,000, share of Customs seizures, \$1,641.07. P. J. O'Keefe, special Customs agent, salary \$1,200; share of Customs seizures \$641.41. Thomas Sargent, Customs appraiser Toronto, salary \$1,600; share of Customs seizures \$312.82. J. Shaughnessy, special preventive officer, salary \$600, share of Customs seizures \$536.06. J. A. Van Ingen, Customs collector, Woodstock, Ontario, salary \$1,200, share of Customs seizures \$1,280.63. R. G. Warren, Customs officer, Fort Erie, salary \$1,050, share of Customs seizures, \$454.91. These are a few instances collected from this list of 115 officers of Customs who largely supplement their salaries, and in some cases get two or three times as much as their salaries amount to from their share of Customs seizures. I imagine that those officers are specially careful to discharge that particular part of their business, and that their energies will be directed mainly to the business of making seizures. It strikes me that there is danger that these men may in some cases entrap importers into difficulties of this kind for the purpose of pouncing upon them and making seizures of their invoices so as to get their portion of the spoil. It occurs to me that this is a most vicious system. It must, I imagine, lead on the part of these officers to a particular care that they will discharge this kind of duty which neither the public nor the Government expect of them. I hear in various parts of the country complaints as to the characteristics of the Customs officers. It is said that they are in the habit of treating importers as men who are natural-born scoundrels requiring to be watched, and not entitled to the ordinary business courtesy that one business man extends to another. This system is practically productive of such a result. It is exactly the system to create a class of officials in the service who will be exacting, tyrannical and inclined to make seizures upon the slightest pretext. The importer is, in a measure, at the mercy of these officers. He presents his invoices, and if the official chooses to make a seizure the importer has no remedy. The case is referred of course to the head of the department, who will naturally feel inclined to sustain his own officials, and, in the great majority of cases, will do so when the circumstances will give the least excuse for doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. The system promotes tyrannical conduct on the part of the officials of the Government. It is in every respect a most vicious system, and these men will pay more attention to their own interest in the matter of making seizures than they will to the public interest. Wherever it is possible for them they will prey upon the individuals who are so unfortunate as to be called upon to do business with them. I hold that these men should be debarred from participating in the profits of those seizures. It is no part of their duty, and it has the tendency to prevent them faithfully discharging their real duties. I do not believe that any great commercial country in the world encourages a system of this kind which is in force in the Customs Department of this country, and I think it is desirable that a change should be made in the regulations of the Customs Department in this respect.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I quite agree with most of the remarks made by my hon. friend on the other side of the House in connection with this matter. This system is a most vicious one, and living, as I do, on the frontier, I have an opportunity of knowing it. I may say that some of those officers whose names have been read out, appear in last year's Public Accounts as deriving not less than \$11,000 in the shape of seizures, salaries and travelling expenses. Some of them \$9,000. They are planted everywhere in this country, and they deal very unfairly with importers. I have known them in my town to go in and compel druggists to remove the bottles from their shelves, and to make them go to the cellars and spend two days' time in unearthing invoices for years back, without discovering one jot or tittle of evidence that they were dishonest in their dealings. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that some check should be put upon men whose only object is to have this power placed in their hands, in order to get money out of the public whether rightly or wrongly.

Mr. FOSTER. If a discussion is to be raised on this subject, had we not better let it stand until the Minister is present.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no objection to let it stand after I make my brief statement. I am much obliged to my hon. friend on my right for bringing this matter up. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen who were in the last House, and those who were in the previous House, that ever since the Consolidated Customs Act was passed in 1882 or 1883, I fought, step by step, and stage by stage its objectionable features, the most objectionable feature of which was this very feature of allowing the officials of the Customs houses to participate in the seizure of goods. Hon. gentlemen have mentioned some cases, and it would take all night to repeat the history of the gross acts of injustice that have been perpetrated—not against the roguish importers, but against many of the most honest importers in the Dominion. Some of the first men in trade in Montreal have been arraigned before the courts on the merest possible suspicion, and these men have been discredited before the public. There have been, occasionally, cases where frauds have been discovered, and it was the business of these officials to find those out, whether they participated in the profits or not. But I will relate a case which is worse than any of them. There was the celebrated case of Ayers & Co., in which the seizures amounted to over \$400,000, and in which the profits to those officers, it is said, would have been nearly \$100,000. They allowed Messrs. Ayers & Co., after they had gone to the department and told them what they were doing, and asked their opinion about the construction of the statute—allowed them to go on, year after year, and import goods and enter them, as stated, and accepted by the department, and then came down and seized those goods from them, although they had full knowledge of the fact, after years of such entries.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. MULOCK. And so did the Minister know it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, the Minister knew it; and they allowed them to import those goods until they amounted to \$400,000 or \$500,000, and then they came down and closed up the establishment, took the company's books, papers and property, and discredited them before the world, not only on this side of the line, but on the other; and if these men had not been in the strongest and wealthiest position, the company would possibly have been brought to ruin. That case was tried in the Supreme Court of the Dominion, and I refer you to the shorthand notes of what the Chief Justice of that court said of Mr. O'Hara, who occupies a prominent position in the Custom house of Montreal, and who was to participate in this large amount of money. There you can see what Chief Justice Ritchie says, using the strongest possible language of condemnation of those men for leading a respectable firm on year after year with the knowledge that they were entering goods in a certain way, with the knowledge of the Government and its officers, and as they, the importers believed, according to the statute. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Customs is not here. I regret to say this behind his back; but he knows that time and again I have addressed him from my place in this House about the iniquities of this system, not only during the passage of the Act, but also last year, and every time the Customs Act has come up. It is time that this injustice should be put a stop to; and while I quite agree with the hon. Finance Minister that it would be well to have this matter stand over until the responsible officer is here, yet when the matter was started, feeling that I had for years endeavored to get these abuses remedied, I felt it my duty to add my voice against the iniquitous system perpetrated by these officers, and which is sanctioned and allowed by the Government of the day.

Department of Postmaster General..... \$184,960

Mr. FOSTER. In this department there is a net decrease of \$715. The increases are 134 statutes at \$50, twelve at \$30, two first class clerks \$2,800, one second class clerk at \$1,100, making \$10,960. The decreases are one chief clerk \$2,400, one chief clerk for three months who has been superannuated \$600, difference in salary \$400, two second class clerks \$2,800, difference in salaries of nineteen clerks \$5,399, difference in salaries of four packers \$150, making the total decrease \$11,675.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one matter, I presume, I might as well bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General now as at any other time, that is, in reference to letters not sufficiently prepaid. Under the regulation of the department at present, such letters are sent to the dead letter office, and a notice is sent to the party to whom the letter is addressed that a letter is there, and he is required to send the deficiency in postage to the dead letter office, and after a good deal of circumlocution he gets his letter. It seems to me it is a very absurd system. It strikes me it would be better to send the letter to the person to whom it is addressed with the shortage stated upon it, and require him to pay it. It may be a letter of importance, and it appears to me that it would serve the department as well to take that course.

Mr. HAGGART. That matter I have been considering for some time. You will remember that in a debate in the House the present system was insisted upon for this reason, that it was felt that it would not be judicious to trust clerks in the post offices, who might be acquainted with individuals to whom letters were addressed, and allow them to open letters, and it was decided that it was better to send them to a central office and have them redirected. The difficulty could be got over by another system, that is, the American system. Under that system, if a letter is insuffi-

ciently prepaid, notice is sent from the place where it is posted to the individual to whom the letter is addressed, stating that upon his remittance of the amount necessary to cover the postage the letter will be forwarded. The objection to that plan is that it is impossible to keep track of the accounts of the different offices throughout the country, and the expense of keeping these small accounts far exceeds the amount of revenue collected.

Mr. CHARLTON. If there is so much difficulty in settling this matter, probably the better way would be just to send the letter on. I do not suppose the department would lose more than a few dollars at the utmost by doing so.

Mr. HAGGART. The same objection would apply if the letter were sent on not sufficiently prepaid, and the office at which it arrived was given the duty of collecting the sum of money. Accounts would have to be kept and considerable difficulty would arise in that respect.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has no account to be kept in the case of a dead letter?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; they are under direct control here, and there is a check which is the simplest and cheapest that possibly could be adopted.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a system that entails great loss of time in the delivery of the letter. It seems to me it involves a great amount of clerical work to send a letter to the dead letter office, then to send word to the person to whom the letter is addressed requiring him to write a letter to the dead letter office covering a remittance, and finally to send on the letter. I do not understand why the shortage could not be charged to the person to whom the letter is addressed, and require the post office of his locality to collect it.

Mr. HAGGART. I am considering that question at present for the purpose of reaching a solution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that in former times the custom suggested by my hon. friend was adopted without material inconvenience. That was to send forward letters that were insufficiently prepaid, provided they had any stamp on them at all, and the shortage was collected from the parties to whom they were addressed. That did not add materially to the expense of the post office.

Mr. HAGGART. It did not, but, unfortunately, it added a good deal to the cost of getting returns from the different post offices, which was greatly in excess of the extra amount collected.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the first time we have had an opportunity of addressing the hon. gentleman in relation to his department, and as his appointment is one of the few which the Government has made in past years that I approve of—there are one or two more, but they are not very numerous,—I take this opportunity of asking him what truth there is in the rumor which has appeared in some Government papers in relation to making a uniform rate of postage between Canada and the United States. It was stated in the Government organs the Postmaster General was considering the desirability of reducing the postage in Canada, from three to two cents so as to make it uniform with that of the United States. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what progress he has made in that direction.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was not in the House, perhaps, yesterday or the day before, when the question was asked and I answered it. I stated that it was not at present the intention of the Government to reduce the postage from three to two cents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very sorry for it. I would like to see so popular a man as my hon. friend, I believe, will make himself, inaugurate his promotion to so important an

office by making a reform which would be so much appreciated by the general public.

Mr. ELLIS. I perceive quite a difference in the way the Estimates are brought down this year compared with last. Last year they were all under sub-heads; this year they are grouped together. Does that point to a change in the mode of carrying on business in the Post Office.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Before we leave the question of postage and the reduction of rates, I would ask the hon. the Postmaster General if he has considered the propriety of increasing the weight of a letter from half an ounce to an ounce? I think the American system allows an ounce instead of half an ounce for the two cents. I think he might perhaps see his way towards making that concession in the public interest. I presume it would not involve a very large sacrifice, and, in many cases, it would be found a convenience to business men.

Mr. HAGGART. There are a good many changes proposed, which I intend to introduce in a Bill this Session, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that the change suggested by him is one of those I intend to adopt.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec) I would draw the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to a great complaint with reference to dutiable mail matter. Formerly the duties were collected at the Post Office, but now they are collected at the Custom house. A book, for instance, comes through the mail from a foreign country, which is worth about 25 cents. Instead of delivering the book to the party to whom it is addressed and collecting the duty from him at the Post Office, the party receives through the Post Office a notice from the Custom house informing him that there is a dutiable package for him at the Custom house. He has, therefore, to go to the Custom house, which is often a mile or more away, and pay cab hire there and back, besides the 15 per cent. duty, all to obtain a book which is worth about 25 cents. I do not blame the Postmaster General for this system, and I am glad to say that, on my writing to him on the subject, he answered that he shared my views. I saw in some of the papers that the system had been put an end to, but very lately it was applied to myself, so that it is evidently still in existence. I am quite sure it costs the Government three times more than they get from it. I have taken the trouble to get information as to how it is worked. The last book I received through the mail I paid eight cents duty on, and in order to collect that the Government had to make the following entries:—At the post office, after the book arrived, the post office people had to get a receipt from the Custom house officer to whom it was sent. That officer had to make an entry in his books of his receipt of the book; then he had to write a note to me informing me that such a book was there. That notice was sent through the post office. After receiving it I paid twenty-five cents to go to the Custom house and twenty-five cents to return, and all to get a book worth fifty cents. I do not see that there can be much difficulty in altering the system. One of the post office clerks might be entrusted with the duty of collecting those small amounts.

Mr. BURDETT. I would take the liberty of suggesting to the hon. the Postmaster General, the propriety of having the postmasters, in places where the people have boxes, to place in those boxes all unstamped letters, which bear on their face the names of the parties sending them, in order that those parties might sufficiently stamp them, or where the parties are going to the post office two, three or four times a day, to notify them that their letters are insufficiently stamped. It not unfrequently happens in matters of importance, where persons or firms have important matters



to attend to, that there is insufficient postage, and, before the letters reach them from the dead letter office, the time for attending to the important matter has passed. It has happened in my own case that letters containing important legal documents have been insufficiently stamped, sometimes a week has elapsed before I would hear from the dead letter office; and the rule might come up on the second day after the notice was mailed, and had consequently been delayed.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), I may say that there is a great deal in what he has stated as to the annoyance which has been caused by such practices as those to which he referred. I have been endeavoring to remedy that, but there has been a good deal of difficulty in consequence of the friction between the Post Office Department and the Customs.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry to hear that there is trouble in the Cabinet.

Mr. HAGGART. We have been trying to arrange this matter satisfactorily, and I propose to introduce in the Bill which I intend to move this Session two clauses to remedy the difficulty which the hon. gentleman speaks of. As to the point raised by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett), I have given instructions to the postmasters that, where the senders' name is on the envelope when there is not sufficient postage, and the senders have boxes in the city, they are to give notice to them and allow them to put on the stamp and then let the letter be forwarded.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there were 17 superannuations in this department last year. A year ago I asked the Postmaster General to find out the amount that had been allowed to the postmaster at Victoria, who was superannuated last year in order to make room for an hon. gentleman who once sat in this House. He stated that the superannuation allowance and the salary granted would not exceed the amount which had been paid to the postmaster in that city. I find that the postmaster was getting \$2,400 a year salary, and that the Government have allowed him \$672 as a retiring allowance. They are paying the new postmaster \$2,000 a year, so that the amount now paid is \$2,672, whereas it was only \$2,400 before. I find that there have been no less than 64 superannuations this year, and that the superannuation fund has been drawn on to the extent of \$27,000 for the superannuations of this year, in addition to those of last year. As I said, there were 17 superannuations in the Post Office Department, and I see that there are eleven positions occupied by parties who were superannuated which have yet to be filled. I desire to know if it is the intention of the Postmaster General to fill all the vacancies created by superannuation, or if it is the intention to abolish some of them?

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman mean that there is a difference of eleven vacancies between the Estimates and the number of clerks I have? I do not require so many third-class clerks as I did before. I think, though, that those to whom the hon. gentleman is referring are the ocean mail clerks, who were superannuated, as there was no further use for them. That was something which took place before I entered into office. I do not remember more than one superannuation since I have been in the office.

Mr. BURDETT. While thanking the Postmaster General for having already acted upon the suggestion which I brought forward, I would call his attention to another matter which has been the subject of some correspondence between myself and his department, and I think also with the Principal of the Deaf and Dumb Institute at Belleville, as to the rate of postage which is charged upon the examination

Mr. BURDETT.

questions and answers of the pupils in that and similar institutions. The only means that parents, who have children who are unfortunate enough to be born deaf and dumb, have to know what progress they make is by being able to scan the questions and answers of their children during the time they are pupils at the institute. Formerly the questions and answers were to be permitted to be sent through the post office at a very low rate—I think one cent. That practice prevailed for some years, and was found eminently satisfactory. A different system has recently been adopted, by which a much higher rate has been charged on these questions and answers. They are, you may say, in the shape of printed or manuscript matter, and the charge to the Government would be very small if they permitted them to go to the parents from the institute, under the hand of the principal, free of postage, or at most for one cent postage. It certainly is a matter which I believe should engage the attention of the hon. gentleman. These institutes through the country are doing a large amount of good. A great many young people, afflicted or deprived of certain faculties as they have been, are being educated, informed and made useful and prosperous citizens by means of these institutes. The Provincial Governments have been at great expense in building and maintaining these institutes, and so far they have worked well in the interest of the country and of the pupils. I believe the Principal of the Belleville Institute has corresponded with the Postmaster General on this matter, and I ask the hon. gentleman to consider it as he is considering other matters in his department, and to have an order passed by which the questions put to the pupils by their teachers in the institute and the answers to the questions may be sent home to the parents of the children either free of postage or at a very low postage rate. I do not believe that any member of this House or any man in the country would take exception to such a course. It is a matter in which we are all interested as citizens, and we all ought to be willing that the Postmaster General should permit these questions and answers to be sent home to the parents of the children as cheaply as possible, if not free. No abuse could arise, in my opinion, if they were sent free, because they could be sent under the frank of the principals, and they are men whose characters are above reproach, and who are above making any improper use of any authority which might be given to them in this way. I had intended to move for returns of correspondence on this matter, but possibly it is more convenient for the hon. gentleman and myself to mention it now, and it will occupy less time.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not at present remember what the correspondence was, but the duties of the Postmaster General are ministerial, they are fixed by statute, and he cannot make exceptions. It would be a dangerous power to give him.

Mr. BURDETT. But I understand the hon. gentleman is going to change the statute.

Mr. HAGGART. I am; but I have not thought of this matter in connection with it.

Mr. BURDETT. I hope you will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like the Postmaster General to state exactly what is done with a sum of \$162,000, which I dare say he will remember is carried forward to the credit of next year. The actual deficit in the working of the Post Office for 1888, as he, no doubt, is aware, was \$729,000. But by bringing forward a certain sum which appears there to have been retained, as I understand, by certain of the post office officials, five-quarters, so to speak, are put into the year 1888. Now, what I particularly want to know is whether that money has been paid into the Treasury whereas it formerly was not paid in, or whether it simply exists in the form of an alteration in the book accounts. The reason I ask is because I notice in the

statement of the Post Office in the Public Accounts that the total sum deposited to the credit of the Receiver General up to the 30th June, 1888, is \$2,216,000, and immediately below there is this sum of \$162,000, which he will find on page 16 of the Public Accounts, No. 3. Immediately below is this sum, which, so far as I can understand, does not appear to have been placed to the credit of the Receiver General, or to have come in cash.

Mr. HAGGART. The balance due by the postmasters throughout the country, the alteration of the time at which they made their returns, threw five quarters into one year instead of four.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman has not looked into it, it can be investigated in the Public Accounts Committee; I just mention to him what I want to understand. Apparently from this statement, all that actually went to the credit of the Receiver General was the sum I stated, and I want to know whether the other sum has gone in cash, or whether it simply exists in the form of a book credit? He can let me know when we meet in the Public Accounts.

Mr. HAGGART. I will let you know. It must be a cash sum, I think, because it is included in the revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not so appear in this case.

Department of Agriculture..... \$56,270

Mr. FOSTER. There is a net increase of \$5,050. There were 17 statutory increases, two at \$25, two at \$30, and one at \$20. Additional to Mr. Johnson, statistician, \$600; additional to Mr. Pope, \$550; two promotions from third to second class, \$200; new third class clerks, one at \$500, one at \$450, four at \$730. The decreases are made up of difference between Mr. Low's and Small's salaries, \$475; two third-class clerks not filled, \$800; one packer, not filled, \$300; difference between Mr. Small's and Mr. Lynch's salaries, \$575. Total decrease, \$2,150, leaving a net increase of \$5,050. It is only fair to state that a large part of this increase is made up by a decrease in contingencies, some of these being officers who have long been employed and paid from contingencies, and who have in this estimate been made permanent, the sums being deducted from the contingencies as the House will see.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like some explanation as to the increase in Mr. Johnson's salary. And why did the Government deem it necessary to increase his salary? It would appear that he has not been in the service very long, and therefore could hardly claim that he was entitled to that increase.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Johnson was employed in the first instance at the salary we now vote for him. He filled the place of Mr. Layton, who was at the head of that branch before he died, some 12 months ago. Mr. Layton's salary was \$1,800, but the salary given to Mr. Johnson was \$2,400, the maximum of a chief clerk. Mr. Johnson is one of our very best statisticians, and we thought his services well worth the amount of money we give him. He was paid that last year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand that the previous officer who occupied that position was not an efficient officer? That he did not do his work well? If he did his work well why was he paid less than Mr. Johnson is paid?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Layton, the previous officer, was certainly a very good man, a very efficient man, but he had not the general knowledge and information in regard to statistics that Mr. Johnson has. I believe there is no man in Canada who has more general knowledge as to statistics

than Mr. Johnson, and we were glad to secure his services at the head of that particular branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are two alterations here of considerable moment. I see a reduction of \$400 here under the heading of chief clerk. Has an officer been superannuated?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Small comes up and becomes chief clerk and secretary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has become of the previous chief clerk?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Taché was superannuated, Mr. Lowe went in deputy head, and Mr. Small took his place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of the increase of the deputy commissioner of patents? Last year \$2,250 were asked for him, and now \$2,800, an increase of \$550.

Mr. CARLING. That was the salary that was paid to the late Mr. Cambie, and the Act passed last Session fixed the salary of the deputy commissioner of patents at \$2,800. Mr. Cambie only received this salary mentioned by the hon. gentleman. He was voted the difference between the salary of Mr. Cambie, and the vote fixed last year by Act of Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who is the officer now?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Pope.

Mr. McMULLEN. What Pope is that?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Had this Pope been in the service before?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What position did he occupy in the service?

Mr. CARLING. He was Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Oh, I think I have heard of him, then. Would the Minister give us to understand that it is on account of services rendered to the Government that he receives his increased salary, or that he was simply transferred from one position to another in order to give him an increased salary?

Mr. CARLING. This is not an increase of salary. This is the amount voted him last Session by an Act passed by Parliament.

Mr. WILSON. Did he get it last Session?

Mr. CARLING. He was paid it last year.

Mr. WILSON. I understood that this increased amount of \$550 was not asked from the House, that the item was dropped. We so understood it, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman shakes his head. If the Government feel that Mr. Pope did them a special service we may yet find that the Ministers have paid it out of their own pockets, recognising, as they ought to recognise, the fact that Mr. Pope did them a special service. I repeat that I understood that the item was dropped. If during last year only \$2,250 was voted, how can the Minister state that they paid Mr. Pope an increased sum of \$550? I should like to have the hon. gentleman explain the matter.

Mr. CARLING. The best explanation I can give I have already given, namely, that his salary was fixed by Act of Parliament at \$2,800, and he has been paid that salary in accordance with that Act.

Mr. MILLS. Was he appointed at that time?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite aware that the statement made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is cor-

rect. Last year a Bill was brought in; a very extended discussion took place over it, and the result was that the First Minister, who is not now in his place, withdrew the Bill in order to get on with business, and it was not again brought before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It was the previous year it was dropped out of the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, it was last year; I would not be certain, but my impression is so. This is the third attempt to increase the salary of Mr. Pope, and I would suggest that if the Government wish to get through a vote to increase his salary in the present Parliament, the best course they can adopt, in view of our recollection of the irregularities in the gazetting of members, is to change his name, and then they may possibly be able to get through quietly a Bill to increase his salary. It is undoubtedly objectionable to the Opposition to be asked to quietly consent to an increase in the case of this man. We have very vivid recollections of the irregularities in the gazetting of members after the last election, and we cannot be expected to forget or forgive the conduct of that man. It is our duty to bring the matter pointedly before the House as well as before the country in order to warn any man who permits himself to be made the tool of any Government for the time being that his case will receive special attention when he applies to Parliament for an increase of salary. We do not want unreasonably to pounce on Mr. Pope, but we cannot forgive and will not forget for years his action in regard to the gazetting. We have now the same strong objection to granting an increase to his salary as we had when it was brought before the House before. It appears on the face of it as a reward for conduct decidedly objectionable to us although it might be pleasing to hon. gentlemen opposite, and it cannot be expected that we will quietly sit and permit a Bill or resolution to pass and to forget and forgive the injustice done to us at the last election in the gazetting of the returns of representatives of the people. It is quite clear that that gentleman has been removed from the position he occupied owing to the irregularities having taken place, and had he continued to discharge the duties of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery we would have looked forward to similar irregularities occurring again. The First Minister deemed it to be his duty to remove him and give him another position, and then he brought a resolution before the House to increase Mr. Pope's salary. That resolution was withdrawn when first presented; whether it was passed last Session I am not positive, but I am under the impression it was not. At any rate we cannot be expected to sit quietly here and allow an increase to be granted to a man for whom we have the utmost contempt for the course taken by him in connection with the gazetting of the returns of members at the last election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is greatly to be regretted that this party should have been retained in the public service. Two years ago his conduct was made the subject of discussion; an explanation was demanded from him by the House for his gross disregard of the provisions of the Election Law and of his duties under that law. He sent down to the House a statement utterly devoid of truth, one which upon the face of it disclosed the fact that he had the effrontery to make an indecently false statement to this House. The Government came down a few weeks later with a proposal to add \$400 or \$500 to Mr. Pope's salary, to increase his salary as Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to increase the salary of a man who showed such utter disregard of the duties which devolve upon him under the law. It was perfectly obvious to every member on both sides of the House that this proposed increase of Mr. Pope's salary was a reward for his misconduct in office, that there was an attempt made on the part of hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches to

Mr. McMULLEN.

reward a man who was guilty of this conduct and who by that malfeasance of office had interfered with the rights and liberties of the electors of this country. There can be no doubt of that. We find then, Sir, when the Government were compelled on that occasion to withdraw the proposal to increase Mr. Pope's salary in order to get along with the public business, that they undertake to keep what seems to be their engagements with Mr. Pope by transferring him from that office to another office and by increasing his salary from \$2,250 to \$2,800. Now, I say that a grosser and more flagrant act of misconduct on the part of a public officer cannot well be conceived; a gross act of misconduct that is only surpassed by the proposition of the Government to reward him for his misconduct in this particular way. I regret, Sir, that the duty of submitting an estimate of this sort should devolve upon the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Agriculture. I am of opinion, and I hope I do the hon. gentleman no more than justice to say, that his sense of justice must have revolted at a proposition of this sort. Why, Sir, every member in this House knows that Mr. Pope, under the Act, is required to gazette the returns of members to this House in the order in which he receives them. Every member on both sides of this House knows that Mr. Pope did not do that. We know that he did this: that he purposely withheld the returns which he received from being gazetted, and that the result was that he gave, in some instances, those who were opposed to the members returned at least thirty days longer than the law gave them to protest the elections. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was not gazetted for four weeks after the returns received by Mr. Pope, and I myself was not gazetted for upwards of four weeks after that return was in his hands. Other hon. gentlemen were treated in exactly the same way. There were eighty members on this side of the House who were not gazetted as the law required they should be gazetted. We suppose that this House represents the people. We suppose that the electors are upon a footing of equality, and that the members returned to this House are upon a footing of equality before the law. I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to put themselves in our places. Our whole system of responsible government is a system of forbearance. It is necessary that the hon. gentlemen who command the majority in this House should deal fairly and honestly with those who are in the minority, and that they, above all others, should see that the protection that the law intended should be given to the minority, is extended to them. I want to know in what way those hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches have discharged this part of their duty. I want to know if they were on this side of the House, and we were on that side of the House, whether they would be willing that the opportunities for contesting their elections should be extended for three or four weeks beyond the time fixed by law. I want to know whether they would be satisfied with the conduct of this public officer who is sworn to discharge the duties that the law imposes upon him, and that the First Minister who would lead us should enter into a contract with that officer, that he should disregard his oath of office, that he should deal unfairly and unjustly with the Opposition, and that he should extend the time that the law gave for enquiring into the due returns of these members, and that he should receive a reward of \$400 or \$500 a year as compensation for his infamy and misconduct in that matter. This is in effect what the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have done, and this is in effect what the Administration has made the hon. Minister of Agriculture do in this instance. The hon. Minister says that this appropriation was provided for by law. If it were so it would not be in those estimates. It would be a statutory appropriation.

Mr. CARLING. It is a statutory appropriation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it should not be here. The hon. gentleman will see that he is giving to this officer \$550,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Take off the thousand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should say \$550 a year more than he received before; more than the officer who preceded him in office, and more than is given to any chief clerk in any other department of the Government. Why, Sir, what construction is to be put upon that? It is simply this: that this officer, or any public officer who chooses to be guilty of malfeasance in office as a servant of the Government, and in the interest of the Government, and against the opponents of the Government, may look to the Government for the reward of his infamy. I, Sir, as a representative of the people in this House, protest against this conduct. I protest against it as utterly subversive of the principles of parliamentary government, and I trust that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House, who wishes to see the law fairly administered will give his countenance and support to a proposition that is so monstrous in itself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If it is a statutory allowance that \$2,800 must be given to the occupant of that office, but the gentleman who now occupies it should never have been appointed. That is the ground we take. We hold on this side of the House, and we think gentlemen on the other side of the House should hold, that when a public servant has been convicted of such dereliction of duty amounting to a positive malfeasance of office as that gentleman was proved to have been guilty of on the floor of this Parliament, he should be punished, and when it was impossible for any Minister in the House to rise to defend his conduct or a single soul of all the supporters of the Government to say one word in justification of what he had done, then, Sir, I say it was conclusively proved that he was not a fit subject for promotion. It is an outrage on this Parliament and nothing short of an outrage. It is an outrage on decency that the Government should come down with a proposition to raise the salary of this individual.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And to make him a judge too.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Sir, consider the position he was in. Occupying a judicial office and sworn to do his duty, he received the returns sent to him by the different returning officers. His sworn duty was to gazette the returns of those members as they came to him. It was evident on the face of it that instead of doing what the law required, he selected the Conservatives and gazetted their returns immediately, but in the case of the Liberals, the opponents of the Government, he deliberately let their returns lie for week after week, week after week, and week after week, till it ran to three or four weeks in some cases. I, myself, on coming to Parliament, had to take the precaution to bring the certificate of the returning officer in my pocket, for I was not sure whether I would be permitted on the floor of this House at all, my return not having been gazetted until, I believe, the Saturday before the House opened. Sir, it is not personal animosity in this case, but the interest of the country demands that this matter shall be denounced. It is only common justice, and the purity of the country demands that this thing shall be denounced, and denounced at every Session and at every opportunity as long as the Government persist in what they are now doing. Why, Sir, the Minister told us to-night in reference to another gentleman who occupied a position in the Civil Service that he had been reduced from the rank of chief clerk to a lower rank. Then, Sir, there is such a thing as promotion by way of degradation of rank known to the Government. I would ask what the gentleman was guilty of, that he was lowered to an inferior rank? I am not in a position to say what he was guilty of, but I venture to say it was impossible for him to have been guilty of a fouler

transaction than this man was guilty of whose salary we are now asked to increase. I make these remarks, and I make them somewhat warmly, not on my own account, for I have no feeling of revenge against him, but I say he outraged the principles of common fairness, of common justice, and of common decency. It is little short of an outrage on Parliament to ask us to increase his salary as a reward for such services as he may have rendered in the interest of anyone be he who he might. The Government should be above taking advantage of services rendered in such a way. But, Sir, when we find they were sitting there without defending the man who was not present to defend himself, we were forced to attack him. He had committed the offence, and their duty was to have defended him if his conduct was capable of defence. Incapable of defending him, as they proved themselves to be, I ask what is their effrontery in coming forward and asking this Parliament, year after year, to sanction an increase of salary to that man, whose conduct not one of them dared to defend when it was challenged in this House.

Mr. TUPPER. I think hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the two hon. gentlemen who last addressed this Committee, have entirely forgotten the facts connected with the case they pretend now to discuss. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated that, so far as his recollection went, nothing had been said on this side of the House, when this man's conduct was arraigned and when his character was violently assailed, as it has been assailed to-night, on a basis largely and chiefly composed of the suspicions of hon. gentlemen opposite. Just after they came from the country, smarting under a defeat, and found themselves to their surprise and chagrin in a very large minority, those gentlemen suspected that some man must have been guilty of great misconduct for their being placed in such a position; and when they found that certain prominent hon. gentlemen on the ministerial side of the House were first gazetted, and many prominent gentlemen on the other side were gazetted later, their suspicion was that that must have been the result of a plot.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So it was.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen have no proof of that. They sat there as a responsible Opposition. They sat there with certain powers under the Rules of this House, and to this day they have been able to do no more than produce those returns in the *Gazette*, and on that basis charge this man with all the crimes in the calendar. I was able myself on that occasion to point out—as merely a coincidence, and to show that their presumption was not altogether sound—that because these returns appeared in the way they described them, misconduct or malfeasance occurred—I was able to point out that, in 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, the same irregularities to some extent occurred; prominent members on their side of the House were first gazetted, and prominent members in the Opposition were gazetted last. I pointed out that there were many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—myself and my colleague from Pictou among the number—who were gazetted among the last, although our returns were received among the first. I was not suspicious of the existence of the reason which hon. gentlemen opposite suspected, and yet I had just as much right so to do. I think it unfair, unmanly, and beneath the dignity of members of this House to charge this man in the way these hon. gentlemen have done. He has not had a fair trial, and has not been proved guilty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why not give a commission?

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman keep cool? What I say is that until that charge is brought home to that officer in a proper, British, manly way, these hon. gentlemen should satisfy themselves with their suspicion,

and keep that suspicion to themselves. Why, after several years have elapsed since all these horrible misdeeds have occurred, are we treated with these charges again? Why do hon. gentlemen fling them again and again before the people? They repeated them on the hustings in various Provinces, and a great deal of space has been occupied in the newspapers with them, and why should the business of the country be delayed while they repeat the old charges and rake up an old debate that is gone and past? The House has expressed its opinion on the matter; the people, on different occasions, have expressed their opinion; and the result has been the same in the country as in the House. The majority of the bye-elections have sustained the Government; the Government is responsible for this man, and the House has declared its opinion on the question.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** I am certainly somewhat surprised at the coolness and effrontery of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper). Sir, he does credit to his ancestor who could with the boldest effrontery get up and call white black and black white. I had great respect for that hon. gentleman's audacity as for his ability, and I am gratified to find in the hon. gentleman a worthy descendant of his father. For a young gentleman to get up in this House and coolly charge hon. gentlemen on this side with first bringing charges that were baseless—

**Mr. TUPPER.** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** True, there was no charge tried, Government refused a committee to try it; but when this matter first came up charges were boldly made against both the officer and against the Government. It will be in the memory of the House that I stated that I believed that the First Minister, and I told him so at the time, was at the bottom of this plot, in order to try to get myself and others protested against by having our returns kept back for over four weeks after the time they should have been gazetted. Does the hon. gentleman not know that when this very thing occurred, the conduct of this officer was arraigned? He speaks of the thing as having been passed over and tried several Sessions ago. This is only the third Session of this Parliament. We did arraign that officer. We could not arraign the Government, because they had not then been guilty of the outrageous audacity of promoting and increasing the salary of the man who was guilty of that misconduct, but they did so promote him last Session and attempted to increase his salary in which latter they failed. The hon. gentleman says the Government have been sustained in the bye-elections, and on this ground believes that the country has condoned the iniquitous act. We all know that a bye-election is no test of the opinion of the people, because with the powers the Government possess they have always the advantage, and yet they have been beaten in several cases; and my hon. friend gets up and gives that as a reason why this matter should not be brought up to-day. Does the hon. gentleman not know that a committee was moved for by gentlemen on this side of the House last Session, and that that committee was refused by gentlemen occupying seats on the Treasury benches? It comes with a bad grace from the members of the Government to charge us with bringing up an old thing that had been tried and settled, for it has not been tried and it has not been settled. I want to say to the hon. members of the Cabinet that I intend to bring up this question every Session until justice be done to hon. members on this side, and the criminals, whoever they may be, punished. The regular Opposition here may take what course they like, but I tell this House that, every Session, while I hold a seat in it I shall arraign at the bar of public opinion the party that contributed to reward, and the Administration that rewarded, this man and placed him in a better position for his treachery and his treason against right and common justice. The hon. gentle-

**Mr. TUPPER.**

man would have done well to have thought of the position in which he was placing himself when he boldly rose and justified the conduct of this officer, and contended that nothing had been proven against him, but that he was arraigned merely on suspicion. Was it mere suspicion to charge that he had kept the publication of my return back four weeks while he published the returns of other gentlemen which had not come in when mine had been received? Would it have been an injustice if the Government had managed to succeed in bringing about a contestation of my election that might have cost me two or three thousand dollars? That is what the hon. gentleman who leads this Government wished to do in my case particularly, and I will, every Session, arraign the Government on this subject until I rouse public opinion and get justice done.

**Mr. PLATT.** I cannot say that I think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is much more to blame than his colleagues. He is simply a little bolder than the others in defending the act for which they are responsible. The Government as a whole not only defended this man, but rewarded him for the conduct we have been condemning. There is a serious aspect to this question, which it is perhaps of more value to the House to consider than the mere increase of salary. It has been well said that that gentleman now occupies a position of honor and trust in this country—a semi-judicial position. I would like to ask this House, especially those members who believe there was a charge fairly proven against that gentleman two or three years ago, whether they will have any confidence in the transactions he may perform in his new department? I would like to know how many in this House will place any credence whatever in the returns brought down from the Patent Office, especially if they are under the signature of the Commissioner of Patents. It has been stated that nothing has been proven against this gentleman. I may state that I have proved, as conclusively as words and documents can prove, that not only was there malfeasance in the gazettement of the returns of hon. members, but that the return itself, as laid upon the Table of this House, was falsified. I proved that in my individual case, and I proved it by records from the post office, that he falsified the return. That has not been denied, and it just leaves the case in this position: that we have an official in Ottawa occupying a high position of trust, who may be called upon to act in the interest of various people in this country, and in whose conduct the people, judging from his past record, can have no confidence whatever. How are we to know how those who come before him will be treated? Are we sure that those who present their petitions for patents will be considered in the order in which they were presented, or is it likely if two or three come in the same day the one on top will be taken up first and the others laid aside, if we are to judge by the only excuse he made last year, and if a return is brought down by the department can we place any credence in it, especially if it be signed by the Commissioner of Patents? I, for my part, if it were one in which I was deeply interested, would place very little reliance on it.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** As the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has invited the attention of this House to the evidence which was laid before them by my hon. friend, I will refresh his memory and that of the House as to the facts. The facts were, and let the House remember how these facts speak trumpet-tongued of the honesty of the present deputy commissioner of patents and the man who suborned perjury:

On Monday the 7th, sixteen members were returned—eleven Tories and five Reformers. In the *Gazette* of the Saturday following all the Tories were gazetted and but one of the five Reformers. On Tuesday there were fifteen Tories and eleven Reformers returned. In the *Gazette* of the Saturday following the whole of the fifteen Tories were gazetted and but two of the five Reformers. On Wednesday there were sixteen Tories and

four Reformers returned, and on the Saturday following fourteen Tories and one Reformer were gazetted. On Monday there were six Tories and five Reformers returned, and in the *Gazette* of the Saturday following six Tories and not one Reformer were gazetted. On Friday, the day preceding the issue of the *Gazette*, eight Tories and ten Reformers were returned, and there were five Tories, and no Reformers, gazetted. For the week there were fifty-seven Tories and thirty-seven Reformers returned, and of the fifty-seven Tories fifty-two were gazetted, while of the thirty-seven Reformers but five were gazetted.

Does any hon. gentleman mean to tell me, has even the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the sublime audacity to rise up and tell the House that this was an accident? Fifty-two of his friends were returned and gazetted—and but five on this side were returned and gazetted—and this by pure accident; and this accident occurred, not only once or twice or three times, or even six times. The plain facts of the matter, as disclosed by the returns laid on the Table, as proved again and again, were these: that this man, who it is now proposed to reward for deliberate breach of his oath of office with an additional salary of \$700 or \$800 more than he received when he committed that breach, deliberately broke his oath, as we have now clear proof he did, at the instance of Ministers of the Crown. I do not accuse the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because he was not in the Cabinet at the time, but I say the Ministers of the Crown then in the Cabinet were guilty of inciting this man to deliberately violate his oath of office, and that a more disgraceful transaction was never perpetrated in Canada than that now rewarded by a vote of public money. And the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries dares to get up and say that we were afraid to bring this man to trial. The records of the House show that we demanded he should be brought before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that our demand was voted down. If the hon. gentleman desires now to have a public trial, let him grant a committee, and let this man state on oath how he came to make the returns and whether he did this thing on his own motion or at the instance of certain Ministers. I remember challenging the Ministry, and other gentlemen also challenged them, and but one, the Secretary of State, ventured to rise in his place and deny the charge that he had held communication with Mr. Pope on the subject of the returns. My hon. friend is perfectly justified in his remarks. We have the amplest proofs, which no one can pretend to gainsay, that there was no possibility of accident in the gazetting of the returns, but that they were deliberately made, for a dishonest purpose, and no opposition was ever more just than that now offered by us to the rewarding of this man for an act of treachery, and a gross violation of the duties he was sworn to perform.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman might have shown me the courtesy, while speaking in that rather excited manner, when I wished to interpose—since I was foolish enough to imagine he wished to enlighten the House on the whole case—to have allowed me to do so, and to read from the same *Hansard* which he read, in regard to the facts of the last return the evidence as to the dates of the receipt of the returns and their gazetting in 1874. I am not guilty of that sublime audacity, which I think the House generally understands that hon. gentleman himself to have a monopoly of. I am not guilty here of taking the position that the hon. gentleman endeavors to make this House believe I am guilty of doing. What I said, and what I say again—and I hope the hon. gentleman will understand me now—is that suspicion is not proof, that that curious state of affairs which he read from the returns is not evidence and would not be evidence, or that kind of evidence, which would be sufficient in any court of law to hang a cat. The hon. gentleman is not familiar with the rules of evidence. He has shown ignorance, gross ignorance, of all the rules of evidence which obtain in British courts of justice, and it is not sufficient for him to say that he arraigned the Government, and that these statements of his

sufficiently established the guilt of this man. The hon. gentleman should be able to show more than the suspicion brought to his mind by that document. He should have come to this House regularly and in due form, and he and his friends should have taken the proper course when they sought to prove these charges. If we were to infer every matter of wrong-doing which every hon. gentleman opposite may suspect someone to have been guilty of, we could not get on with the business of the country in a year. All hon. gentlemen on that side suspect all hon. gentlemen on this side of doing the most atrocious things; they charge them with doing these things, but the trouble is that very few people in the country agree with them in regard to these charges. If these hon. gentlemen really intend to prove the serious charges they made against Mr. Pope at that time, they should not have been content with the statements made by a member, which simply went to show not Mr. Pope's guilt, but that, in the large number of returns which went to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, his own return was not picked up the first in the heap, they should have come not with their suspicion, but with some solid and substantial evidence sufficient to put the man on his trial. The House decided that, notwithstanding the statements so made, after the letter which Mr. Pope sent in, a long letter which was published in the Votes and Proceedings of 1887, page 186, the latter was consistent with the state of things to which these hon. gentlemen alluded. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny, no one will deny, that the hon. member who last spoke is a hot-headed partisan. Some of his party like that style of a man, but men who calmly consider these facts, men who would act as jurymen in an ordinary criminal trial, after reading the statement which the hon. gentleman just read, and the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery which is recorded in that page, would come to the conclusion that it was quite possible, to say the least, that he was innocent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TUPPER. That is my conclusion, and I am content to leave it to the public to decide again. That is the opinion also of many respectable and well informed people in the different counties in which I have been. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take the trouble to read calmly and carefully the statement of Mr. Pope, together with the returns, and I challenge him then to stand up and say, as he has said, that it is impossible for that statement to be true.

Mr. MITCHELL. During my hon. friend's remarks, he referred to something which occurred in 1874, when Mr. Mackenzie's Government was in power, as justifying the Government in defending Mr. Pope's conduct in this case. This the gentlemen on this side of House deny. I will let both sides of the House fight this out, but, as an independent member, whose election was affected by Mr. Pope's action—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, an independent man—though not very friendly to the Ministry, I admit;—I say it is no justification for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to state that, when my friends on this side were on the Government benches, they treated some one in that way. That is no justification to the public, and it is no satisfactory answer to me. I say, further, that, in my opinion, if it is possible to make out a case against any man short of positive eyesight, or a confession by the man himself of his guilt, that case was made out in this matter. If my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was so satisfied as to the innocence of Mr. Pope, or if the hon. gentleman who leads him was so satisfied of his innocence, why did they rally their forces and prevent Mr. Pope's going before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to have the matter in-

vestigated? We know that all the old gentleman at the head of the Government has to do is to pull the string and up they jump; and so they did then when he pulled the string and prevented his going to the committee. I have no hesitation in saying that my belief is that the hon. gentleman, who is not present now, I am sorry to say, but who leads the Government, would, if this had gone to that committee, have been convicted of a conspiracy to drive some of us out of the House; and, in his own interest, he prevented it. Now he comes to this House and asks Parliament to reward the criminal by increasing his salary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am surprised at the statement which was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when he undertakes to tell this committee that there is no evidence beyond suspicion against Mr. Pope. The evidence which we adduced against Mr. Pope was evidence which would be taken in any court of law to convict any party of any crime, however serious. What is his statement in his defence? He says, in his report to this House, by way of explanation, that, when a few names were left over from one day to the next, the returns which were received in the meantime were put on the top of those which had not been dealt with. If he had done that, what would have followed? It would have resulted that the returns he left over the first day would have been the last to be dealt with. Is that the case? Is there any instance where the return of a member on the other side of the House passed the second week of the *Gazette*? How did he get at those if the others were put on the top of them? It is perfectly obvious that Mr. Pope, in undertaking to explain this matter to the House, made a false statement, and that what he said happened could not have happened in consequence of what he did, if what he did as he reported actually happened. Then the hon. gentleman says that the same thing was done in 1874. There is not a tittle of evidence of the same thing being done in 1874.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say the same thing happened.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, a similar thing.

Mr. TUPPER. I said there were similar instances.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said there were similar grounds of complaint. I deny that any such grounds of complaint existed, but, if they did, that would be no defence whatever for Mr. Pope's conduct. If he was guilty of that conduct on a former occasion it would not be any defence for his conduct now; but there is no evidence whatever of that. The statements adduced by the hon. gentleman before, by way of extenuation of Mr. Pope's offence, do not establish that any former Government had been guilty of what we charge against the hon. gentleman of sustaining Mr. Pope in his conduct, and that is the matter of which we complain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would suggest to my hon friend (Mr. Mills) that a charge of that kind having been made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries against the former Government, it is due to himself and his colleagues and the people who sustained him on that occasion, that he should now get up and challenge the Minister to let the whole matter in reference to 1874 and 1887, go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation.

Mr. TUPPER. Let me set myself right once more. Both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken imagine that I alluded to 1874 as a *tu quoque* argument. I did not. I am not of the opinion that any wrong was done in 1874. I am of opinion, however, that, to some extent, the returns came in in the same way. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I gave the circumstances at the time. The hon. gentleman will remember that he moved for the returns, and on the discussion of his motion I brought before the House the facts which led me to the opinion that something similar

Mr. MITCHELL.

had occurred in 1874, and I stated then that I did not impute wrong either to the officer or to the Government of the day; that it seemed to me that it was possible, with a large number of cases and a large majority of men on one side, that for a long time the names might run in one particular party, with here and there a member of the smaller party. I did not use the weak argument at all of saying that because wrong was done in 1874 the hon. gentlemen should say nothing in 1887. I simply cited it to prove that in both instances it was a mere accident.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to the gazetting of 1873, although the Minister of Marine has spoken of inviting us to a comparison, the Minister must know, as he has been a member of this House for some time, and is now a member of the Government, that the law at that time in reference to protesting elections was very different to what it is now. He knows very well that the Controverted Elections Act was not passed, and that protests were entered after the assembling of Parliament, consequently there could be no inference drawn between the gazetting at that time and at the late election. At that time protests were filed after the assembling of Parliament. Every person against whom a protest was entered had it filed in the same way, so that the cases are not analogous at all. Now, if you look into the returns for evidence of want of fair play on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at the last election, you have only to look at the return that he presented to the House. Now, out of this pile of returns, how does it happen that some that were received earlier were gazetted later? It does not appear to have been a result of chance at all; it appears certainly to have been the result of a deliberate intention on the part of that officer—whoever inspired that officer to act in dereliction of his duty, and in violation of his oath of office, it is not for me to say, but that it was done is a self-evident proposition. Now, I will name a few elections from the list. Take, for instance, the case of Bothwell. The return was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 10th of March, and was not gazetted until the 2nd of April. In the Haldimand election the returns were received on the 18th of March and gazetted on the 19th of March. Now, take the case of South Grey, the return was received on the 16th of March and was not gazetted until the 26th. Here is a return that was received two days before the return of the Haldimand election, but was not gazetted until seven days after the gazetting of the Haldimand election. What does that go to show? It goes to show that the member elected for Haldimand supported the Government; it goes to show clearly that there was collusion between the Government and the officer; it further goes to show that the member who was elected for South Grey did not support the Government, and the consequence was that the gazetting of his return was delayed. Take the case of Wentworth. The return for North Wentworth was received on the 5th of March and was gazetted on the 26th of that month. The member for North Wentworth is Mr. Bain, and he is sitting on this side of the House. The return for the other Wentworth was received on the 7th March, and the member was gazetted on the 12th of March, two weeks sooner, although his return was received two days later than the other. One of these gentlemen supports the Government, and the other is opposed to them. Do you think that was all accident; that there is not evidence of collusion and dishonesty on the part of that officer? Sir, it is clear to me, and I think it is clear to the people of this country, that there was collusion, that there was injustice, that there was a dishonesty on the part of that officer, which was connived at by the Government of this country. It is a sad commentary on the Government of this country, in this age of enlightenment and civilisation, that they should be found to back up

an officer, to increase the salary of an officer, who has been proved to be so derelict in his duty. There is the Minister of Agriculture who used to pose as honest John Carling. Look at the idea of honest John Carling raising the salary of a dishonest officer, who has been shown to have violated his oath, and to have proved himself unworthy of his position.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The House can congratulate itself on the fact that while it has the misfortune to have upon this side of the House a new, young, untried member like the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who ventures to be audacious at times, we have an old parliamentarian, a man whose temper is so cool, whose judgment is so well balanced, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who can so nicely rebuke him in such a proper and judicial spirit. It is an evidence that justice can be done even if there be some who speak upon the question with some warmth. It is to be regretted, however, that there are not more judicial minds, that there are not more who can take that high judicial stand, that is taken by the Minister of Marine—I mean on both sides of the House. I notice that there is not another one on the other side of the House possessed of a judicial mind equal in capacity of the task he undertook to-night; that so far we have failed to find one whose judicial mind is balanced precisely the same way as that of the hon. gentleman. They hesitate to endorse his opinion; they have not been quite convinced by his reasoning. But I call attention to this fact, that that gentleman who is possessed of this eminent legal and judicial mind, coming into this case unprejudiced, either one way or the other, has only been able to say with respect to this officer, that there is a possibility that we judged him rather harshly,—that is all that he ventured to say. Well, now, if there is but a possibility that he may not have been as bad as pictured, I would ask, is it not good ground that we should hesitate in advancing his salary until we have a little further investigation of the matter, and ascertain whether that possibility even exists or not? They have been challenged, the Minister has been challenged. He is a member of a government that is all powerful in this House. They have been challenged now. He says the matter has not been proved. We challenge them now to give a committee where they may be examined under oath, the other members of the Government and this official that is charged. Sir, we ask them to give that, and we ask them to withhold any increase of salary, any promotion, any honor to be done to this man that we believe to be guilty of malfeasance in office, until this is done. Will the hon. gentleman, with a calm and judicial mind, and recognising that it would be a proper thing for him to do, that it is the only way that the suspicion can be removed that this man's conduct has excited, and which the hon. gentleman, in his remarks, admits to be suspicious—will he agree to this? He says the evidence that was produced before this House would not be sufficient to hang a cat upon. Well, Sir, it is upon evidence that was adduced before this House that is sufficient for this Government to advance a man to a higher position and salary, and he himself admits that the evidence was so strong that it left a bare possibility that he could offer some excuse some way in mitigation of his conduct. We heard the statement made by a member of this House, that he had the documentary evidence proving, not only malfeasance in not gazetting the returns according to law, but we had the proof on the floor of the House that when he made his return to the House he made a falsified return. The hon. Minister heard that, and yet he says there is a possibility, a bare possibility, that there may be some extenuation of his conduct. If hon. members wish to act in a judicial manner, and have the least respect for this man, it is strange that that hon.

gentleman alone has had the courage to defend his action. Whether it was wise courage on his part or not, time will prove, but his shouldering the matter, and the lame attempt made to furnish an excuse, does not vindicate that man's character against the charges brought against him. There is only one way in which that can be done. Let it form matter for investigation and examination before a committee. Then that man can be put on oath, and the members of the Government can be put on oath, and if it be then found that ill-founded charges have been made, which cannot be substantiated, those who have made them will acknowledge their satisfaction that this officer has been able to prove his innocence. But shirking from that course now, as they have done before, the evidence of which is the fact that they dropped the proposed increase two years ago, wiping it from the Estimates—the hon. gentleman's father consenting to drop it out—because the feeling of the House was so strong that it was an outrage to propose to increase the salary of a man lying under those charges, now the new Marine Minister trusting that time had blunted our memories and made us unmindful of the transactions that had taken place, becomes the first man who has ever ventured to say a word in defence of that officer. The hon. gentleman, however, has not been supported to-night by any other Minister. Hon. members on the other side, ever ready to applaud and to defend almost everything done by the Government, have, on this occasion, proved unequal to the task of defending this officer. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) even has not risen to defend the transaction. It is true he ventured a "hear, hear," but the vast majority of the members opposite never expressed approval of the hon. Minister's remarks. No; I rejoice in this fact, that though the Parliament of Canada did consent to the placing of that gentleman in another position where he received a higher salary, it maintained its character in so far that hon. members did it reluctantly, did it in silence and said nothing in justification of what it had done.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand from the silence of the Government that they do not promise to permit an enquiry into the serious charges again brought to their attention before pressing this increase to a vote. If that is the case, let us see what principle the Government propose to affirm in this action? A former officer of this House, a man who took an oath of office, in which he swore that he would be true and discharge his duties as the law required, is, in consequence of some influence, no doubt the influence of the Administration, which is standing by him to-day, proved guilty in the minds of all reasonable men of having in at least fifty cases violated his oath of office. That charge is brought to the attention of the House; and opportunity is presented for proper judicial enquiry, but the Government using their majority refuses an enquiry. The charge is made by hon. members on the floor of this House, notably by the member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt). He said that in his own knowledge, when certain returns were placed in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that officer denied in the first place the receipt of the returns within the time mentioned. When, however, the evidence of a government office, the post office certificate, was produced, the officer was convicted as having made a misstatement; he then shifted his ground and offered another explanation, namely, that what happened was the result of chance. The second explanation was equally as fallacious as the first. Then the Government came to his rescue, and I assume that from that time forward they bore the whole burden of the charge. At that time the then Minister of Finance had the courage to propose an increase in the officer's salary, but when the charge was brought to his attention, when he saw what the sentiment of the House was, when he found that the Government had



not the courage to permit an investigation, he then adopted the better part of valor and discreetly withdrew the proposition. To-day his successor, not in office but in lineage, younger and rasher perhaps, makes a defence to-day which the then Minister of Finance did not feel himself permitted to do until an investigation was held. Not a member of the Government responsible at that time, however, dares to rise in his place and defend the act. They set up a Minister who is capable of giving negative evidence, that he was not one of the conspirators, and is, therefore, able to make a statement with regard to the matter. He was not in the Government and did not conspire with the officer to do wrong; but I repeat that not a member of the Government of that day dare deny complicity and permit an enquiry, when such Ministers could be placed under oath and compelled to state what they had to do with the matter. I ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs who were then in the Government if they dare deny complicity in this matter. If he were present, I would ask the First Minister, the principal defender in this case, to deny complicity, and to permit enquiry where he could be put on oath. The Government have too many opportunities to defeat the ends of justice by refusing a proper judicial enquiry, and having sheltered this officer they propose to reward his breach of duty and reward him by increasing his salary and permitting him to hold a high judicial position. There are upwards of 5,000 officers under the Government engaged in discharging duties connected with the conduct of public affairs. They are all under obligation to discharge their duties honestly, and many of them have taken a similar oath to that taken by this man. To those 5,000 officers and upwards the Administration have said, in so many words: violate your oath of office, consider perjury as a step in the course of promotion, so long as you serve us in office we will reward you accordingly. What sort of an admission can this be, what must be their views on morality when a government incites to perjury and rewards the perjurer? Of course the reward must follow, the Government must stand by the men who do their wrong doing; but when the hon. Minister of Marine tells us there has been an enquiry, I say, let him tell it to the marines but not to the intelligent people of Canada. The matter has never yet been investigated, and even if it were to be investigated, judging from the extremely judicial spirit manifested by the Minister of Marine, I presume we could very well anticipate the verdict. It would be just such a verdict as was rendered in the case of the hon. member who now sits for Queen's, N. B. Has there ever been a case since the present Government came into office that every man from the second in command down to the lowest in the ranks was not compelled to do exactly what the Premier told him to do? When you outraged public opinion and sealed it with a vote of Parliament, and seated a man who had been rejected by the constituents of Queen's County did not every member on the Government side of the House except two, yield to the tyranny of their chief and vote that the people's representative should be excluded from this House? To the honor of the man thus seated let it be stated that he refused to accept the verdict of the Government and the majority in this House, and abandoned his seat and went back to the people his masters. But that act had the endorsement of the gentlemen opposite as every other act had that was questioned, and as I suppose every other act will have that will continue to be questioned. Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I think it is indecent to apply public money to compensate wrong-doing. If this man has to be paid, then the money to pay him should come out of the pockets of those whose work he did. Let the Government pay him if they like out of their own money. If they have profited by his conduct let them pay him properly, but do not use the public money to encourage and endorse wrong-doing, and at the same time pre-

Mr. MULOCK.

vent an enquiry into those charges. Can anybody say that these charges are not well founded? When we find that an enquiry is denied into these serious statements what conclusion must a reasonable man draw? None but that these charges are well founded. So long as a proper investigation is denied there can be but that one conclusion. As a matter of evidence alone it would be held by a judge of the land that where such statements as these were made and an enquiry was prevented it must be assumed that they were well founded. If they are not well founded let the Government clear the atmosphere by holding an enquiry, and then, and not till then, will they be true to the interests of the people of Canada, and not abuse the trust imposed on them, even though they have a majority in this House that may do (as I assume it will do) what the First Minister will order them. The Minister of Finance I see is itching to get out of his seat to state what he knows about this matter. He is the man who is looking after the money, and I understand he is to put the pruning knife to the expenditure. He is, however, in this case increasing the expenses of the Patent Office over which this officer presides by several thousand dollars a year. That is the first act of the Minister of Finance. He may save \$50 here and there by dispensing with the services of some worthy official, and he may condone the dismissal from the service of the Crown of a man like the Collector of Customs at Halifax. Such an officer may receive the condign punishment of the Minister of Finance, but a man who can commit fraud, who can commit offences against the criminal law is to have his salary increased, and the expenses of his department raised by many thousands of dollars. I hope the Minister of Finance will not continue his record as he is beginning it in this regard at least.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to suggest as this is the first night's sitting we have had, and with due regard to the motion that is introduced by my hon. friend from the opposite side of the House—

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it I?

Mr. FOSTER. Not you; your brother there. And in order to preserve the good health of the House, as there has been a pretty full presentation of the case from the opposite side, we might pass the item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Tell us what you think about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well to pass the item.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement which I knew I had made, and which I have looked up in answer to the observation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I took the trouble of going over the *Gazettes*, and I found that the hon. gentleman's statement that there was an analogy between the gazetting of members in 1874 and 1887 was altogether unfounded. I have before me the statement that I made at that time with reference to those returns and I call the attention of the House to this fact: that of those gazetted, as near as may be, there appeared in the *Gazette* members of both sides of the House in proportion to the number of members returned. This was true with regard to the returns from every Province. There was no analogy whatever between the proceedings of Mr. Pope in 1887 and in 1874. In 1874 there were gazetted on the 7th February, 35 members. Of these 35, 22 were Reformers, and 12 Conservatives. The hon. gentleman will remember that at that time in the House there were, I think, something less than 60 of the Conservative party returned; the remainder were Reformers, and the number of members that were gazetted on each occasion as near as may be, corresponded to the proportions of the parties returned at the time. In the next *Gazette* we find—

Mr. TUPPER. What date is the next *Gazette* that you refer to?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman the same page before him that I am looking at? I have page 210.

Mr. TUPPER. No; I have page 338.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at page 210 he will find there the statement. I need not repeat those statements, but members will find there an analysis of the result of the returns that were made in 1874, and which is altogether different from those in 1837.

Mr. TUPPER. Not so much difference.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find that, apart from those who were returned by acclamation, the gazetted of members in every instance was as near the proportion as could be.

Mr. TUPPER. On the 21st February there were ten of the other side gazetted, and two Conservatives. That is somewhat similar.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, there could not be any similarity when there were no more members returned. The hon. gentleman will see that in the other case where there were fifteen Conservatives and eleven Reformers returned, that the eleven Reformers were not gazetted, that they were not gazetted even in the next *Gazette*, and that some of them were not gazetted in the third *Gazette*. Nothing of that sort occurred, after the election of 1874.

Mr. LAURIER. I agree with the Minister of Finance, that there has been a very full presentation of this case made by this side of the House, and as there has been no answer whatever from the other side of the House, we can allow the item to pass, and the country to judge.

Mr. FOSTER. The passing of the item will compensate for the other.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very sorry that the leader of the second great party in this House, has taken this course, but I suppose we will get the opinion of the House on concurrence.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; on concurrence.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to have it a little earlier than concurrence, but, of course, my party is not sufficiently strong to bring about that result.

Mr. BOWELL. But it is made of good fighting material. Committee rose and reported progress.

#### THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House is adjourned I wish to know what is the intention of the Government with regard to the annual financial statement. I presume they are not intending to make it within the next week. As we have made a departure from our ordinary practice, which was that the financial statement should precede the consideration of the Estimates, it would be convenient that reasonable notice should be given before the hon. gentleman makes his financial statement. I would suggest, if it suits his convenience, that he should announce the fact four or five days in advance of the time he proposes to make it. I suppose he will have no objection to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do that.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### MARINERS' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 26) to amend the Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, chap. 73 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The Bill proposes simply to extend the coasting trade as defined by the Act relating to the certificates of masters and mates, so as to embrace ports in the West Indies and the Islands of St. Pierre-Miquelon. Under the Act at present, it is confined to ports in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 27) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, chap. 104 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The only change proposed is with regard to the branding of barrels. At present barrels require to be branded, either by marks burned or cut into the staves of the barrel. By this Bill it is proposed that the marks shall be made on the head of the barrel, for many reasons. They are more accessible there, and we find that when the marks are on the staves, in the process of rolling and handling they become obliterated. On the other hand, we afford much greater facilities to those obliged to mark barrels by providing that the marks may be made by branding, cutting or painting.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. JONCAS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 28) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chap. 8 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The proposed amendments are of purely local interest, relating exclusively to the County of Gaspé. I am asking for the same delay in that county as there is in Algoma and Cariboo. I am sorry to say communications are not easier now in the County of Gaspé than they were ten years ago, and it would be impossible for the returning officer to appoint the nomination day within eight days from the reception of his writ.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THE JESUITS ESTATE ACT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. BARRON asked. 1. Has the Bill, 51-52 Victoria, chap. 13, intituled: "An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuits Estate," yet been before the Government for their consideration? 2. Have they reported thereon to His Excellency the Governor General? 3. If so, did they report in favor of allowing or disallowing the Bill? 4. Has the Government communicated the purport of the report to the Government of Quebec? If so, when? 5. When does the time, in ordinary course, expire up to which disallowance of the Bill might take place?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The answer to the first question of the hon. gentleman is, that the Act referred to has been before the Government for their consideration; to the second question, that the Minister of Justice reported on that Act to His Excellency the Governor General on the 16th January last; to the third question, that the Minister

of Justice reported that the Act in question, together with 112 other Acts passed at the same Session of the Quebec Legislature, should be left to its operation; to the fourth question, that the report of the Minister of Justice was approved on the 19th January, 1889, and the result was at once communicated to the Government of Quebec; to the fifth question, that the Acts of the Legislature of Quebec for the Session of 1888 were received by the Secretary of State on the 8th August.

#### PIERS IN LAKE ST. LOUIS.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether the Government have come to a decision as to the expediency of constructing piers in Lake St. Louis, or elsewhere in the St. Lawrence, with a view to diminish the danger from inundations on both banks of the river; if so, is it their intention to place a sum in the Estimates this year for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter has been under the consideration of the Government and they came to the decision, for the present, not to build piers, as suggested in the enquiry of the hon. member.

#### LONGUEUIL WHARVES.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause the work on the Longueuil wharves to be completed, with a view to render the same useful to navigation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the time the works were undertaken, it was not intended that they should be extended to the shore. The matter is now under consideration.

#### POSTAL SERVICE IN LONGUEUIL.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take action, in view of the complaints made against the postmaster of the town of Longueuil, and respecting the management of the post office in that town; and also to improve the postal service for the town and parish of Longueuil?

Mr. HAGGART. The Post Office Inspector reports that the postmaster has been unable, notwithstanding his continued efforts to do so, to find any suitable building for a post office at a rent within his means. There is not at present any proposition before the department for any change in the mail service to Longueuil.

#### COUNTY COURT JUDGES FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint County Court Judges in the Province of British Columbia at an early date; and if so, how many?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament for the authority to make three appointments to the County Bench in British Columbia. If the authority be given, it is intended that the appointments shall be made as early as possible.

#### CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT MONEYS.

Mr. ROOME asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during this present Session, to enact legislation whereby the moneys accumulated in the hands of the county treasurers of the different counties, where the Canada Temperance Act is and has been in force, from fines, &c., may be divided amongst the different municipalities in each county, proportionate to the amounts which have been realised from the different municipalities?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not the intention of the Government at present to propose any legislation of that kind, the view of the Government being that the rights of the various municipalities have been fixed and determined by the Order in Council dealing with that subject.

#### BELLEVILLE DRILL SHED.

Mr. BURDETT asked, Whether the Government intend placing any sum in the Supplementary Estimates to aid in the construction of a drill shed at Belleville?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Unfortunately, I cannot give the answer now. The Supplementary Estimates will show what the Government has decided upon.

#### ARTHABASKA FISHERY OVERSEER.

Mr. TURCOT asked, What was the amount of revenue collected by P. C. Bourke, fishery overseer, acting for the Government, in the District of Arthabaska, during the past fiscal year; and what was the amount of his salary, his travelling expenses, and his allowance for his office?

Mr. TUPPER. No revenue was collected by P. C. Bourke, fishery overseer in the district of Arthabaska, in the past fiscal year. His salary was \$75, and his travelling expenses amounted to \$41.10. There is no allowance for his office.

#### REDUCTION OF LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. TURCOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce the postage on letters within the Dominion of Canada to three cents per ounce weight; and to lessen the charge for the carriage of parcels sent by mail?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to reduce the postage on letters within the Dominion to 3 cents per ounce weight. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to lessen the charge for the carriage of parcels sent by mail.

#### CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE asked, Whether the Government would be opposed to the incorporation of a company undertaking the construction of a canal from Chambly to Longueuil?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It depends altogether on the terms of the Bill. We would be better able to judge when we see the measure the hon. gentleman proposes to bring down.

#### GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. DENISON moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the desirability of the Government acquiring all the electric telegraph lines in Canada, and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to hear such telegraph, railway companies and proprietors as may wish to be heard, by themselves, their counsel or agents, and to report to this House.

He said: I intend to take up only a few minutes' time of the House, as, last year, in introducing a similar motion, I placed pretty fully before the House some facts as to the telegraph lines in the old world and elsewhere. I then pointed out that nearly every country in the world, except Canada and our neighbors to the south, had acquired their telegraph lines. In France, Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark—in fact, nearly all over Europe, 20 years ago, the telegraph lines were acquired by the Governments of their respective countries. If we would be a progressive country we should not be behind the old world in this matter; being a new country, we should be more progressive,

and I think the time has come that we should take some step towards acquiring the lines and having them owned by the Government of the country. I certainly am aware that it would require a large sum of money to buy out old companies, but it is in the interest of the community at large that these lines should be owned by the Government. Now we have to pay two or three rates across the continent, whereas, if the Government owned the lines, they would all be under one management from end to end. The Government now own certain lines in the North-West Territories and also down in the Eastern Provinces. It is true the Government has built these lines in sections of the country where there were none before; I do not object to that, but if it is well for the Government to build lines in sparsely-settled sections where they can get no revenue from them, it ought to be good for the Government to own the lines in the older settled parts of the country where we may expect a dividend to be paid. The present companies pay a dividend on their stock, and as the Government could borrow money at a lower rate of interest, we may assume that we would have a sufficient revenue to pay a certain percentage on the outlay. At present it is a great shame that a person living outside of Canada should have the means of, in a manner, manufacturing public opinion in this country. It is a great power to leave in the hands of a foreigner. We had a practical illustration of this not long ago, when a despatch was sent by Mr. Wiman, saying there was a proposal to buy out Canada. Here is the despatch:

"New York, Sept. 29.—I deem it my duty to say that information from Washington reaches me of a reliable character to the effect that the Senate Committee of Foreign Affairs have, during the past few days, in furtherance of the views of its chairman, Senator Sherman, been discussing the question of inviting the Dominion of Canada to join the United States. So far have matters progressed that it is not at all unlikely that a resolution will be reported for the concurrent action of both Houses, declaring it to be the duty of the President to open negotiations with Great Britain looking to a political union between the English-speaking nations on this continent. The condition attending the invitation of Canada is understood to be that the United States would assume the entire debt of the Dominion, estimated at three hundred millions of dollars. Commercial union was urged as the basis of the proposed negotiation, on the ground that while a large majority might be secured for it, only a small minority favored political union, but the sentiment of the committee was so strong in favor of proposing at first political union that it was impossible to contend with it.

"ERASTUS WIMAN."

Then we have a telegram addressed to the papers, saying:

"We are now requested by Erastus Wiman to withdraw his communication in reference to the doings of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the American Senate. Will you please do this and greatly oblige,

"G. N. W. TELEGRAPH CO."

These messages were sent about the country, deadhead, I suppose, and the stockholders in Canada of the Montreal Co. have to pay their share for these messages. The public generally are beginning to see that it is desirable that the lines should be owned by somebody else, for we find them crying out for some change. One paper says this:

"These telegraphic messages from the United States should always be regarded with suspicion, not only because they are naturally apt to be biased, but also because the transmission and, to a certain extent, the collection, of news is in the hands of the telegraph ring, and that is almost identical with the clique which is promoting the agitation for annexation."

Another paper says:

"We can all remember the unsatisfactory results that arose from the establishment of a monopoly by the amalgamation of companies, and these were aggravated in many ways when the combine came under the control of a foreigner, himself the mere lieutenant of the great telegraph monopolist of the United States, the whole system being virtually one concern, which, at least, cannot be said to put Canadian interests in the first place."

I think these items show that it is dangerous that this great power should be placed in the hands of a foreign company, and although I know that it is a matter of spending considerable sums to purchase the telegraphs, I think the time is drawing near when the Government ought to be in a position

to do so. I have put this motion on the paper with the object of drawing the attention of the House and the country to this matter, and I should be glad to see it supported by other hon. members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the second time my hon. friend has made a motion of this kind in Parliament, and I must say that he shows he has studied the subject. However, I do not think the time has come for the Government of the country to take possession of the telegraph lines of this country. The hon. gentleman is aware that, besides those lines in the hands of telegraph companies, there are other lines that belong to railway companies, and I think it is hardly feasible for the Government to assume the lines used by railway companies. Moreover, the purchase of these lines by the Government would require a very large sum of money, and I do not think that the question is sufficiently ripe to justify Parliament and the people of this country in going to so large an expense. True, my hon. friend says that these lines will give a revenue; they would give a revenue, but it is well known that these large companies, like large railway enterprises, always pay a better revenue in the hands of private individuals than in the hands of the Government. That is perfectly well known, the results are there, and therefore I think that, in the case of some of the companies which pay large dividends to their shareholders, it would not be increasing that revenue, nor would it maintain that revenue, for the Government to take them into its own hands. My hon. friend says that, inasmuch as the Government are building telegraph lines where they do not yield much revenue, therefore it will be proper that the Government should take over the lines which yield a large revenue. Well, there is no doubt that we would be glad if the lines already constructed by the Government, and being constructed by the Government, would give a large revenue, but those lines have not been built for revenue purposes, but rather for the general utility of the country. These telegraph lines have been built on the lower St. Lawrence, on the Atlantic coast, on the Pacific coast, and some in the North-West Territories, for the purpose of protecting life and property. They are designed to procure relief to crews of vessels wrecked on our coasts, and it is by means of these lines that the necessary help can be given. These lines, moreover, afford the means of giving valuable information in many cases to the fishing interests, and they furnish the country a return in that way. Thus the returns, though they are not made in so many dollars placed in the hands of the Government, are such as to repay and reward the country for the expenditure. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, stated that telegraph despatches sent over the lines are often in the interest of one firm or one individual, and that sometimes those despatches are false. How could that state of things be avoided even if those lines were under the control of the Government? If they are to be the telegraph lines of the country, they cannot be the telegraph lines of the Government or of any set of men, but the lines of the people at large, and therefore, although the lines were in the hands of the Government, every individual who now sends a despatch over them would have the same right to forward it as at present. You could not prevent some of the despatches being false. On account of the competition between the different lines now in operation it is very soon ascertained whether any despatch is true or not. Moreover, and I have reserved this as a *bonne bouche*, politics run rather high in this country at times, and perhaps our friends on the other side of the House would not have the same confidence in the secrecy of their despatches at election times as we would have ourselves, and perhaps if the hon. gentlemen opposite were occupying these benches, we, being then on the opposite side of the House, might share the want of confidence they might have now in us. It is proper that, in considering

questions of this kind, we should take up the different points and examine them in all their bearings. I hope my hon. friend, having brought the question before the House and made his speech, and having heard these remarks made by me on behalf of the Government, will be satisfied with having made his motion and will not press it, but ask permission to withdraw it.

Mr. DENISON. I beg to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### FISHING IN ONTARIO INLAND WATERS.

Mr. DAWSON moved for :

Return of all licenses granted and all applications made for license to fish in the inland waters of Ontario, north and north-west of Lakes Huron and Superior; also, of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario, in respect to the expediency of permitting net fishing by white men in these inland waters; also, of all correspondence between the Indian Department and any other department of the Government in regard to the distress and destitution which would be brought upon the resident Indian population by unrestricted net fishing in the waters from which they derive their chief means of subsistence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I desire with the permission of the House, to draw attention to the effect that unrestricted net fishing in the inland waters to which it refers would have on the Indians. In the region to the north and north-west of Lakes Huron and Superior there are many inland lakes of greater or less extent, and where they are of considerable size, a few Indian families will always be found residing near them. Some of these families, indeed many of them, have advanced so far in civilisation that they cultivate little gardens, and these, with the fish which they can always easily procure, both in summer and winter, afford them a sufficiency of food, while the furs obtained by hunting, being always ready of sale, enable them to clothe themselves comfortably. This has until now been the happy condition of these Indians, and is so, except in a few instances, still. So that, although the larger game, such as the caribou and moose, is fast disappearing before the deadly rifle and reckless hunting of the white man, they still manage to live, except in certain sections, with comparative comfort in their own primitive way. But the white man, not content with annihilating the moose and the caribou, is now invading their fisheries, and unless means can be found of putting a stop to this, the result must be great distress, if not actual starvation, among the Indians. The indiscriminate slaughter of the buffalo at the time the Union Pacific Railway was being built, brought destitution to the Indians of the plains, and the consequence has been, as both the Dominion and United States Governments feel to their cost, that on both sides of the international boundary line they have to be fed and clothed, at an enormous annual outlay. Surely no one could wish to see such a state of things existing in the regions to which this motion has reference, and yet it will most assuredly come about unless timely measures are taken to prevent it. The fish of the inland waters are to the Indians of the forest what the buffalo were to the Indians of the plains—the staff of life—and if they are exterminated, the Government will have to provide food for additional hordes of very deserving and very hungry Indians. Already the destructive pound-net has, in some cases, reached the inland lakes to which the motion refers. This implement of destruction is fast depleting the great lakes, and what its effect will be on the small inland lakes can easily be imagined. A single pound-net in a lake of say ten miles in length by two in width—an average size—could be so used as, in one season, to entrap almost every fish therein above the size of a minnow, at least, so I am told. With these nets there is no respite for the fish. A pound net can be set in the fall and left under the ice all winter to do its deadly work. There is no escape for the fish. A guide net, perhaps miles in length, is ex-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

tended along the bottom; this leads to a labyrinth of skillfully constructed net chambers which the fish are sure to enter, and from which they are drawn up at will through convenient openings cut in the ice, and shipped by hundreds of tons to the United States markets, so that, in course of a single season, one of these inland lakes can be so completely swept of its fish as to leave none for the poor Indians, who, in consequence, must strike camp and leave the waters which from time immemorial they and their sires had looked upon as their own. Is it reasonable, is it just or in accordance with the treaties made with the Indians that this should be permitted? Certainly not. In the treaties made with the Indians of Algoma, it was most unequivocally provided that they should, forever, have the right of fishing and hunting over the territories thereby ceded. This right was, in fact and in effect, a part of the price for which they relinquished their acknowledged right in the land. But it may be said it was not an exclusive right. True, but still it was a right, and is it to be rendered nugatory and of no effect by a destructive invention which was never dreamt of by either Indian or white man at the time the treaties were made. To permit the use of an implement which in effect renders a provision of the treaties void is surely, to all practical purposes, an infraction of the treaties. A recent judicial decision in New Brunswick, it is said, gives the control of the inland fisheries to the Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Supreme Court decided that too.

Mr. DAWSON. I am thankful the hon. gentleman has informed me that the Supreme Court has decided this also. This may be so, but still it belongs to the Dominion Government to see that the faith of Indian treaties is upheld. In as far as this Province of Ontario is concerned, I am happy to say that the present Government thereof has so far respected the rights of the Indians in this matter, and, as I have reason to know, has, with a humane desire to guard their interests, absolutely refused to grant licenses to fish in the inland waters of which I speak, as will be seen by a letter which, with the leave of the House, I shall now read. The paper in which it appears says :

“THESSALON, 31st January, 1889.

“It has been stated that fishing with the nets has been carried on in the inland lakes of Algoma. Mr. Dobie, of Thessalon, while in Toronto lately, on hearing of the matter, took steps to ascertain whether any person had really received a license to do so or not. He telegraphed the department at Ottawa and received the following message :—

““OTTAWA, 14th January, 1889.

““Has no license from this Department. Lakes mentioned are within jurisdiction of Ontario Government or riparian proprietors.

““JOHN TILTON.”

“The Ontario Government was then interviewed, and the following letter was received :—

“DEPARTMENT OF CROWN LANDS.

““SIR,—I am in receipt of your letter of 15th inst., respecting fishing in the inland lakes of the Province, and have to say in reply, with reference to those lakes to which you refer, that the exclusive right of fishing in the lakes near Thessalon, in the Townships of Day, Gladstone, Kirkwood, Bright, &c., belongs to the Province of Ontario, and that no person has the right to fish with nets in these lakes without authority, either for private use, barter, sale or export.

““No permit or license to fish with nets in the inland lakes of the Province has been issued to any person by the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

““Any person so fishing is guilty of a contravention of the law and is liable to prosecution and punishment under the Ontario Fisheries Act.

““I send by mail a copy of the Act and regulations.

““Your obedient servant,

““AUBREY WHITE,

““Assistant Commissioner.

““J. B. DOBIE, Esq., Walker House, Toronto.”

This admirable and well conceived letter is greatly to the credit of the Ontario Government and it will have an excellent effect in restraining the more respectable fishermen, but who is to prevent poachers from setting pound-

nets without license. At the Lake of the Woods and in the country bordering on its tributary streams, there are no less than three thousand Indians who, now that the game is disappearing, depend largely on the fisheries for the means of subsistence. Sturgeon of excellent quality are still very abundant in these waters, but they are easily exterminated. Pound-net fishing has been already attempted at the Lake of the Woods, and if it is permitted to go on, the Government will have three thousand additional Indians to provide for. Surely some understanding could be come to between the two Governments whereby the fisheries in these inland waters should be reserved to the Indians, until they shall have so far advanced in the ways of the white man as to be able to provide for themselves otherwise. There are over ten thousand Indians, mostly in isolated families, scattered over the wide district which I have the honor to represent, and I conceive it to be my duty to draw the attention of the House and the country to this important matter. The opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway has rendered the inland waters in many cases easy of access to fish poachers with the terrible appliances of modern times, and to permit the use of these engines of destruction in the waters from which the Indians derive their chief means of subsistence, would be, to express it in few words, to take the bread from the mouths of the poor wards of the nation.

Mr. DAVIN. In support of the statement of my hon. friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), I do not wish to go over the ground that he has travelled so ably, but to suggest to my hon. and learned friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that when he deals with this question he should extend his view, and take into consideration the state of affairs in the North-West Territory. Nearly every word that has fallen from my hon. friend will apply to many of our lakes in the North-West. Inspection is urgently needed there, for the most wanton destruction of fish is carried on. I hope, when my hon. and learned friend deals with this question, he will deal with it in a comprehensive manner and not confine himself to Ontario, but consider the needs of the North-West as well.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is very unfortunate that there should be a conflict of jurisdiction between the Ontario and Dominion Governments with reference to the fish in inland waters. Practically, as matters are at present, nobody is in a position to deal with this question. The Dominion Government very properly say, that as the Ontario Government claim any revenue that can possibly arise from these waters they will not go to the expense of protecting them. On the other hand the Ontario Government say, "Everything in these waters is ours and we won't allow the Dominion Government to interfere." Between the two there has been a very rapid destruction of fish in all these inland waters. In the constituency which I represent there are hundreds of lakes, which did contain, and to some extent still contain, fish of a very valuable character; but they are rapidly being exterminated in just the manner described by the hon member for Algoma. I have done my best to devise some means of meeting the difficulty, but, for two years back, I have always received the same reply from the Department—that the Ontario Government claim these waters, and we have been unable to arrive at any settlement. I have searched in vain for any legal authority by which it can be determined what waters belong to the Dominion, and what waters belong to the Province. If you take the rule that navigable waters are excluded from the jurisdiction of the Ontario Government, you exclude from their jurisdiction a large area of those waters, because there are hardly any of these lakes which are not at some time navigated by a steamer. At the same time, it does not appear, from anything I can ascertain, that this is a proper rule for deciding the question. The only decision given on the subject is that given in the New Brunswick

case; but that simply settled the question, as I understand it, regarding riparian proprietors on ungranted Crown lands. The question still remains at issue with regard to granted lands. I do hope the Minister, not only for the considerations urged by the hon. member for Algoma, but for various other considerations, and especially that means may be found to protect the fish from destruction, will endeavor to come to terms with the Ontario Government, under which a rule may be laid down by which the question of jurisdiction will be settled. I fancy that there can be no serious difficulty in the way of a settlement; if no precedent exists, there is surely intelligence enough in these two Governments to make a precedent. The subject is an important one to the constituency I represent, as well as to Algoma, and no doubt the same difficulty has arisen in many parts of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The question has not received much attention in the past, but I can assure the Minister that there are many people besides Indians who are deeply interested in it. My constituents are very much interested in having these fish preserved, as they are a great attraction to that part of the country. What is the use of this Government spending hundreds and thousands of dollars in establishing fish-breeding establishments and propagating fish, in the different parts of the country, when they allow them to be destroyed in this way? The two positions are inconsistent. The Dominion and Ontario Governments should come to some understanding by which this valuable property may be preserved.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think my hon. friend is in error in stating that there is any conflict of jurisdiction between the Provinces and the Dominion. The decision of the court has no reference to the question of jurisdiction, but simply is that the riparian owners have the right of fishing, as incidental to their occupancy of the soil, and, therefore, where the rivers are upon granted lands the different grantees possess the right of fishing. In the case of ungranted lands or Crown lands belonging to the Province, the right of fishery is, of course, incidental to their property in the soil. Therefore, there is no conflict of jurisdiction between the Provinces and the Dominion. Under the British North America Act the regulation of the fisheries is placed under the charge of the Dominion; and, therefore, it is the duty of the Dominion Government to protect the fisheries in our waters, not with the object of bringing any revenue to the Dominion Government—as, of course, any benefit must necessarily enure to the grantees or owners of the fisheries—but for the benefit of the public, more particularly in the tidal waters, where the fisheries are a public right, a *jus publicum*. Of course, the fisheries there are beyond any provincial control, being entirely for the public, and vested in the Crown as represented by the Dominion Government. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is very important that steps should be taken to protect the fisheries. There is no doubt that it is a very important branch of industry, not in Ontario alone, but in all parts of the Dominion.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I should like to say that the Ontario Government do claim a jurisdiction over those waters, for they have undertaken to assert a jurisdiction by appointing fishery officers.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). On their own property, I presume, just the same as grantees on rivers. The Restigouche River, in New Brunswick, for instance, is owned to a large extent by private parties, who keep up a large force in addition to the Dominion officers.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is not one of these places I refer to where the riparian rights are in the possession of the Crown. They are all in the hands of private parties, and yet the Ontario Government is exercising jurisdiction over them.

Mr. EDGAR. I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he would greatly distinguish himself if he

would make a fishery treaty with the Provinces, and if he cannot, that he would at least try to arrange a *modus vivendi*.

Mr. MADILL. There is considerable uncertainty with reference to prosecutions for violation of the Fisheries Act. If the Dominion officials threaten to proceed against parties for violating the laws, those parties telegraph to the Ontario Government, and the Ontario Government telegraphs back that the matter is in dispute between the Province and the Dominion. Therefore, I agree with the hon. members who have spoken, that some understanding should be come to between the Dominion Government and the Ontario Government in regard to this matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to bring before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the desirability of protecting white men as well as Indians. I understand that there has always been some difficulty as to the rights of the Province and of the Dominion in regard to fishery matters. I would like to refer to one case in which the law of the Province of Quebec appears to be in conflict with the views of the Minister of Justice. The case is in connection with the lease of the River Matane. My contention was, and is, that the riparian proprietors of the river have the exclusive right to the fishing in the river, and that the Government, having leased the estuary, had gone beyond its rights. The tidal waters, I grant, in general, would be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, but in this particular instance the right of fishing was ceded to the seigniors of Matane, and these seigniors have since ceded their right to the riparian proprietors. Therefore the Government, in leasing the right to fish in the estuary of the river, actually granted a right which had been granted 200 years ago by the Kings of France to the seigniors of Matane, and the lease or title given by the Government is not a valid one. I do not deny the jurisdiction of the Government over the regulation of the fisheries, but as to giving licenses to strangers over the riparian proprietors, I deny their right to do that. I sent to the hon. the Minister a memorandum on the case which, I think, had a certain effect, for, though the lease was continued, it was granted under the condition that no warranty whatever was given to the lessees, Sir Alexander Galt and his friends. Thus, hereafter the Government may view the rights of the riparian proprietors differently. Though these proprietors are actually the real owners of the rights of fishing, they have been, under the color of a license, sued, condemned and fined, two or three of them heavily, for having fished in their own waters. That is a very hard case indeed. These men are too poor to bring their case before other tribunals, and I think their claim should not be passed over in future.

Mr. TUPPER. The discussion on this motion has been very interesting and, no doubt, instructive. I think, however, it has gone a little beyond the purposes of the hon. the mover of the resolution. The hon. gentleman drew the attention of the House chiefly to certain waters now under the control of the Local Government; but I may say with regard to the different decisions to which allusion was made, concerning these Crown lands and lands granted to riparian proprietors, that there has been, up to this date, no clashing of jurisdiction. We have yielded to the claims so far of the Ontario Government, certainly as regards the waters mentioned, as my hon. friend knows, and I fancy his remarks were more particularly directed to the intention of that Government. I believe that the Government are making greater efforts for the proper protection of those waters. We, on the other hand, have refused to grant licenses. The only licenses that have been granted in the last few years have been either granted by the Government of Ontario or not granted at all. So in Quebec. Where the Local Governments have undertaken to protect the fisheries and to appoint fishery

Mr. EDGAR.

officers, as in certain cases they have, the Federal Government has not been anxious to duplicate these officers, and to double the expense and so produce, to some extent, confusion. Having in charge so many of the streams of this great country, and having, of necessity, such an enormous staff of officers, the Federal Government has only been too glad to receive the co-operation of the Ontario Local Government in the protecting of the fisheries. I take it that the hon. gentleman will not press the first part of the first two paragraphs of his motion. There is no objection to it. I think his object has been attained; but, after what I have said, he will see, for instance, that we have granted no licenses and that we are granting none in these particular waters. That will dispose of the first portion of the motion; and in regard to the second, there has been, so far as my department is concerned, no correspondence with the Government of Ontario on the matter, but, of course, I am not prepared to speak for other departments. The last portion of the motion relates to the Indian Department, and I think my hon. friend has gained his purpose in bringing before the attention of this House, and, indirectly, before the attention of the Ontario Government, the great necessity for the vigorous protection of these waters. I understand, and other gentlemen who know anything about it will know, how difficult it is, no matter where the jurisdiction may be, to properly protect our inland waters. The large expanse of inland waters which we have, makes it almost impossible for us to place officers all over those districts, and illegal fishing will, no doubt, continue as long as there are fish to catch; but, of course, an effort is made as far as possible to prevent illegal fishing. I understand that the Government of Ontario have not only arranged for the protection of these particular waters, but that they are laying claim, and we do not dispute their right, to grant licenses to fish there.

Mr. LISTER. Does not the Ontario Government claim the proprietary rights in all the inland fisheries, Lakes Huron and Superior and the rivers?

Mr. TUPPER. No, they have not gone so far yet.

Mr. LISTER. Have they made any such claim at all?

Mr. TUPPER. None that I am aware of; certainly not since I have been in the department.

Mr. LISTER. I understand they do, and that they have made the claim that the only right of this Parliament is to regulate the fisheries, and that the proprietary rights are in the special province of the Local Parliaments. I understand them to claim this, although this Parliament has assumed the right to license the exercise of proprietary rights. This is a question which will have to be determined, because I am satisfied one Local Government claims this Parliament has gone beyond its powers in undertaking to license fishermen to fish on the inland waters of this country, and on this matter have usurped the rights of the Local Legislature.

Mr. TUPPER. In reference to the larger inland waters, that question has not been raised. At present the Federal Government, without serious question on the part of the Ontario Government, is granting licenses to fish in these large inland waters, and in no instance has the question been raised, to my knowledge, in the courts as to the validity of those licenses.

Mr. LISTER. The Ontario Government, I suppose, does not wish to raise the question unless it becomes absolutely necessary. I believe the Government here is treating the licensees all along the coast with great liberality, and there has really been no reason for bringing the matter before the courts, except at the instance of the lessees, who may go before the courts themselves. It could come up, however, if you refused a license, and the Ontario Government granted it.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no objection to the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Perhaps his view, however, might be met by striking out the first clause altogether. What I meant to draw the attention particularly of this House to was that neither the riparian proprietors or the Provincial Governments have any right to override a treaty. A treaty made with the Indians, by which they relinquished their lands, takes precedence of any other Act, rule, or regulation. It cannot be abrogated. That condition was a part of the price which they received for the land, and it would not be respecting the treaty, it would be actually setting aside the treaty, not to take that into consideration. However, I have no objection to the amendment the hon. gentleman suggests, that the first clause be struck out.

Mr. TEMPLE. As this question has been brought up, there is one matter to which I would like to call the attention of the Minister. In the western part of my county, which adjoins the State of Maine, there are a number of large lakes, in which are a great many fish. I think there are some 40 or 50 miles of lakes, through the middle of which the boundary line between the Province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine runs. On the American side they protect their fish by having wardens to look after it, but on our side there is no protection whatever, there is no one to look after it, and the people do just as they like. I bring this to the notice of the Minister, in the hope that it will be attended to in the future, and that some one will be appointed to look after our fisheries on those large lakes.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION—KIT ALLOWANCE.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That this House regrets the action of the Government in refusing to pay kit allowance to the York-Simcoe Battalion whilst on active duty in the North-West in aiding in suppressing the Rebellion.

He said; I regret that it is necessary again to trouble the House with the oft-told tale of the faults on the part of the Minister of Militia in dealing with this important question; and if, at this stage, it has assumed the serious character it now takes in this motion, I think there are certain features preceding this motion which fully justify the view I now present to the House. It is within the knowledge of hon. members of this House that in the year 1885—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman not to press his motion, and to tell him that, on a strong remonstrance and representation made by hon. members of this House, the Government have reopened the question, and are now having it under consideration. I would, therefore, ask him not to press his motion just now.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand the First Minister to say he wishes the motion to stand?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Will it lose its place on the paper?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course, in regard to this I am a little tired out. I have been for four years asking for this act of justice, and I do not care to have it lose its place on the paper or before the House. I do not wish to be too inquisitive, but I would like to ascertain about how long the hon. gentleman thinks it will take for the Government to make up their minds on this matter?

Mr. LAURIER. To-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to do everything on my part to aid in carrying out what the First Minister seems to have promised, but I do not wish to do anything to jeopardise the bringing on of this motion in the way I intended, unless a favorable decision is arrived at.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask the hon. gentleman to allow the motion to stand, and I will settle with my hon. friend as to when it is to be brought on.

Mr. MULOCK. I will allow it to stand to-day, and I presume when it is called again a similar request will be made.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a very vague engagement.  
Motion allowed to stand.

#### BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RAILWAY.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Return of all correspondence between the Grand Trunk Railway authorities and the Government respecting the subsidy granted for the completion of the line of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company from the Village of Madoc to Eldorado, in the North Riding of Hastings, and in reference to the work done towards the completion of such work and respecting the acceptance and opening up the same for traffic.

He said: Perhaps I may be permitted to make a few preliminary explanations in regard to this work and the importance of opening up this short line of railway. I believe it has been the policy of the Government, with which policy I do not propose to quarrel, and in fact which policy I approve, to grant aid to railways, for the purpose of opening up the country as the settlement and the development of the country require. I think, then, the Government having adopted that policy, and approving of that principle, it is their duty to see that railways to which subsidies are granted or promised are properly constructed, that they are put in running order, and that the companies are compelled to run the same in the interests of the public. With this object in view, large grants had been made by municipalities in aiding and assisting companies in constructing railways. The wisdom of municipalities in making those grants I do not propose to question at present. But I will say this, that the city of Belleville, in the past, has granted the sum of \$175,000 to aid in constructing railways in order to open up the country and to develop its resources in that vicinity—one line of railway extending from Belleville to Peterboro', and on to the Georgian Bay. Last Session a charter was granted from the vicinity of Belleville in that direction, and another by way of Tweed from Belleville to Lake Nipissing. I will also add that the County of Hastings has paid \$50,000 for the construction of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, of which the portion now under discussion is a part. That railway has been completed and is now running, and has been running for some years, from Belleville to the village of Madoc, in the County of Hastings, a distance of some 26 miles. A line has been constructed from Picton extending north through to the village of Trenton, cutting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then through to the village of Marmora, to reach the Coal Hill mines in North Hastings, the charter permitting it to be extended much further for the purpose of opening up the country. Grants have also been made to a railway extending from Napanee, running into the interior north of Belleville. With the construction of these railways I entirely agree, and with the policy of the Government in aiding in constructing these railways I entirely agree. All I ask the Government to do is, when they grant money to aid and construct railways, to see that the money is properly, judiciously, and economically applied for the purposes of the works to aid which it is granted; because I am opposed to money being granted to



railways simply for the purpose of allowing men to make a profit out of railway charters, and getting assistance to build railways that they may traffic in charters the same as they do in lumber or cordwood. This line of railway is of vast importance and utility to the people of Belleville and to the people of North Hastings. The link from Madoc to Eldorado, where it will intersect with the Central Ontario Railway, is a distance of about 8 miles; 4 miles of that has been constructed, and ore has been brought over it to Belleville and shipped to the States from the Walbridge hematite mines, from which a large and valuable quantity of ore has been taken. Its owners allege that there is still subsisting larger and more valuable quantities of ore to be taken from that mine, to be smelted either in this country or in the States. I wish to ascertain whether it is the fault of the Government, or whether it is the fault of the Grand Trunk Railway, that this road is not completed from Madoc to Eldorado, and a junction made with the Central Ontario, in order that the ore, produce, and timber of the great country north of Belleville and Madoc, may be brought to the front. There are over 6,000, I may say in the neighborhood of 10,000 people living in these northern townships, and there are others going in. The country is being developed, mines are being discovered and opened up, men are going in there with portable saw mills, and in many other ways people are developing the country. They are building cheese factories, saw mills, grist mills, carding and woollen mills, and other machinery has been taken in for the purpose of assisting in clearing up and developing that country. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that these people should have direct communication with the front. They should have direct and immediate communication from the north to the village of Madoc, the principal village in North Hastings. There are other important villages in North Hastings, growing and thriving, and I consider that it is of the utmost importance to the people of these villages, and to the people of Belleville, that they should have direct communication with the people in the northern part of the county. Vast sums of money have been spent, a great number of miles of railway have been constructed, in order to open up portions of the country for a far less number of people than are now living there, and for people who have undergone far less trials and difficulties than the people of Hastings have undergone to make the northern townships what they are to-day. Now, the object of this motion is to ascertain why there is this delay, after this grant has been made, after this Government has said that this railway is in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, after it has been taken out of the hands of the Ontario Government, who had jurisdiction formerly over these lines of railway. This Government has charged itself with them. Have they neglected their duty? I wish to find out why that line is not completed and operated. I am informed that the work has been done, but that the Government has refused to recognise the work, accept the road and pay the subsidy, and, therefore, it has not been run and is now lying idle. If that be true, the Government is to blame; if it is not true, the Government is not to blame. As I said before, if public relief is granted in aid of railways I respectfully submit that the Government ought to insist upon the money being properly applied, the work done, and properly inspected and accepted in order that the people may have the use of them. In the present state of railway building in this country, it is much better to see that the roads now in existence are properly run, and properly managed, and at reasonable rates, than it is to open up new and imaginary lines. I ask for information in order, if possible, that the blame, if any, may be placed upon the right shoulders. I know that the Minister of Customs, who

Mr. BURDETT.

represents North Hastings, is as anxious as I am to see that country developed, that he is as anxious as I am to see that the County of Hastings, a very large, and important county of this Province, situated in the central part of Ontario, is developed; and that the forests and the mines in that district are developed. My hon. friend's riding is over 100 miles long; the county itself is as large as the whole of Prince Edward Island, and the people have a right to enjoy these roads for which they have granted large sums of money and for which they are now heavily taxed. They have a right, I respectfully submit, to see that this railway is opened and run in the interests of the public. I have no doubt that, when the attention of the Government is called to it, they will do all in their power, as they ought to do, to assist in having this road opened and run in the interest of the public at large. I mentioned that people were going out there and building cheese factories. The cheese industry is one of the principal industries in that part of the Province at this time; in fact if it were not for that, the farmers would have very little to depend upon. That county is particularly adapted for pasturing and grazing purposes; and if railway facilities are given to these people by which they can get in their supplies, and carry out their produce, it will be of vast benefit to them, and will aid very much in developing that part of the country. There are thousands of acres of good land—arable land, valuable land, productive land, and if facilities are afforded the people of the country to go into the interior and develop it, there will be no necessity, Session after Session, of talking and making recriminations regarding who is to blame for our young men leaving the country and seeking homes in other lands. We have ample land for them here, if proper facilities are afforded them to develop it and make a living for themselves at home.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I learn from the hon. gentleman that he approves of the subsidy granted to the several lines of railway that he alluded to in his part of the country. Those subsidies were granted for the purpose of opening that mineral region giving connection with the rear, and with the great leading railway that runs to the North-West through the County of Prince Edward, and through the County of Hastings and all that country. The hon. gentleman moves for the correspondence between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway; if there be any correspondence—I suppose there will be some—it will be brought down at once, so that the hon. gentleman can see whether there is any blame attaching to the Grand Trunk Railway or the Government. I do not see how any blame can attach to the Government. The Government have no power to compel a subsidised railway company to build their road. The subsidies are granted, as the House knows, to railways which Parliament thinks cannot be completed by private enterprise or municipal enterprise, and which are of such merit that Parliament and the country should assist in their construction. Some of these grants have not been sufficient to inspire public confidence and to induce the parties who hold the charters to build the road. The Government cannot help that; they have given a grant of \$3,200 a mile, or whatever it may be. The statute provides that the road must be commenced within a certain period and finished within the time stated in the Act or the subsidy is cancelled, and it appears that a road has no great merit when, with such substantial assistance, the promoters and the country through which it will pass, have not been able to accumulate sufficient funds to build it. From what dropped from the hon. gentleman—I am not aware of the circumstances myself—it would appear as if the Government had withheld money from the Grand Trunk which they had a right to have as they had completed the road. I rather fancy that when the matter is looked into this will not be found to

be the case. The pressure of these roads on the Government is generally to be resisted, as it is in the direction of obtaining subsidies before they have been fairly earned, and the Government and my colleague, the Minister of Railways, who understands this subject thoroughly, has always been most anxious to assist any railways subsidised by not raising objections on immaterial grounds. If the work has been substantially done for the number of miles required by the contract between the Government and the railway (generally ten miles at a time), any minor deficiencies are overlooked and the subsidy is paid. However, I speak in ignorance of the particular circumstances of this case, and I can only again assure the hon. gentleman that the papers will be brought down without delay.

**Mr. BURDETT.** I have not charged the Government with any dereliction of duty, and I think they are able to perform their duty when it is called to their attention. What I understand the fact to be is, that the road has been completed, but the Government engineer, or some person in the employ of the Government, has refused to accept it because the bridges or culverts—there are no bridges of any importance—were of wood instead of iron, or something of that kind. I want to get at that difficulty; and the First Minister has said he will help me as far as possible.

**Mr. SHANLY.** Is the road graded?

**Mr. BURDETT.** I am told so.

**Mr. BOWELL.** The road referred to by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) is one that had been constructed, and had been running. For certain reasons it had fallen into disuse, and a subsidy was granted to the Grand Trunk or the Midland system, in order to repair it and put it in such a state as would enable traffic to pass over from the Ontario Central road to connect with the Belleville and North Hastings road at Eldorado, in Madoc. I certainly could have no objection to the hon. gentleman taking the north riding of Hastings under his personal charge. I am very glad, in this instance, that I agree fully with the hon. gentleman as regards the desirability of developing the resources of the whole of the country, whether to the north or to the east. As the First Minister has already said, my hon. friend will find, when the papers come down, that not only has the attention of the Government been called to the subject covered by his motion, but that the representatives of both ridings, apart from the other positions they hold in this House, have had frequent interviews with, and called the attention of, the Minister of Railways to the necessity of doing precisely what my hon. friend says should be done—to have the railway properly constructed, so that it could be used for the purpose for which the grant was made. The Government have not been derelict in this particular, as the hon. gentleman will find, and I hope that all their acts will meet with his approbation as much as I am quite sure they will do in this instance, when the papers are brought down, and the hon. gentleman knows the facts.

**Mr. COOK.** In regard to this matter the Premier stated that it was not the policy of the Government to compel people to build railways, and they were unable to do so. That is very true. The Government have been very liberal in assisting the construction of railways all over the country. I wish the Government would pay a little more attention to the question of freight rates on those railways they have assisted to such a large extent. In some sections we have railways running in different directions from the north for the purpose of developing the resources of the country by bringing out lumber and otherwise acting to the general advantage of the district. In a great many instances the railway companies do not comply with the conditions on which they obtained bonuses from the Government; they charge excessive rates, and the Grand

Trunk is particularly severe in matters of this kind. That company not only charges excessive rates, but they have, as it were, gobbled up many of the smaller roads running to the north, and have side-tracked these districts so as to make the roads of no great advantage. I am aware that the Governor in Council has power to regulate the rates of tolls for freight. They have not exercised that power to any great extent in the past, but I trust they will hereafter look a little more closely into this matter. I should have been much pleased if the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), to establish a Railway Commission, had passed, for it would have relieved the Government of any responsibility, and would have placed the question of rates in the hands of men of ordinary common sense—as the hon. gentleman stated at the time he moved his motion—and the people would have been better served than they are at present. I believe there is now a question of litigation in regard to lumber carriage on some of the roads in the north. The railway company not only gives special rates to individuals, thus allowing one party an advantage over another, but sometimes they will not furnish the cars required, and this has been not only a very serious inconvenience, but, in some instances, a matter of almost ruin to lumber manufacturers and other parties in the northern country. That is a matter which should receive the serious attention of the Government at a very early day, and I trust the leader of the Government, who has shown a desire to look into the matter covered by the motion moved by my hon. friend, will also look into this matter of traffic rates and see that the section of country traversed by railways that have received aid from the Government do perform the work for which they were constructed.

**Mr. TISDALE.** I cannot allow the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman to pass without offering a few observations, because I have some knowledge of the extension of the Grand Trunk and other railways into the northern country. I am prepared to say that had not the Grand Trunk taken over 200 miles of road, of which I am personally cognisant, and operated the road, it would otherwise have been closed to-day. It is exceedingly unfair for the hon. gentleman to have spoken of the Grand Trunk or any other railway in the general manner he has done. The Royal Commission appointed by the Government, upon whose report the Bill introduced last year by the Government was founded, considered these questions very fully and carefully, and, in accordance with their recommendations, power is now vested in the Government to enquire into any of these matters which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. If he would bring down specific charges, as he should do when he rises in this House where the parties charged cannot reply, and makes such general statements, then they could be met, and the Government would see that justice was done, if any injustice had taken place. It is very unfair to rise in this House and in a general way arraign any railway, when the hon. gentleman dare not formulate any specific charges so that they could be brought before the proper tribunal.

Motion agreed to.

#### FREIGHT TRANSIT THROUGH CANADA.

On the Order, motion of Mr. IVES, for:

Select Committee to enquire into and report upon the amount of tonnage and kind of freight, during the year 1887, going to or from Canada, and passing through the United States in bond, its destination and place of shipment, both as to exports and imports, and what changes or improvements are necessary to be made to make it *advantageous to shippers* and importers to have such freight carried by lines of transit wholly through Canadian territory and received at or shipped from Canadian ports. Also, to enquire into and report upon the cost of transportation of such freight, and the probable cost had such freight been carried over lines of transit not passing through any portion of the United States. Also, to enquire into and report upon the tonnage, kind

of freight, destination and place of shipment of all merchandise during the same period passing through Canada in bond from one part to another part of the United States. The said committee to be composed of Sir A. G. Archibald and Messrs. Burns, Charlton, Davies, Ellis, Jones (Halifax), Joncas, Kenny, Laundry, Langelier (Quebec), Perley, Skinner, Weldon (Albert), Wood (Westmoreland), and the mover. That said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as the committee deem necessary.

An hon. MEMBER. Stand.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to this motion. It is a motion of some importance, in which many of the members feel interested, and I ask whether it would not be better to have an early day set for its discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have had some conversation with my hon. friend in whose name this resolution stands, and I made a suggestion to him he will probably adopt, in the direction of altering the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been altered once already. Is this a second amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A second edition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A further alteration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, a further amelioration.

Mr. CASEY. We are to understand that the motion stands at the request of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. It is well to understand this, because it has been taken as a matter of course too frequently, recently, that motions should stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

#### PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government through specially appointed officers.

He said: I again bring before this House the question of prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I do so this time at the request of the temperance people of this Dominion, as expressed by them in a large and influential convention held in Montreal in July last. Two years ago I submitted to this House a resolution in similar terms to the one which I submit to-day. After a somewhat lengthy discussion that resolution received the support of seventy members of this House. A year ago I again submitted for the consideration of this House the resolution which I put forward to-day, but owing to the late period of the Session at which the matter was reached, it was found impossible to fully dispose of the question. The debate was adjourned, and, unfortunately, we did not afterwards reach it, so that no division took place. I do not think that it requires any apology on my part to again bring up this question in this Parliament. It is quite true that this is the third occasion on which it has been brought before this House during the present Parliament. I fear, however, that we shall have to face the question, not only in subsequent Sessions of this Parliament, but also in future Parliaments, until it is settled in some satisfactory manner. I do not think it advisable on my part, after having on several former occasions given my reasons at some length in support of this resolution, to again trouble the House with those arguments. However, this is a question of very great moment to the people of this Dominion, and no question of greater and more far-reaching consequence to the whole of the electors of the Dominion can come before this Parliament. The moral

Mr. TISDALE.

sentiment of this country is forcing this question to the front, and I regard it as the great moral issue of the day. We are dealing with very extensive questions here which affect the trade and commerce of this country, and I believe it to be our duty likewise to deal with questions which affect the morals of the people. I know of no question which so deeply interests the people in this respect, as the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Anything which touches the home life of the people must necessarily be of great interest to the people, and any evil which affects our home life must necessarily attack the very foundations of all our institutions. I trust that this question will be considered fully and fairly in connection with the introduction of this motion. I am quite aware that it is surrounded with a great many other considerations which have to be dealt with. There is, we are told, the question of the revenue, which must be provided. I do not purpose at any length to discuss this issue on the present occasion. I am satisfied, however, that should the traffic in intoxicating liquors be prohibited, the revenue will, at all events before any lengthened period has elapsed, properly take care of itself. The people have to pay the revenue of the country, and it would be much better for them to pay it upon commodities which do not injuriously affect the lives and the welfare of the people. Again, there is the question of compensation to be dealt with. Some contend (and perhaps with some show of reason) that we ought, in connection with the consideration of this question, to decide the other questions which arise as a corollary to it—for instance, the compensation to those engaged in the traffic of intoxicating liquors. I do not know what turn this debate may take before this resolution is disposed of by the House, and it may be that this question will be forced upon our consideration. I can only speak for myself in this matter, and I have this much to say, that, if by conceding to those engaged in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors the right of compensation, were to secure to this country the blessings and benefits of the entire abrogation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, I for one would be quite prepared to put my hand in my pocket as a ratepayer and contribute my share for that purpose. I know, however, that there are large numbers of people in this country who contend, and with an equal show of reason, that those engaged in that traffic are not entitled to compensation. However, in my judgment, the proper time to consider that question is when we have before us for our consideration a measure providing for the suppression or prohibition of the traffic. I do not think that it would be advisable to pronounce upon this aspect of the question, in advance of the submission to this or to any succeeding Parliament a measure having in view the suppression of the traffic. This question is not one which is moving the people of this Dominion alone, but in every civilised country on the face of the globe it is forcing itself to the front. I was very glad to see not long ago that the Government of the mother country were taking steps to inform themselves in reference to the legislation of this country. I have not had the privilege of examining the report which was sent from this Government to the Home Government at their request, in reference to the working of our local option law, known as the Canada Temperance Act. I expect, in a return which will likely be brought down in pursuance of a motion of which I have given notice, to have an opportunity of perusing that document. But there is one thing in connection with the request of the Home Government which has given me some satisfaction at least, and that is the fact that the Government of Great Britain is interesting itself in this question which vitally affects the people of the United Kingdom as well as the people of this Dominion. It has been said that prohibition does not prohibit, and we have been told that there is a retrograde movement on this question in this Dominion. About a

year ago several repeal votes were had upon the Canada Temperance Act, and, in my judgment, very unfortunately, the people had to some extent taken a retrograde step upon this question. My judgment is that the Canada Temperance Act has been a benefit in the direction of suppressing the traffic in intoxicating liquor. The statistics of the country afford ample evidence of that fact. I have some figures here to which I wish to call the attention of the House, to show the effect which the movement for local option, which has had its rise within recent years in this country, has had upon the traffic. Take, for instance, the Inland Revenue returns for the four years, commencing with 1884 and ending with 1887, and we find that the spirits taken out for home consumption aggregated \$12,166,257, an average of \$3,041,541 for each of those years. When we come, however, to the year 1888, we see something which is remarkable as indicating the lessened consumption of spirits in this country. We find that in that year the value of spirits taken out for home consumption was \$2,326,327, or nearly three-quarters of a million less than was taken out on the average during any of the preceding four years. It seems to me that this fact indicates very strongly that the local option movement has had a very salutary effect in reducing the consumption of intoxicating liquors in this Dominion. Then, there is another test which I would like to present to the House as indicating in another way the salutary effect of the local option movement in lessening crime in the country. I suppose the commitments for drunkenness should be regarded as a sort of barometer to indicate the degree of drunkenness prevailing in the country. Now, I wish to compare the returns of commitments for drunkenness in fifteen counties of the Province of Ontario prior to the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act, with those after the adoption of that Act. Take, for instance, the first whole year under license, before the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act, the year 1884, during which, in those fifteen counties, the commitments for drunkenness numbered 692. Then I take the year 1887, being the first whole year under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and I find that the number of commitments, in the same fifteen counties, was only 186, which, I think, demonstrates very forcibly that the local option law has had a very salutary effect in reducing drunkenness in the Province of Ontario at least. But it may be said that there is a general improvement in the morals of the people, and that this is a result of influences which are outside altogether of the operation of the local option law in those counties. Well, I will apply another test. I will take a group of fifteen counties which have never been under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and I will compare the number of commitments for drunkenness in them for the same two years. In those fifteen counties I find that the commitments for drunkenness numbered 2,985 in 1884 and 2,999 in 1887, an increase of fourteen, showing that there has been at least no decrease in the number of commitments for drunkenness in these counties, and proving conclusively to my mind that the operation of the local option law has had a salutary effect. Now, Sir, if local option, which is necessarily a very imperfect law, and is only partial prohibition at best, has had such a salutary effect on the morals of the people, may we not reasonably ask what effect would not general prohibition have on the morals of the people? I think we are fully warranted in coming to the conclusion that a general prohibitory measure in this Dominion would be a vast improvement upon the license system which now prevails, and that ultimately not only the revenues of the country, but the morals of the people, and, above all, the happiness of the people of this Dominion, would be very largely promoted. Now, as I am exceedingly anxious that we should reach a division upon this question, I do not propose taking up the time of this

House at any greater length. I have, in as brief a form as possible, given my reasons for bringing this very important question before you, and I trust that, after proper discussion and consideration of it has been had, we shall deal with it in the most searching and serious way, and give to this resolution greater support than it received on any former occasion.

Mr. WOOD (Brookville). I beg to move in amendment that:

All after the word "purposes" in the original resolution be omitted and the following substituted therefor: "When the public sentiment of the country is ripe for the reception and enforcement of such a measure of prohibition."

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg to move in amendment to the amendment that:

All the words after "purposes" in the original resolution be struck out and the following substituted: "If it be found, on a vote of the qualified electors of the Dominion having first been taken, and a majority thereof are in favor of a prohibition law which shall also make full provision for compensating those engaged in the manufacture of such liquors."

Mr. FISHER. I am not at all sorry that this question has assumed its present shape. We can quite understand the objects and intentions of those gentlemen who have moved these amendments. We can quite appreciate, from their action, that they are not desirous of voting upon the question as it has been put before them on former occasions by the temperance people of this country, or as it has to-day been put before them as a square issue, but prefer to mix it up with other matters in such a way that the real square issue may be avoided, and that we may be compelled to deal with two matters entirely extraneous to the principle of the original motion. On former occasions similar efforts were made to introduce the question of compensation, and on such occasions I always took the opportunity of saying that I believed it was not wise or right to introduce the question of compensation until we came to discuss the details of a prohibitory law. When those details are really before the House, it will be the duty of everybody to discuss them and decide as to whether it is wise or right to give compensation for the loss of such industries as might be destroyed by a prohibitory law. But, at the present stage, I do not believe it is in the interest of the country at large, and especially of the future of this temperance cause, that we should have a bare opinion in this House on this question of compensation. The other side issue brought up is that of the way in which this prohibition should be brought about. Heretofore, on many occasions, when this question was discussed in the House, we desired to proceed by the constitutional methods long tried and well understood in this country, but by the amendment to the amendment which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has now before the House, we are asked to introduce an innovation. We are asked to take the vote of the people directly upon a question of the highest interest; we are asked, as a body representing the people of Canada, to relegate to the people a portion of that authority and power which they have placed in our hands. I am not prepared to say that that would be a wise step for us to take. Personally, I am well satisfied with the constitutional methods of this country. I believe that if they are followed carefully and wisely, we will arrive at the conclusion which we deem right in the interests of the people. I believe that the representatives of the people assembled here have been delegated sufficient authority and are competent to act in the matter; but there are some reasons why it should be wiser and better that a plebiscite should be asked and this great question brought directly before the people, to be pronounced upon by them apart from any political strife. No doubt, the representatives of the people here were not elected upon this direct issue alone; no doubt, they stand here representing many conflicting interests; no doubt, at the general

elections held a few years ago although this temperance question was one of the most prominent brought before the electorate, still the electorate did not pronounce absolutely upon it, and therefore there may be good ground for submitting this question to the people apart from any other political matter. There is also no doubt that, when this temperance question is being discussed before the country, frequently political issues aside from it have been dragged into the discussion. There is no doubt that, on many occasions, those gentlemen who have been taking part in temperance discussions have been influenced by political preferences and political interests, and that they have not voted or acted simply in accordance with temperance principles, or in the interest of the cause they were pretending to advocate at the time they spoke. It is however, doubtful in my mind whether even such an object would justify the substitution of what is not a constitutional method in this country for our ordinary constitutional procedure; but, if I believed that the cause of temperance would be advanced by bringing this question to a plébiscite in this country, I would be inclined to depart from our ordinary constitutional method. I have so much at heart the temperance cause that I would adopt any legitimate method in the interest of that cause by which it would be advanced to a triumph, so that the people of Canada could come under the enforcement of entire prohibition. But I do not consider that the present moment, and the present way in which the question of a plébiscite is brought before this House, is such that it is right or fair to ask us to deal with it now. It is brought in as a side issue and as an amendment to such an important question as that which was proposed a few minutes ago by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). The question before the House was a direct and clear proposition. How the result may best be brought about is a side issue, and it is not desirable that the minds or the attention of the people or of this House should be drawn aside from the main question to discuss the details as to how it can be brought about. Then, when we find that the amendment to the amendment includes another question—that of compensation—I feel that I cannot accept or adopt the amendment to the amendment or acknowledge that there is any justification for it in preference to the original motion. I shall, therefore, feel it my duty to vote against the amendment to the amendment. Then, when I deal with the amendment to the original motion, I find that, practically, it is the same expedient that was adopted a few years ago to emasculate the motion made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, then the member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster). It is practically the amendment which was then proposed by the late hon. Thomas White, then member for Cardwell, and which, when added to the original motion, was adopted unanimously by the House. But, although that occurred five or six years ago, we find that the adoption of that motion did not in any way advance the temperance cause, and that it was in no sense a help to us who have been advocating temperance in Canada since that time. On the contrary, we found that the test of the opinion of this House on the temperance question was not taken at all on the original motion, but on its being amended as it is now proposed to amend it by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). When the amendment was adopted to the prohibitory resolution which was introduced during that Session of Parliament, the whole press and people of this country, and especially the temperance people, looked upon the vote on the sub-amendment as the crucial test of the temperance view of this House. My hon. friend, the then member for Shelburne, Nova Scotia, introduced a sub-amendment that the resolution should be immediately acted upon, and that the people of Canada were ready for prohibition. That sub-amendment was lost by a considerable majority, and everywhere throughout the country those who voted for that sub-amendment, and those only, were accepted as the true

Mr. FISHER.

defenders of the temperance cause. It was then thoroughly acknowledged and understood through the country that the motion for total prohibition, amended as it then was, and as it is now proposed to be by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), was practically of no avail, and that those who voted for it did not really endorse, or sustain, or support, or pledge themselves to the temperance cause of this country. I cannot, therefore, believe that it is in the best interests of the temperance cause that the amendment to the original resolution should be adopted here, and I believe it is absolutely necessary, if we wish to put on record the opinion of members of this House on the temperance question, that they should vote straight and square on the original motion, and should say whether they are or are not in favor of total prohibition in this country to-day. I do not consider that it is necessary, or that it is my duty to go into the merits of these side issues, as I contend they are—the merits of compensation or the merits of the plébiscite, further than I have done. When the details of a prohibitory law are before the House, I shall be ready, and it will be my duty, to discuss compensation as a portion of those details, and I shall be ready then to say what my opinion is in regard to it; but at the present moment, I do not consider that is the question at issue or the question before this House, and therefore I have no hesitation in voting against the sub-amendment, in voting against the first amendment, and in voting for the original resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and seconded by myself.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Brome has commenced the discussion of this question as he does all others.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman having moved an amendment, it is the same as if he had spoken on it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the adjournment of the debate, in order to give my hon. friend the opportunity of getting this question properly before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) for having—he being an old parliamentarian and a friend of prohibition—taken an opportunity to place me in order, so that I might say a few words on this question. I was going to say that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) commenced the discussion of this question, as he generally does, by charging hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with not being loyal to the temperance cause, charging my hon. friend the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) and myself with not being favorable to the original resolution, with not having the backbone to face it. I will not yield in my loyalty to the temperance cause to the hon. gentleman or to any other hon. gentleman in this House, when it is brought forward apart from politics; but, if politics are to have first place in temperance resolutions, I generally stand by my politics. We threshed this subject pretty well out to-day in another part of this building. We had a meeting for the purpose of discussing this and other questions, and my hon. friend took there, as he does here, a strong political side of the question. He argues that the amendment to the amendment is unconstitutional. I would like to have him point out to me in what respect it is unconstitutional. I do not say in that resolution that this Government shall find out the sentiment of the majority of the people. That can be done by the temperance people of this country, it can be done by the Provincial Legislatures of this country, it can be done by the municipal institutions of this country. When there is a strong public sentiment shown for prohibition, then the Government are going to give it to us; as soon as we can prove to them that a majority of the people are in favor of prohibition, it will be the duty of the Government to give us prohibition. I expressly guarded my resolution

so that it should not be in conflict with the constitution, so that my hon. friend may take that part of his excuse back. He has, I believe, and I believe that the Temperance Alliance has, no other object in view in bringing that resolution here, year after year, and having it voted down, than to make some political capital for their friends through the country and against the Government. I explained to-day, in another part of this House, the way the Scott Act is being enforced throughout the Province of Ontario, an Act which has been passed and sustained in this House time and again, and which has proved itself to be all that is required by the temperance people. The Dominion Alliance met here the other day. Are they coming before this Parliament and asking any amendments to the Scott Act? No. They say the Scott Act is all right, that it is workable. That Scott Act has in it fines and penalties for first, second and third offences. We have had it in force in our counties for three years, and every hotel man in those counties during those three years has been selling liquor right along. And has any one of them been fined for second or third offence? I say no. And who is to blame? The officials of the Ontario Government have not enforced that Act. Yet my hon. friend wanted to censure the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West to-day for having simply done his duty clearly within the law of this country. They want to censure him. Let him come nearer home and censure the Ontario Government for not having enforced the Scott Act, which was passed by this Government with all the machinery for making it workable, which my hon. friend admits by not coming to this House and asking for amendments to it. I told my hon. friend that I would move an amendment to the resolution of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), asking for a plebiscite vote, asking that the voice of the electors of this Dominion might be had, asking for prohibition pure and simple. I believe that in asking for prohibition we should do as the English people did in removing slavery from their country—they bought it out. Let us not have any grievance to trouble us in the future after we get prohibition. Those men have invested their money in the manufacture of this article, under the sanction and authority of all Governments that have been in power; let us, while we are removing the manufacture, indemnify those who have invested their money in that manufacture. Then we will remove that grievance and, with the majority of the people at our back, this Government, or any Government that may be in power, will provide the ways and means for carrying on the Government without any revenue from liquor. These are my sentiments on the temperance question, and I will not yield to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher), or to any other temperance man in this House, in being true to temperance when temperance comes up independent of politics; but when men like my hon. friend opposite try to make political capital out of temperance then they may count on my opposition.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is hardly necessary for me to reply to the hon. gentleman when it is so very evident to the House that he has introduced politics, while I am sure that no one can possibly find any politics in the words which I uttered here when I spoke a few minutes ago. As to what occurred in another place in this building—I believe I may refer to it, as we were not in committee of this House—the hon. gentleman did say that he proposed to move an amendment, something in this sense, to the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I then suggested to him what I said just now, that it would be very much better to move a substantive motion, and allow an expression of this House to be taken upon what I call a side issue, or, at any rate, another issue,

that of the plebiscite. But he, knowing that there was a desire on my part and on the part of some other members, to have an expression of the opinion of the House on that question, deliberately preferred to mix it up with this other question; and I then said that I clearly would have to vote against the plebiscite, and in substitution to the amendment which I myself was seconding on the floor of this House. I confess that I cannot quite make out the explanations which the hon. member has made of his own motion. I am very glad that my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) moved the adjournment of the debate, so that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken might make an explanation of his amendment. But his explanation leaves me more in the dark than I was before; because I understood at the time I spoke before that his amendment was that a plebiscite should be taken, and that this Parliament should make such arrangements as would procure the opinion and desire of the people of Canada on this question. But a minute or two ago, in his explanation to this amendment, the hon. gentleman said that he was careful not to throw the onus of doing this upon the Dominion Government, but that it might be done by the Local Legislatures, or by anybody else who chose. Now, I think that would be a very great mistake. If we are to take a plebiscite it is absolutely necessary that it should be taken in such a way that the people of the whole of the Dominion of Canada, from one end to the other, should be able to vote upon it. The Government of the Dominion are the only authorities who can bring about such an expression of opinion on the part of the people, and, as I said a few minutes ago, if such an expression of opinion is asked for, let it be taken in such a way that party politics cannot be introduced into it, in such a way that the people may speak on that question alone. But if we were to put upon the Local Governments the duty of taking plebiscite, among the first to question their methods would be the hon. gentleman from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor). He has here, without any excuse whatever, without any question having arisen in regard to it, taken upon himself to bring up the question of the enforcement of the Scott Act by the Ontario Government, whom we all know he is ready to criticise at any moment. The hon. member alluded to a question which arose this morning in another place in this building. The hon. member knows that in that place not a word was said of the Ontario Government, or of any other Government, until he brought the matter up himself; that no question whatever arose as to party politics until he told us—not myself alone, but everybody in that meeting—that we need not go to the North-West to censure anybody, but that we could come before this Parliament and censure those who are nearer home. The hon. member acknowledges that he did so, and he knows very well, and everybody who was present at that meeting knows very well, that up to the time he introduced party politics, no mention or allusion was made to them by anybody, incidentally or remotely. The fact of the matter is, the hon. member, I suppose, was desirous of screening somebody—it is possible from the way he spoke that he may be now desirous of screening somebody. I do not know, I hope it is not so, but after what he has said I must believe it is so. But, Sir, I believe that the amendment he has proposed here involves the direct duty of the Government of which he is a supporter to take immediate steps to bring about the plebiscite in this country. The hon. gentleman nods. I understand, then, that he does throw that responsibility upon the Government which he supports, and that if this motion is carried, as he proposes that it should be carried—

Mr. TAYLOR. You say that would be unconstitutional. It was put in that way.

Mr. FISHER. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand fully what is my argument. I do not say that a plebiscite would be unconstitutional. I say that Parliament has a perfect right to introduce into Canada the system of plebiscite if it chooses to do so; but to-day we have in Canada constitutional methods by which a prohibitory or any other law can be imposed on the people, and it is not necessary to make an innovation on our constitutional method. But if the hon. gentleman's motion is carried it casts immediately upon the Government the duty of bringing about a plebiscite, and I do not think my hon. friend foresaw that little dilemma. If he does that, he will be practically casting a reflection upon the Government which he supports because they have not taken that step before this. If this motion is carried it is practically a censure on the Government for not having before this time taken a plebiscite and compelling them to take it as soon as possible and find out what is the will of the people of Canada upon prohibition; and when that will has been expressed it will be the duty of the Government to carry it out. It has been stated over and over by various speakers in Parliament and elsewhere that it is the duty of the Government to carry out the express will of the people, and no doubt the Government would carry out that expressed view, were it declared at the polls. The only objection I have to a plebiscite is that it is an innovation on our constitutional methods. If that innovation is going to bring about prohibition, I am ready to support the motion, but I do not consider it is going to help to bring about a plebiscite, or to help to bring about prohibition. I desire that the vote should be taken on the original motion, which is the motion proposed in this House before, which is the motion drawn up by the representatives of the temperance people in this country, assembled in convention, and which is on the journals of Parliament; which is the resolution passed by the temperance people in convention held in Montreal last fall, at which were gathered representatives from all parts of the country, a convention which could have been attended by the hon. gentleman, or anyone else holding his views, and at which convention it was decided, after much discussion, to have this resolution proposed in the House of Commons, and a vote of the House challenged upon it. I consider, therefore, it is the bounden duty of those who believe that the temperance people know their own minds, to vote for the original motion, and leave out altogether those side issues which have been imported into the question.

Mr. ROOME. As seconder of the motion moved by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) I desire to offer a few words. As a temperance man, and one who has always been so, I believe this motion is in the interest of temperance in this country. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has pointed to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and referred to the introduction of politics into this discussion at a meeting of temperance people which took place this morning. That meeting was held for the purpose of considering a vote of censure on the Governor of the North-West Territories, and while there we discussed the temperance question as applied to the whole country and in doing so the action of the Ontario Government on the Scott Act was brought forward. I claim that that Act should be a warning when we attempt to place another Statute on the Statute-book without having a majority of the people prepared to carry it out, for in such an event it would be useless. The Scott Act had not sufficient power behind it to carry it out and for that reason it has failed. I claim there are several reasons why it has failed and why it will be repealed in every county of Ontario as soon as a vote can be taken upon it. One reason was that at the time the Act came into force it had not a majority of the people at its back, although it was carried by a majority of votes

Mr. FISHER.

polled in each county. This was due to the fact that those who were indifferent to the question did not come forward and vote, but when the Act came into force it had not a majority of the people to aid in carrying it out. A second reason was the lack of compensation to those engaged in the liquor traffic. Under the Crooks Act, many of these men were called upon to expend all their means in fitting up their houses, so as to be able to get a license under that law, and when they had succeeded in placing their houses in a position to receive a license the Government stepped in and said: You cannot sell. A certain amount of sympathy was aroused for the liquor dealers by their friends, and this did something to assist in defeating the Act. In this motion we propose that when a vote has been taken and the majority of the people of the Dominion have expressed themselves in favor of a prohibitory Act, then it will be time for the Government to take action, and, by giving a certain recompense to those engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquor, it will remove that influence which tells against the Scott Act in the different counties—not that the men are to be paid for what they have invested in the trade, but that a certain amount be allowed, which will tend to remove that feeling which would otherwise prevail. A similar course was adopted many years ago by Great Britain in regard to the abolition of slavery. The Government devoted a certain amount of money to remove that curse, and by so doing saved much to the country. Our neighbors across the line did not see fit to remove slavery in their midst in that manner, and were afterwards obliged to expend millions of money and sacrifice millions of lives to suppress it. It will be the same in our case with the liquor question. If we devote a certain amount to recompense those engaged in the liquor traffic and manufacture, it may assist in bringing about prohibition, but to pass a law at present to prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, without the majority of the people being in favor of it, would be to place a useless Act on the Statute book. Judging from our experience of the Scott Act, it would be impossible to put in force any prohibitory law unless it were supported by a majority of the people. The amendment to the amendment, proposed by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), is, therefore, one which should meet the views of the temperance people of Canada, and of the temperance members in this House. I should like to see prohibition brought about and carried to a successful issue, as I believe liquor to be one of the great curses of our country, and it should be the aim of every temperance man to lay aside his politics, to a very great extent, and assist in bringing about the enactment of some measure, not by trying to make political capital out of the question, which has been done too much in Canada in past years, but by joining together and supporting some plan which by degrees would in the end bring about prohibition. The amendment to the amendment, I therefore think, should meet the approbation of the majority of members of this House.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

#### REBATE OF DUTY ON CORN.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That, whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export, should also receive a similar rebate.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution is very clear and apparent. Under the present law distillers who import corn for the purpose of manufacturing it into whiskey, or other spirits, are allowed a rebate of the duty on the grain that they import, but the farmer who imports corn to feed his cattle so as to convert them into beef has to pay a duty of

7½ cents a bushel on the grain imported for this purpose. The difficulties that arise, and the injuries done the farmer are of a more serious character than the mere matter of the duty, for while the distiller is allowed a rebate on the grain, he is not charged any duty on the slop which he uses for the purpose of fattening cattle in order to compete with the farmers' cattle. Hence the farmer is obliged to pay this duty which is commuted to the distiller, who enters into competition with him in fattening cattle for export. This is one of the anomalies of the fiscal policy of the Government. This is one of the difficulties which it creates and which are becoming more and more apparent from year to year. We see very many instances in the operation of the tariff of how the farmers are discriminated against, and how many articles are allowed to come in free as raw material to enter into the manufacture of goods, which afterwards come into competition with the products of the farmer. Another instance of this unfair discrimination is to be found in the case of wool. The manufacturer is allowed to import wool free, to use it in manufacture, and yet the farmers are in no way compensated. In the case of this duty on corn, they were told that the duty was to be placed upon it, for the purpose of increasing the price and for the purpose of preventing corn being brought in, to compete with and lessen the value of their own corn. This end has not been attained, for the price has not been increased. The question now arises did this duty raise the price of corn for the Canadian corn grower? I think the examination of the prices of corn will show that the price has not been increased. For instance in 1878 the price of corn in the United States was 47½ cents a bushel and in Canada at that time it was 66¼ cents a bushel, so that our farmers received 19 cents more than the farmers of the United States obtained for their corn. In the year 1888, about 9 years after the tariff had been in existence, our farmers had received but 66 cents for corn and the price of corn in the United States had increased to 55 cents a bushel, the difference being then only 11 cents a bushel in favor of our farmers. I quote from the Statistical Record on page 164, and we find, that in 1881, in Montreal, the price of corn was 66 cents a bushel and that in the United States it was 65 cents a bushel. In 1885 in Montreal corn was 49 cents a bushel and it was also 49 cents a bushel in the United States. The period at which the Canadian farmer received the highest price for his corn was the period during which there was no duty on corn. He then received 19 cents a bushel more than the American farmer and at no period since the duty has been on has the difference been so great in his favor as it was at that time. In the mean time our people have paid a good deal of duty on the corn that came into Canada. Last year the duty paid was \$173,384.72, and the duty on cornmeal amounted to \$53,837.17. We exported last year to the United States 40,047 head of cattle and the United States exported to England 241,360 cattle. Now the United States have apparently taken our cattle for export. They have their grain to fatten the cattle and send them to England, whereas if our farmers had been allowed to buy American corn to feed their cattle they might have fattened them at home and have had the advantage of the direct export. They would also have had other advantages in connection with this matter which are of very vital consequence to the farming community. Not only would they have fed their cattle but they would have kept the manures, and the value of manure from a ton of corn fed to cattle is given by the highest authorities at \$7 40. I contend that the farmers have just as much right to this rebate of this duty on corn as the distillers have, and I think the Minister of Finance will agree with me in that proposition. I think also that the members of this House will agree with me that the farmers are as much entitled to the consideration of the members of this House as are any other class in the community. We find further that this

principle of rebate injures the farmers in several other ways. If this rebate was not given to the distillers, the distillers would be obliged to buy the rye grown by our farmers and to use it in the manufacture of spirits, instead of using American corn. It is said, and I believe with a good deal of truth, that a great deal of the corn that was used in the manufacture of spirits last year was not the produce of Canada.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

#### PRIVILEGE—THE INFORMER LECARON.

Mr. FLYNN. Before the House proceeds with the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a cablegram from London which I have seen in to-day's issue of the *Ottawa Free Press*. I regret that the hon. First Minister is not in his place, for I should much prefer that he were here when I read it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman had better wait until the First Minister comes. He will be here soon.

Mr. BOWELL. No objection will be taken to the hon. gentleman reading it, though it is not at the time of calling the Orders of the Day.

Mr. FLYNN. I will read it now to give the Government the earliest opportunity of denying the statement made in this cablegram. It is as follows:—

London, Feb. 13.—Sir Charles Russell before the Parnell Commission yesterday, directed his questions to the career of Lecaron as a spy and paid agent of the British Government. Lecaron was forced to admit that he had received fifty pounds per month for years from the British Government and far more from the Canadian authorities, and that he was still under the pay of both, and that a considerable sum was due him."

Mr. BOWELL. We will leave that to the First Minister.

#### ARTIFICIAL FERTILISERS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock:

That the House do go into Committee of the Whole forthwith to consider a certain resolution declaring it expedient to remove the duty on artificial fertilisers and to place them on the free list.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In rising to resume the debate on the resolution of my hon. friend from North York, I beg leave to trouble the House for a short time while I express my views on this question. Underlying the question itself, there is a principle involved which is probably more important to the class more particularly interested than perhaps any other immediately under consideration. We are not here on our own responsibility to speak simply for ourselves on this matter, but we are endeavoring to speak in the name and on behalf of the great class which we represent here, and which is known as the agricultural class of the Dominion. We are not here representing our own individual opinion, but the opinion of nearly one-half of the people of this country. When we consider the number of farmers in the Dominion, we must see that their interests are of the greatest importance and should be recognized by the representatives of the people, when a question of this nature is brought before them. We have no less than 208,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada who are interested in this question; 208,000 farmers represents no less than two millions of people who derive their livelihood directly from the products of the farm; and, therefore, we are speaking not in the name of a few, but in the name of nearly a majority of the people of Canada. Again, we speak in the name of that class who represent the greatest amount of investment of any class in the Dominion. As compared with the investments of the farmers, the in-



vestments of the manufacturers sink almost into insignificance. Their investments amount to no less than \$1,500,000,000, and therefore when we speak in their name and on their behalf, we claim the attention of the people of this country to what we have to say. Not only are they the greatest in number and in investments, but they are the greatest taxpayers in the Dominion of Canada. But they are not only the greatest taxpayers, they are the greatest employers of labor; and therefore we have the right to consider their interests under all circumstances and to extend them every consideration that would be conducive to the advancement and development of the industry in which they are employed. Now, Sir, what do we claim for this class? We claim in this instance that the artificial fertilisers they use for the purpose of increasing the fertility of the land shall be permitted to come into this country free of duty. Now, in asking that, in the interest of such a large class, surely we are not asking too much of this Government. The lands of this country are not so fertile as they were many years ago, and they require to be fertilised in order to be brought up to such a standard as will enable the farmers to produce from their lands sufficient to meet expenses and to yield a reasonable profit. But we find that the profits of the farmers for the last few years have not been what we would like to see; and when we find that the soil is not so fruitful as it was at a time when it did not require the same manuring, underdraining and other attention that it requires to-day, it is the duty of this Government to extend every advantage to this great class, whose prosperity in my opinion is the foundation of the prosperity of every other class in the Dominion. But again the land has not only been depreciating in fertility, but it has been depreciating also in value, and it is reasonable to suppose that it is depreciating in value because the receipts of the farmers for the products of their labor are not equal to what they have been in years past, and the consequence is that if they wish to dispose of their lands they cannot reasonably expect to realise as much for them as they could a few years ago. I know it is contended by many hon. members that farm lands are as high in price to-day as they were many years ago, but this is certainly not the case. I am sure I shall be borne out by those who know the value of farm lands throughout the country when I say that they cannot realise within 15 or 20 per cent. of what they could a number of years ago. Now, the fertilisers are raw material to the farmer, and we admit the principle in our legislation that raw material should be brought in free. In fact, in this country we have no less than 8,500,000 pounds of wool brought in free of duty as raw material for the manufacture of woollen goods, so that our manufacturers may be able to place on the market their woollen goods to better advantage than if they were not permitted to import the raw material free. We import into this country, free of duty, no less than 32,000,000 pounds of cotton as raw material, as a basis for our cotton manufacturers. We have permitted to come in last year free of duty no less than 2,157,000 tons of coal, which is, to a very large extent, the raw material of many manufactures in this country. We allowed to be brought in free of duty no less than 184,000,000 pounds of salt, which is raw material to the fishermen of the Eastern Provinces, in order that their employment might be thus made more lucrative. If it is right to permit such a large quantity of raw material to come in free to assist our manufacturers and other parties engaged in various industries, upon the same principle it will be right and just that we should allow fertilisers, which are raw material to the farmer, to come in free of duty. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to another feature of this question. The endeavor has been made by those who have spoken against the removal of the duty to show that it

Mr. MACDONALD (HURON),

would interfere with the manufacturers of this country, but under our National Policy we have bound ourselves to expose, at the will of the United States, the products of our farms to open competition with the farmers of that country. We have told the United States in plain words: If you will permit our wheat to go into your country free of duty, we will permit your wheat to come into Canada free of duty. But, on the other hand, these hon. gentlemen contend that if we were to say to the United States, allow our fertilisers to go into your country free of duty, and we will allow yours to come in free, that would be interfering with our manufacturing industries. In many ways our farmers are exposed to competition. Why not open up our markets so that our farmers will stand on equal footing with the manufacturers. I will now refer to the objections that were brought against this motion by hon. gentlemen the other day. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), who, I believe, is a prospective Minister, who is likely to be appointed to that high position which is now occupied by the Minister of Railways, and who therefore no doubt spoke with authority, said, in commencing his speech, that if it was the general policy of the Government, which was attacked by this resolution, he would say nothing, but that there was a sectional matter upon which he rose to speak; and he went on to show that there was a large manufactory of fertilisers in his section of the country, that of Messrs. Nicholls & Co., of Capelton, formerly of New York, which, if this resolution were carried, would be injuriously affected. I would ask, is it right and just to tax the farmers of this country in order to support a foreign company which established itself in Sherbrooke for the purpose of manufacturing fertilisers? The hon. gentleman went on to say that he placed the interest of the capital of this foreign company in the one scale, and the theory, as he called it, of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in the other. But you must remember, Sir, that it was not a theory which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) advanced, and that upon the one hand the hon. member for Sherbrooke was placing the interests of this company, and on the other the interests of the farming community, and then asked Parliament to support the company by a protective duty at the expense of the farmer. I say it is unfair to a most important class of the community that we should impose a duty for the purpose of increasing the profits of a certain company and increasing the burthen of those who already bear the heaviest burthens imposed by the National Policy. Another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who is generally fluent and pretty clever in putting his case, attempted to argue in favor of this tax, but on this occasion he had no case. He said that the farmers were being defrauded by artificial fertilisers of inferior quality being brought into this country. He must conclude that our farmers are not so sharp as they really are. You will find, Sir, among them men as sharp, as capable of discharging business and of investigating matters in their own behalf as you will find in this House to-day. The hon. gentleman said that because no analysis was made of importations of fertilisers, inferior fertilisers were brought in, and our farmers cheated out of their money. Another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) argued that the fertilisers brought from the United States were of an inferior quality, that the analysis only took place of fertilisers for use in that country, and therefore he contended that this tax should continue in the interests of the farmers of this country. But the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) was himself the author of a Bill brought in in 1884 and placed upon the Statutes, which contains the provision that fertilisers imported from foreign countries into the Dominion must be subjected to analysis here

before they can be entered, and that the materials manufactured in this country must also be analysed. I have the Bill before me.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is there anything in the Bill about analyzing fertilisers from foreign countries brought in by private individuals?

**Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).** In order to prove that I am right in my contention, I will read the clause. The preamble of the Bill reads: "For the prevention of frauds in the manufacture and sale of agricultural fertilisers." Then the 5th section gives a definition of agricultural fertilisers. It says the expression "agricultural fertilisers used in this Act shall be construed to mean any and every substance imported, manufactured, prepared or exposed for sale for fertilising or manuring purposes." That plainly refers to any articles imported as fertilisers from foreign countries.

**Mr. SPROULE.** It says, "manufactured or exposed for sale." But if I send an order to Buffalo, as a private individual, and the fertiliser is sent to me, is there anything to prevent my going over the line and bringing it across and using it without its being analysed.

**Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.)** I understand from this Act that all fertilisers must be analysed. If each individual were allowed to bring the article across, what would be the use of putting on the Statute-book an Act for the protection of farmers. It would be useless if each private individual had a right to violate its provisions?

**Mr. SPROULE.** That is how it is being done.

**Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).** Therefore, there is ample provision for the analysis of fertilisers, and that provision includes articles imported from foreign countries as well as manufactured in our own. Another argument that was adduced was one brought forward in that pleasing style which is characteristic of the Postmaster General, who has generally a gentlemanly way of putting things in a fluent, off-handed style, but with that positiveness which is peculiarly characteristic of him. He showed that we had all the materials in abundance close at our hand for the manufacture of those articles which are used as fertilisers. He pointed out in eloquent terms, and truly, that we had large beds of superphosphates in this country, and also deposits of copper pyrites from which the sulphuric acid is manufactured. If we have these raw materials in abundance, and have every facility for their disposal, why should any manufacturer require a high protective duty to sustain him in the market? The same hon. gentleman told us that we could manufacture sulphuric acid in this country so cheaply that we could send it into the United States and compete with the manufacturers in that country. Then, why should we not be able to control our own Canadian market without a protective duty of 35½ per cent. on sulphuric acid? That is the duty now imposed in favor of the manufacturer. But, if it can be manufactured here as cheaply as it can in the United States, and if we have the raw material ready to our hands, is it to the interest of the farming community, who have to pay this duty, to keep it standing as an extra profit to the Canadian manufacturers of artificial fertilisers? If we have these phosphate beds, and if we have these two elements which are required to enter into the manufacture of these fertilisers, is it reasonable to keep this duty on in order to put the extra amount into the pockets of these men at the expense of the agricultural community? I say it is not, and therefore we ask the Government to remove that duty. Another gentleman corroborated that argument. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, who is always capable of making the best out of the worst, who is almost able to make black ap-

pear to be white, corroborated this argument. I was astonished at the weakness of the position which he took. He showed that we had rich beds of superphosphates in this country, that we had every convenience for manufacturing sulphuric acid, so that we could compete with any country in the world, and we were told that these articles were sent to England, and to foreign countries and competed in foreign markets. If that is so, is it right that a high duty should be put upon these articles in order to put an extra profit into the pockets of the manufacturers here? When he was asked the question: Why do you put on the duty? he said, you must remember that they are infant industries. We have heard that expression from time to time for the last ten years. So often do I hear this statement that our industries are of an infant character that I almost conclude that our Dominion is a foundling hospital, and that the Government and their supporters are simply nurses to care for the foundlings. What constitutes an infant industry? You give every facility for the introduction of the raw material which the industry requires, you give it every facility for its development. Has not a Canadian as much skill, as much energy, and as much push, to enable him to go into that industry and make it a success as one of any other nationality? and especially so when these hon. gentlemen, out of their own mouths, unite in saying that we have greater facilities in this country for the production of artificial fertilisers than they have in any other. What constitutes an infant industry? Is it not time to take off the long clothes from the infant? Will it develop its muscles and strengthen its bones as long as you do not allow it to walk? Take off the swaddling clothes from these infants, allow them to use their muscles and those muscles will develop and their bones will harden, and they will grow up in the same way as the industries of the United States have done. Take the infant industries in Michigan. In every town and village in Michigan they have small industries which have to compete with the oldest in the United States, and yet their goods go into every State and compete with those of the oldest manufacturers in the country. They have grown largely, they are increasing the number of their hands, they are increasing their investments in these industries in the West; and, when you remember that Michigan and Illinois and other States are younger than Ontario and most of the Provinces of Canada, I call the attention of the country to those who vote against this motion to-night, in order to show that they stand by their party rather than by the people of the country. In order to sustain foreign capital and foreign investments in this country, they are willing to burden the Canadian farmer to add to the large profits of the manufacturers of artificial fertilisers. I might continue much longer in dealing with these matters, but I would remind the Government that they are leading the country into some serious difficulties in connection with these restrictive measures. I see to-night that a Retaliatory Bill has been introduced by C. S. Baker, of New York, into the Congress of the United States, that is going to impose a heavier duty on our products. He proposes in his Bill to put 15 cents a bushel upon barley, and the United States is our only market for barley; 5 cents a dozen upon eggs, and we exported to the United States last year nearly \$2,000,000 worth of eggs; 25 cents a bushel on potatoes, and how will the people of Prince Edward Island, whose principal product is potatoes, be able to pay 25 cents a bushel to get their product into the United States market, the only market they have for it? If we irritate the United States by these retaliatory tariffs, this is what we must expect. It is time to face this question, and to come to a wise conclusion as to what is best for the country. In putting burdens upon the great industrial class of this country we are committing a crime against them, and at the same time are leading to retaliatory measures on the part of the neighbor-

ing Government. Instead of throwing open our markets as they have been doing to us—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about fresh fish?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes, they allowed our fresh fish to go in there free since 1883. They removed the duty on shrubs, and vines, and seeds four or five years ago, and it was not until last year, and then by force of circumstances, that this Government removed the duty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And then they taxed the baskets.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And then they proposed to tax the baskets, and they did. They permitted the fruits to come in free, and put a duty on the baskets in which they were imported. The nurserymen of our country are allowed to go into the State of New York without any obstacle being thrown in their way at all to sell their goods, and now I see in a Bill before me that an obstruction is to be thrown in the way of those who come from the United States into our country to do the same business that we are permitted freely to do in theirs. I do not wonder at human nature standing up on its dignity and that the Americans say to themselves: If the Canadians are going on in such a course so much in opposition to our interests, we have a right to retaliate in the matter along the lines on which we have been attacked. I think it is the duty of this Government to give earnest heed to what they are doing, and to change their policy to something of a more reciprocal character, so that peace, good will and harmony may exist between the two great nations that are adjoining each other.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). Since having a seat in this House it is not often that I have asked the indulgence of its members to speak upon any question which may have been under discussion, and I do not know that I would do so to night were it not for the fact that this question which has been introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is one which affects the class of which I have the honor to belong, the farmers of this country. While I may not be able to use the eloquence and the glib tongue of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, it is possible that upon this question I may be able to vote with my party and to act in the interest of my country. Sir, we have been told by the hon. member for Middlesex that the farmers of this country ask for no protection. Now, I take it that the question has been decided not only by the farmers of this country but by the people generally in 1878, 1882, and in 1877; they do want protection, and they have said that this Government has given them protection. I need scarcely point out in what direction the Government has given them protection. We find in the case of wheat, in the case of oats, in the case of pork, which are large elements in the production of the farmers of this country, that a very essential protection has been given them. Now take the case of wheat. We find that large importations have been made into this country. We find that 15 cents a bushel have been placed upon wheat, and 50 cents a barrel on flour. Now, if there had been no protection, the Americans would have placed their wheat upon this market. But the point is here, that the price in Canada must have been greater because the price of wheat is ruled, as we are told, by the Liverpool market, and if the price had not been greater in Ontario, they would have sent it where they could have got a higher price, but they sent it into Ontario, after paying 15 cents upon wheat and 50 cents upon flour. And let me express this wish, that the Government of the day will see it to be in the interests of the farmers of this country to allow the duty of 15 cents a bushel upon wheat to remain the same, and to increase that upon flour; and that instead of allowing it to remain at 50 cents, they make it at least 75

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.)

cents or 80 cents. I believe the farmers and the millers of this country are looking in that direction. I believe there can be no question that if it were possible to get the feeling of the farmers and of the millers, they would unmistakably pronounce in that direction. I have spoken in regard to oats and pork. We find that many times during the last 4 or 5 years oats could have been brought into this country, had it not been for the duty placed upon them, a great deal cheaper than those who had to use them could get them in Canada. The fact is that we have a large surplus of oats and peas in this country. Let me also mention Indian corn, which has been touched upon in this debate. We were told by the hon. gentleman that corn was dearer without the duty in Canada than it was in the United States. He also told us that it was of the same price with the duty of 7 cents a bushel upon it that it was in the United States. Well, it appears to me that the Americans could have no difficulty in bringing in their corn if corn was higher in Canada without the duty that it was in their own country. But the point is this, that if American corn is allowed to come into Canada free, it must displace just so many bushels of our peas and oats. Those cognisant of the fact know that there are many sections of our country that are not adapted to growing wheat and some of the finer kinds of grain, but are well adapted to growing coarse grains; consequently, every bushel of American corn that comes into this country must displace either a bushel of oats or a bushel of peas that has to be sent out of the country. Now allusion was made to the fact to-day that the distiller is allowed to import his corn for certain purposes free of duty, but that the man who feeds the corn has to pay 7 cents a bushel upon it. Now, just let me say that there is a large number of cattle exported to the United States at a very low cost, and those that are exported to Britain cost perhaps four times as much as those that go to the other side. Well, the distiller in Canada who feeds a great many poor cattle, buys cattle fixed at a price between the two, and in that way he helps the Canadian farmer. Now, let me touch upon the question of pork. I do not deny that we require a good deal of pork, and the Trade and Navigation Returns will show that upon a certain portion of the pork imported into this country the duty is 1 cent a pound, upon other portions 2 cents. If you take the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last three or four years you will find that the Canadian farmers have upon pork alone, with the duty of 1 cent a pound, been able to put in their pockets over one million dollars. Now, the hon. member for South Huron tells us that the farmers of Ontario, all over the Province, will not long continue to farm under the old system of raising coarse grains and cattle, in order to send them to a foreign market; they must feed them at home and be consumed in this country on the farm. Then, almost in the same breath, they tell us that the policy of the Government was made mainly in the interest of the manufacturers. How in the name of common sense are these grains to be fed upon our soil? How are these cattle to be consumed in our own country, if we have not a population to do it? It does appear to me that the manufactures in this country have got to be fostered in every conceivable shape, and I admit the policy. I agree with the statement of the hon. member for South Huron that these things should be consumed in our own country, but I must confess that I cannot see how it is to be done, unless the population of this country is very much increased over what it is at the present time, and I believe that that cannot be done in any better way than by fostering the industries of the country. Now, I come to the question introduced by the hon. member for North York, that of fertilisers. I agree with the statement made, I think by the hon. member from Brome (Mr. Fisher), that they are not very generally used by the

farmers of this country, but that possibly the day is not far distant when they would be more used than at the present time. But does any hon. gentleman on the other side mean to say that if the duty were taken off these fertilisers, there would be even one pound more used in Canada than at the present time? This hon. gentleman states that these fertilisers can be bought cheaper when their comparative value is known. Do they mean to say that they can be bought cheaper on the other side of the line than in Canada? No, I believe they do not, and they cannot prove that statement. There is another point in connection with this matter and it was referred to by the introducer of the resolution, that on the free list of the United States, are "bones crude, not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed, bone dust and bone ash for manufacture of phosphate and fertilisers." I venture to take this position that there is not an hon. gentleman opposite who does not know that bones and phosphates are taken to the other side and manufactured there, and hon. gentlemen opposite desire Canadian farmers to pay the freight upon those bones and upon those phosphates, sending the raw products there and bringing them back in a manufactured state and paying the freight both ways. Is that reasonable or in the interest of the Canadian farmer? It appears to me that the resolution introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), is one that is not in the interest of the Canadian farmer. Possibly I may not be able to convince many members of this House in regard to this matter, but I am speaking with regard to something of which I know, and while our lands in many sections of the country do require a certain amount of fertilisers, and whilst perhaps their use may be steadily increasing, we have in our own country deposits of phosphates and also the material out of which we can make sulphuric acid; therefore if we go to a foreign country for those phosphates, we are not true to our country, we are unwise to our best interests and the Canadian farmer has sunk far below what I think he has. Let me say this with respect to the Canadian farmer, that he knows pretty nearly what he is about, and although we have been taunted that we require others to look after our interests, we really want the reward of our labor to go to the honest farmer and not to the rogue.

#### INFORMER LECARON.

Mr. FLYNN. When you, Sir, resumed the chair at eight o'clock I brought to your notice an article in the *Free Press* of this evening. I regretted that the First Minister was not in his place, but since then he came into his place, and I presume his colleagues communicated to him the statement I made to the House. I read the paragraph which appears in an evening paper in order to give the Government the earliest opportunity to contradict it, if they could contradict it, and I presume they will be able to contradict it. Lecaron made some extraordinary statements, but none more extraordinary than the statement that he was also in the pay of the Canadian Government. I, therefore, read this paragraph in order, if it is not true, as I hope it is not true, that the Government might have the earliest opportunity to contradict it. I wait for the answer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not hear the quotation read by the hon. gentleman, but perhaps the hon. gentleman will wait until the First Minister is here, and then repeat his statement.

Mr. FLYNN. As I stated before, immediately when you, Sir, resumed the chair, I brought this matter to the notice of the Government. I was then requested to wait for the First Minister—I regretted he was absent, and was anxious he should be here. He came in a little while afterwards, and I presume his colleagues communicated the statement to him. I look upon this as a very important matter. The

right hon. gentleman has left the House and I do not know when he will return, and, moreover, I may be absent when he does return. I suppose he is within the building and his colleagues could intimate the matter to him. I have, however, discharged my duty; I have asked the question of the Government, and if they think it is not of sufficient importance to deny it, the responsibility is theirs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not hear the statement, as I was out of the House myself at the time, coming in at perhaps a quarter or twenty minutes after eight. If the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to repeat it now, perhaps I might answer him.

Mr. FLYNN. I will read the statement. It appears in the *Free Press* this afternoon and is dated London, February 13th. (Paragraph re-read.) That was the statement.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have been in the Government for a long time and I think if such a thing had existed—

Mr. FLYNN. If desired, I will read the paragraph again, as the First Minister is now in his place. (Paragraph re-read.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I do not know Lecaron, I never saw him, I never corresponded with him, I never paid him any money, I am not aware we are paying him any money now.

Mr. MILLS. Are you paying anybody for such a purpose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, we are paying nobody.

#### ARTIFICIAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the motion is put to the House I claim its indulgence for a few moments. The debate has taken a rather wider range than the motion involved and this I regret, because it is calculated to perhaps cloud the discussion of this particular question and perhaps prejudice it in the minds of some hon. members. However I disclaim any desire whatever to touch upon that subject commonly called the National Policy. I consider the granting of the motion in question is entirely consistent with the principle of protection or as it is called in this country the National Policy, which principle is in no way involved in the issue now before the House. I should like to ask the hon. gentlemen who have defended this tax of \$10 a ton on commercial fertilisers, is it the consumer or the manufacturer? The defence of the tax was led off by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), for whom I entertain as warm a personal feeling as he can towards me; but hon. members will remember well that he stated that he defended this tax at the request of a man or a firm engaged in the manufacture and not the purchase of the fertilisers. He was representing the seller. Now, who is representing the buyer? The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who support this tax do not pretend to support it by argument. They do not pretend to support it in the interest of the consumers, but in a side way, some for one reason and others for another, they try to defend it. For example, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) said it is necessary to exclude foreign fertilisers, or otherwise this country would be flooded with inferior grades of the article. At the same time he discredits his own bantling, the Act he passed in 1885, a very excellent measure indeed, and one which supplies all possible protection against the adulterated article whether manufactured in Canada or imported. That Act is in full force, and not one pound of the fertiliser from abroad can be sold without having passed the Government analysis. Therefore, so far from attaching any importance whatever to the argument of the hon. member for

Welland (Mr. Ferguson) I think the statute of his own creation on the Statute-book, is a complete answer to his argument. If this Act be defective, let him apply to the House to remedy it, and I am sure that the same spirit which suggested the passage of the measure will help him in causing it to accomplish what the desire of the House at the time was. The Postmaster General favored us with a few remarks on this subject, and in so far as he told us of the natural resources of Canada in connection with this question, I entirely agree with him. I agree with him when he says that we have in Canada, through the gift of a bountiful nature, all the natural products necessary to manufacture this article. He truthfully says that we have here, almost under the shadow of the walls of this House, large deposits of phosphate richer than are to be found in any other part of the world and in greater abundance. I also agree with him when he says that the only other article necessary for the manufacture of fertiliser is sulphuric acid, and that we can now in Canada manufacture this acid cheaper than in any other part of the known world. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have at our doors the two natural products necessary for the manufacture of this article and if as he says "they are found under conditions more favorable than they are to be found in any other part of the known world," what is the need of a duty of \$10 a ton upon the manufactured article? Wherein comes the necessity for protection in a case like this? Why, Sir, the very nature of the article itself is all the duty that you require. The American people are our nearest neighbors, they do not protect their acid, and it is admitted that they have to import it from Canada for their own use. They have no protection and the best protection that any country requires in regard to acids, sulphuric acid for example, is, that it is a dangerous and expensive article to transfer from locality to locality, and the freight therefore is so high as almost to prohibit its transference, whereby to place it in competition with any article produced in the country to which it may be sought to be imported. I entirely agree with the facts stated by the Postmaster General and I only wonder that a man of his excellent judgment and great ability is compelled by influences, the thralldom of which he cannot escape, to draw conclusions not justified by the premises and to arrive at conclusions which are unsound in every regard. If we have all the products necessary for the production of this article within our own country, and in the most favorable conditions under the sun, why add to the cost of the manufactured article by an unnecessary duty. Why is this done? It is done to put money into the pockets of the favored few and to extort money out of the taxpayers, the burden carriers of Canada, the farmers who are the source of our great wealth. It is done because there is nobody in the government to speak in the interests of the farmers or to defend them. Who is the member of the Government to-day, from the Premier down, who honestly stands up for the welfare of the farmers whenever their interests are involved. No one. They are willing to try and deceive them with sophistry, but whenever it is sought to increase the taxes who are the advisers of the Government on behalf of the farmers? Those who promote the increase of the taxes, are not the buyers but the manufacturers. Does the Government ever ask the buyers to come before them when they are deciding judicially whether they will yield or not to the claims of those who ask for increased duties? No; they listen to the advice of interested parties, they put on the screws, they raise the tariff, and when the election time approaches they pass around the hat to get a little into their own coffers. That is the way the thing works and the man who has to bear the burden is never consulted except about election times. Then the Premier and his friends will go to the farmers and say: "See what friends we have been to you,

Mr. MULOCK.

the cloth men came to us and said: 'Put up the price of cloth to keep out shoddy' and we did raise the tariff to keep out shoddy" but still the question remains: Is shoddy kept out? We might go through the whole list of articles on which an inordinate duty has been put on and we will find fallacious reasons advanced to humbug the consumers. The persons who advanced those fallacious reasons, who endorse them and promulgate them over the whole land are the Administration of to-day. So it is in regard to this transaction. No possible excuse or justification can be advanced in support of this measure. The Premier himself I am quite sure will not defend it but he will vote for it all right and he will make his followers vote for it, he will not allow one of them to escape from his whip. I challenge him to stand up and defend his position on this question by argument, he has no argument in favor of it, the only argument that has taken place with him, was in a caucus somewhere with the manufacturers.

Mr. PLATT. The red parlor.

Mr. MULOCK. No, the red parlor comes later on. Then the Premier will again remind them of the relative position they occupy in this vale of tears, and of how he will be again up the tree, and they will be taking shelter under the all spreading branches, and become fat through his activity amongst the branches above. No, Mr. Speaker, there is not a member on that side of the House from the Premier down—or perhaps I should say from the Premier up—who will defend logically the course which they propose to take in this matter. But yet they will all vote to increase this burden on the farmer. I submit that what the Government insist on to-day is nothing more than a direct tax on every farmer who may desire to use the fertiliser in question and it is as much a direct tax as if you were to pass an Act of Parliament to charge the farmer a dollar for every load of barn-yard manure he chooses to haul out from his yard to spread out on his fields. As a matter of justice you might as well pass a measure of that kind, but you would not do that because you know very well that he would quite understand what you were up to. I think that two members like the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) who assert that the Canadian farmer has not enough intelligence to know what he is about, will possibly find that later on they have misjudged him in this regard.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman when I made such an assertion.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman, I believe, endeavored to give his enlarged views on this question on Monday last. I believe that was the day on which he made the assertion.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I want most emphatically to contradict that I ever made such an assertion.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, the contradiction does not get him out of the difficulty. He said that the farmers of Canada did not know what they were buying, that they had to be protected, that they were innocent children, and that it was necessary to throw some mantle about them to prevent them going into the markets of the world where they could best buy what they wanted.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make any such statement. I said they could buy the article in the United States and bring it here, and if they did not expose it for sale, there was nothing to compel them to analyse it, and they did not know whether it was an article of value or not.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, the hon. gentleman did not know what he was talking about when he said they could go into the United States and do all these things. Do the farmers of his county go with a wheelbarrow into the United States and buy a bag of fertilisers and wheel it all the way up to the County of Grey?

Mr. SPROULE. They send their orders.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not know a farmer who gets his fertilisers in that way. If they buy these manufactures, they buy them from middlemen in Canada, and if the hon. gentleman looks at the Statutes of 1884 he will find an Act for protecting the farmer under these circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it does not.

Mr. MULLOCK. Well, I am perfectly satisfied that the hon. member for East Grey is an embodiment of greater wisdom than all the rest of the House of Commons and the Senate put together. They thought differently when they framed that Act. They thought it an Act which would meet the case. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) obtained the assistance of a special committee to prepare that Act; he prepared it with very great care, and it has been put into force; and if he looks into the accounts he will find the revenues that have come in under the operation of that Act. If the hon. member for East Grey were right, which he is not, the House, I have no doubt, would cheerfully amend the Act and protect the farmers from fraud, if it does not do so already. So far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, I think I have made good my statement of what he said when he endeavored to mislead the House, or perhaps did not understand himself what he was saying, when he tried to make this House believe that the Canadian farmer was not safe to be allowed to go out at night alone. This case, I say, is a most clear one, and in conclusion I desire that its consideration shall be in no way clouded by being confused with the general question of protection. While protection may be good as a relative term, while protection may be approved of, there are of course cases to which it is not applicable; and in this case, the fertiliser being as has been well said by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), raw material to the farmer and one of the most important aids to his husbandry, I will beg the House to come to a conclusion wholly irrespective of party considerations, to deal with the subject on its own merits and to remove this tax of from \$6 to \$10 a ton on what is a necessary article for carrying on the farming industry of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I would just like to set myself right with the House, seeing that the hon. gentleman has so emphatically attributed to me what I neither intended to say, nor did say. I said that the Act on the Statute-book at the present time would not prevent any farmer from sending away to the United States for a fertiliser, having it brought in here, and using it himself, so long as he did not expose it for sale, without being aware whether it was of any value or not. I think when I read the clause of the Act, the House and the country will agree with me. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), notwithstanding all his intelligence and extensive information, both professional and agricultural, would be unable to tell himself whether such a fertiliser was of any value unless it was analysed. The Act says expressly that every person who manufactures, sells or disposes of, or offers to sell or to dispose of any agricultural fertiliser, by barter, exchange or otherwise, shall affix to every barrel, sack, box or package thereof a stamp. Now, the farmer does not either manufacture, sell or expose it for sale, but he sends his orders to the United States; and were it not for the customs law, it could come in here; but even with the customs law it can come in if he pays the duty, and the farmer can use it on his farm without knowing the value of it. I speak from what I have seen and from what farmers have told me. One farmer told me that he had paid \$60 for a fertiliser, and after he had put it on his land he would make his affidavit that he did not believe it was worth five cents. I read the Act very carefully before I spoke on this subject, and I came to the conclusion then

that it would not prevent any individual farmer from bringing in and using a fertiliser for himself. It is not to be expected that the farmer can tell how much phosphoric acid or other substances there are in the article he buys. Every farmer is not a chemist, and it is not to be expected that he should know; and if we are not here for the purpose of protecting the farmers when they are not in a position to protect themselves, what are we here for?

Mr. MULLOCK. How does the duty protect them?

Mr. SPROULE. When the farmer pays the duty, there is no analysis because he does not expose the article for sale. This Act only applies to an article manufactured in the country or exposed for sale by the middleman; but the farmer is not a middleman.

Mr. MULLOCK. How will the duty protect him?

Mr. SPROULE. It will protect him in this way. When a man finds that these articles are not worth the duty he pays, he will not bring them in. This Act prevents middlemen from bringing them in and exposing them for sale. There is where the evil is done. If he exposes them for sale, they must be analysed, and the analysis must show what quantity of phosphoric acid and other elements are in them. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for North York, I say there is not an intelligent farmer who reads that Act who will not agree with every word I say, that there would be nothing to protect the farmer if it were not for the Customs duty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely the hon. gentleman must see that his entire argument goes to show that the Act put on the Statute-book by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) is imperfect. His whole argument goes to show that the Act requires these articles, if manufactured in this country, to be analysed, but if imported from abroad enables them to escape the operation of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman's argument is good, all he has to do is to get the Act amended. But I understand him to argue that it is all right for a man to import the article from abroad although it is worthless, provided he pays the duty. What benefit can it be to him if the article is worthless, and he pays \$10 on it? He is so much worse off. The hon. gentleman knows that the farmers are practical people, and learn from experience as quickly as others. If the hon. gentleman's friend imports \$60 worth of these fertilisers from the United States and finds them to be worthless, beside having paid \$10 duty to the Government, he will not import the same articles next year. When he finds the article to be worth nothing, he will not import it, whether it be dutiable or not.

Mr. SPROULE. He might try another kind next year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is altogether astray. If he wants to make the Act apply to imported phosphates, let him do so. That does not touch the question raised by the motion of my hon. friend. The question now is simply whether the raw material, which it is necessary for our farmers to use in the cultivation of their land, should have a revenue tax put on it or not.

Mr. CARLING. I have no desire to take up the time of the House, as the question has been very fully discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides. But the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should not, I think, be allowed to go to the country uncontradicted. The hon. gentleman said he is prepared to prove that the value of farm lands in Ontario has, during the last five years, decreased 30 per cent. This I deny, and I think the hon. gentleman is not able to prove the statement he has made. I find in the returns published by the Ontario Government—the annual report of the Bureau of Industries of

the Province of Ontario—compiled by Mr. Blue, that the value of farm lands in 1882 in Ontario was \$632,000,000, while in 1887 it was \$636,000,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a larger area.

Mr. CARLING. That does not look like a reduction of 30 per cent. Farm buildings in Ontario, in 1882, were valued by Mr. Blue at \$132,000,000, and in 1887 at \$184,000,000. Farm implements in 1882 were valued at \$37,000,000, and in 1887 at \$49,000,000. Live stock was valued at \$80,000,000, in 1882, and in 1887 at \$104,000,000. These are the valuations made by Mr. Blue, the gentleman employed by the Ontario Government. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that he could prove by the leading loan societies of Ontario that his statement was correct, and he referred to the Huron and Erie and other prominent loan societies. I find in the report of the Erie and Huron Loan and Investment Society, that the arrearages for last year were only 4 per cent. of the capital invested, that they were 22 per cent. less than they were the year before, that only two-thirds of one per cent. of the capital employed came back in the shape of property, and that the farmers in the vicinity of their headquarters had placed in the hands of the society over \$1,000,000 for investment. The Canadian Company at its annual meeting held in January last, were informed by the president, first, that the company had reduced its rate 1 per cent. in 1887, and, second, that the prices obtained in 1887 from the sales of land were 25 per cent. higher than in 1886. The North of Scotland Canadian Mortgage Company held its annual meeting in January, 1888, and in his address the chairman referred to the falling off in interest received on mortgage in Canada, which he explained by the fact that a considerable number of mortgages made three or four years ago at a higher rate of interest have fallen in and the money has been lent at the much less rate of interest current now. This company also reported the amount of real estate fallen into the hands of the company through foreclosure was but \$30,000 out of \$3,000,000, or but 1 per cent. All the companies doing business in Canada and reporting to the Federal Government loaned in 1880 \$56,600,000 on real estate security in the city and country. This had increased to \$86,900,000 in 1887. Yet, whereas in 1880 the amount of principal and interest overdue and in default was \$4,100,000 on \$56,000,000, in 1887 it was \$3,200,000 on \$86,900,000. This, coupled with the fact that the amount placed in the hands of the loan companies for investment has increased, including debentures sold in Canada, from \$12,258,300 in 1880 to \$25,500,000 in 1887, is conclusive evidence that the farmers of Canada have been making progress. Now I find that the statements that have been made by my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have been to show that Canada is going backward instead of progressing, and I think statements of that kind have a tendency to injure our country abroad. These statements are to be deplored, as we ought all to unite to build up our country and make it appear as good as it is, and not endeavor to injure it. I find that the sales by the sheriff of lands in the Province of Ontario in 1878 amounted to 138 and in 1888 were only 51. The sales under process of law in the Province of Quebec in 1878 amounted to 805 and in 1887 to 302. In Nova Scotia these sales, in 1878, amounted to 100 against 90 in 1888. In New Brunswick they amounted, in 1878, to 62, as compared with 18 in 1888; and in Prince Edward Island they amounted, in 1878, to 71 against 23 in 1888. This comparison shows clearly that our country is in a much more prosperous condition under this Administration than it was under the policy of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then, it has been said that the farmer must pay higher prices to-day on everything he purchases than he did formerly. Now I say, without fear of contradiction, that, taking an

Mr. CARLING

average of the different articles which our farmers purchase, it will be found that they pay 25 per cent. less to-day for them than they did in 1878. I have the figures here by me to prove this:—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of Prices of Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware and Agricultural Implements, in 1878 and 1887:—

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Articles.	1878.	1887.	Decrease.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Mowers.....	80 00	70 00	10 00
Reapers.....	120 00	80 00	40 00
Horse rakes.....	33 00	28 00	5 00
Binders.....	275 00	160 00	115 00

DRY GOODS AND CLOTHING.

Grey cottons.....	0 07	0 06½	0 01½
Heavy check shirtings.....	0 14½	0 11½	0 02½
Cottonsades (not made in Canada).....		10c. to 22	
Denims.....	0 14½	0 12	0 02½
Tickings.....	0 18	0 15	0 03
Grey flannels.....	0 30	0 27½	0 07½
Cotton prints, English.....	0 11½	0 09½	0 02
do Canadian (not made).....		6½c. to 08	
Canada wool tweeds.....	0 75	0 57½	0 17½
do union do.....	0 40	0 27½	0 12½
do Stoffe.....	0 55	0 40	0 15
Stoffe pants.....	1 75	1 50	0 25
do suits.....	7 50	6 75	0 75
Tweed do.....	10 00	9 00	1 00
do do.....	9 00	8 25	0 75
Knitted shirts and drawers, union.....	3 75	2 90	0 85
do do do.....	4 50	3 25	1 25
Medium grey wool.....	7 50	5 25	2 25
Heavy do.....	9 00	6 50	2 50
Plain Scotch knit.....	12 00	9 50	2 50
do.....	13 00	10 00	3 00
Children's merino.....	4 50	2 75	1 75
do do.....	5 00	3 25	1 75
do do.....	5 50	3 75	1 75
do do.....	6 25	4 25	2 00
do do.....	7 00	4 75	2 25
Ladies' do.....	8 00	5 00	3 00

GROCERIES.

Granulated sugar.....	0 09½	0 06½	0 02½
Green tea.....	0 40	0 25	0 15
Black tea.....	0 45	0 30	0 15
Japan tea.....	0 35	0 20	0 15
Rice.....	0 04½	0 03½	0 00½
Molasses.....	0 28	0 28	
Raisins.....	0 06½	0 06½	
Soap.....	0 03½	0 03½	0 00½
Starch.....	0 05½	0 04½	0 00½
Java coffee.....	0 30	0 25	0 05
Codfish.....	5 00	3 50	1 50
Tapioca.....	0 09	0 06½	0 02½
Sago.....	0 06½	0 03½	0 02½
Candles.....	0 11½	0 06½	0 05

HARDWARE.

Steel shovels.....	1 25	1 10	0 15
Steel spades.....	1 25	1 10	0 15
Pick and handle.....	1 50	1 05	0 45
Field hoe.....	0 60	0 45	0 15
Garden rake.....	0 70	0 60	0 10
Grass scythe.....	0 90	0 60	0 30
Grain scythe.....	1 30	0 90	0 40
Reaping hook.....	0 40	0 35	0 05
Hay forks, 3 prong.....	0 65	0 55	0 10
do 2 do.....	0 45	0 35	0 10
Manure forks, 4 prong.....	1 00	0 75	0 25
do 2 do.....	0 90	0 65	0 25

## HARDWARE—Continued.

Articles.	1878.	1887.	Decrease.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Post-hole augurs, each.....	2 25	1 75	0 50
Steel grain scoop.....	1 30	1 00	0 30
Hay knives.....	1 10	0 90	0 20
Chopping axes.....	1 00	0 75	0 25
White lead, lb.....	0 09	0 07	0 02
Putty.....	0 04	0 03½	0 00½
Nail hammer.....	0 90	0 60	0 30
Horse shoes, keg.....	4 00	3 75	0 25
Horse shoe nails, box.....	4 25	3 25	1 00

This is pretty clear evidence that the National Policy has not injured the farmer, and that the farmer is able to buy his agricultural implements, his tea, his sugar and other articles much cheaper to-day than he could under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe these hon. gentlemen when in power put a tax on tea, so that every farmer's wife had to pay a tax on the tea she consumed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You put it on the tea kettle.

Mr. CARLING. You cannot make tea without the kettle. I might give a number of figures to show that the farmers were never better off than they are at present. I am satisfied that it is the case in Ontario, and that it is the case in all the Provinces of the Dominion, and the more it is discussed and enquired into, it will be found that the farmers in 1888 are much more prosperous—and are enabled to purchase everything they consume for 25 per cent. less—than they were in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. Minister had remained in his seat, I should not have troubled the House on this occasion, but, as the hon. gentleman has chosen to bring forward a quantity of statistics not having a great deal of reference to the duty on artificial fertilisers, it may be as well to spend two or three minutes in referring to the fallacies, not new, but old and stale fallacies, which he once a year inflicts upon this House. In the first place, we will take his argument, so called, that within eight or ten years the value of the farms in Ontario rose from \$632,000,000 to \$636,000,000. If that did occur, bearing in mind the fact that in those 8 or 10 years, at least 500,000 or 600,000 acres of land were added to the area of the Province, it shows not a rise in the value of land, but a relative depreciation to a considerable extent. But these statistics, as has been admitted over and over again by those conversant with them are necessarily imperfect and little to be relied upon, and especially those which refer to the first years. If my memory serves me aright, a couple of years after the first date to which he refers, the value of farm lands was considerably over \$636,000,000, and it has decreased to the extent of \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 since. I have not the figures here, but that is my recollection. However, I did not rise so much to call attention to this as to make a proposition to the hon. gentleman. It does not appear to me to be very desirable that we should spend our time in merely hurling contradictions across the House on a matter of this moment. I know, I may say, of my own personal knowledge and experience that, in at least five or six important counties in Ontario, there has been in the last eight or ten years a remarkable depreciation in the value of land. That I know to my own knowledge, and in many cases to my cost. I know that there has been a depreciation in the value of land in the County of Frontenac, in the County of Lennox, in the County of Addington; and in half a dozen other counties which I could name, there is nothing like the same actual selling value which was obtainable in past

years. My proposition to the Minister of Agriculture is this: He disputes the assertions made by my hon. friend of his knowledge and by myself of my knowledge, and by many hon. gentlemen of their knowledge. I think that, for once, a committee might be of value, and I would suggest that a committee should be appointed to ascertain the actual state of the case. It is of great moment to know if the value of the 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 of acres in the Province of Ontario, and the land also in the other Provinces, is rising or falling. My information, derived from those who are dealing with land, is that, in Ontario at all events, the actual selling value—I do not refer to the assessed value, which I think is all Mr. Blue has to deal with—is much less than it was ten years ago. It is hardly worth while to go on contradicting each other in this House. Let the matter be investigated, and let the committee ask for information on the subject from persons who are conversant with the actual sales that take place in the different counties. There are many persons in each county who could give information on this point, and who, if applied to by a proper committee, would give that information. If the hon. gentlemen would grant such a committee, I think it would serve a good purpose. As to the other argument, that there has been a considerable reduction in the cost of certain articles, we know that the world does not stand still, and we know that improvements are made in manufactures by which many articles are produced cheaper to-day than they were ten years ago, cheaper than they were twenty years ago, and cheaper than they were thirty years ago; but to say that is because you put taxes on certain articles it is as absurd a statement as anything I have ever heard on the floor of this House, and that is saying a great deal—a very great deal. On the other hand, if the prices of a few articles which the farmer has to purchase have been considerably reduced within the last few years, the price of every article the farmers have to sell has been reduced also, with very few exceptions, within the last few years. Our farmers cannot obtain now anything like the price they did obtain for many of the articles which they produce.

Mr. CARLING. What are they?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not now speaking of the sudden rise in the price of wheat, or anything exceptional of that kind, but I say that a comparison of the average prices of beef-cattle and cereals, and other products of the farm ten years ago, with the prices of to-day will show that there has been a very considerable reduction. We are in a position to prove that statement, but it would be absurd at this time and on this question to enter into a discussion of this matter which the hon. gentleman has challenged. If the hon. Minister wants to obtain the actual facts as to the selling price of farms in Ontario, and throughout the whole Dominion, these facts can be obtained easily in the way I have pointed out; and, if that were agreed to, I think it would be found that the statement made by my hon. friend, which I endorse, is correct, that, over the greater portion of Ontario to-day, farms have fallen very largely in value and cannot be sold for anything like as good a price as they could a few years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have in my hand the valuations of cleared lands in Ontario from 1883 to 1888. In 1883, the valuation was \$654,793,000; in 1887, the valuation was \$637,883,000; while in 1886, it was \$648,000,000, showing the reduction from 1886 to 1887 to be about \$12,000,000. But the value of newly cleared lands in Ontario added since 1883 was \$14,210,000, and if the hon. gentleman will add that to the decrease, he will see that there is really over \$25,000,000 of a reduction. He has, therefore, evidently not quoted perfectly from the book. I may give an instance from my



own section of the country. He has cited two or three companies whose lands have not been reduced in value. Well, I know they have. One of the companies had in my section a farm on which there was a mortgage for \$2,200. That farm was valued for about \$3,200 at the time they lent the money upon it; they offered it for sale and they could not get a buyer for it at all. Eventually there was a party who made an offer to purchase at \$1,600 for their mortgage of \$2,200, and they accepted it, feeling that it was the best that they could do. Is not that a positive evidence that the value of land has decreased in our section? I can give you another. Two days before I came here a farm that was sold in my section 7 years ago for \$3,500, was put up for sale, under mortgage, at a reserve bid of \$2,850, and they could not get a buyer. Is not that evidence that the value of land is receding. I, myself, acted as an executor for an estate in which there was a farm left as part of the estate. Ten years ago that man was offered \$7,500 for that farm; we offered it for sale at public auction and we could not get a buyer at a figure that we thought we would be justified in selling for, the prices were that low. At last we got from the Chancery Court an order to sell the farm for what we could get for it, and it was sold for \$4,900. The buildings were in just as good order as they were before, and are standing there to-day. For the hon. gentleman to say that land is not receding in value, is to talk about something that he really knows nothing of, at least so far as our section of the country is concerned. He bases his theory upon the reports he gets. But the farmers have practical experience with regard to the shrinkage of the value of lands, and are in a better position to speak than the Minister of Agriculture. I challenge him to-day to go through any agricultural district in this country, and call a meeting of intelligent farmers and ask them to say whether the price of land is receding in value or not, and he will find from their answer, unless they are so blindly devoted partisans that they would persist in any statement he might wish—they will say that lands have diminished in value. I am sorry personally to have to admit that they are very seriously reduced. A great many men have lost seriously in lands owing to reduction in value. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, is a very large land-holder; if he were forced to sell to-day, he would not begin to realise the price he could have got some years ago. But perhaps he forms his impression from sales made in the city of London. Now, he said that the farmers were getting binders for \$150; but if it were not for his National Policy the farmers would be able to buy binders for \$100. If the hon. gentleman will give a committee of this House I will prove to that committee that one of the largest manufacturers of binders in this country turned out a lot of binders last year for \$74 each, and he sold them for \$150. The actual cost was \$74, and under the National Policy he charged the farmers \$150, simply because they had a protection of 35 per cent. against the American binders. In regard to fertilisers, the hon. member for Welland said that it was necessary to keep up the duty because the farmers were so simple, they were so poor judges of fertilisers, that they would buy bad stuff, and in order to protect them from being victimised it was best to put the duty on and keep the stuff out. I suppose the Minister of Agriculture will say the same thing in regard to binders. In order to protect the poor innocent farmer from buying American binders at \$100 say, if the duty was off, they kept the duty on, and make him pay \$150 for a Canadian binder. Now, I will give him another evidence. If the hon. gentleman will make one single investigation this year, if he will search the records in the different counties in this country, he will find that there have been more chattel mortgages recorded by farmers in the Province of Ontario within six months than there have ever been in the same period before. Still, we

Mr. McMULLEN.

find men for political purposes, even those who occupy high positions in the country, daring to state in the face of an intelligent people, and those who have the evidence before them, that there has been no shrinkage in value; they still persist in stating that land is keeping up to its full value. It is unfair to make those statements; men should blush when they dare to stand up, and make such statements before the House and country.

Mr. PORTER. I did not intend to take any part in the debate at all, because I considered that the subject before the House for discussion was simply a sort of preliminary skirmish in reference to the subject which will probably come up in a larger debate later on in the Session. The hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches have strayed away very far indeed from the subject introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). Instead of confining themselves to the subject according to the rules of the debate, they have dragged in almost every question it was possible to bring into the discussion. More especially they have shown their intention by the subject they have now introduced of making an onslaught upon the Government's National Policy. Sir, I do not intend at the present time to defend the action of the Government on this subject. I have already by my vote in the House proclaimed my convictions on that matter, and the people of the country have recently proclaimed their convictions on that matter. But there is one thing particularly worthy of notice in the speeches of members of the Opposition who have spoken on this matter; it is this, that they particularly and peculiarly constitute themselves the champions of the farmers of Canada. Now, Sir, I object to that. I do not know by what right they alone speak in the interest of the farmers, and insinuate, nay, almost declare positively, that we on this side have no regard for the farming interests of the country. I beg to assure those hon. gentlemen that we are just as much interested in the welfare of the Canadian farmer as they possibly can be, and if we differ from them in any part of the policy it is simply a matter of conviction, and not at all a matter of party servility, as they charge upon us. We, Sir, have the interests of the farmers at heart, we think of them and consider what shall be best for their welfare in every action and every vote which we give in this House; and if our policy and our actions do not meet with their approbation then we can only say that it is a difference of opinion between the two parties who are, perhaps, equally willing to forward the best interests of our country. Sir, there is one thing most remarkable in this discussion, and more especially it is distinguishable in the observations of the last gentleman who addressed the House. He emphasised very forcibly indeed the decrease in the value of farm lands, in the Province of Ontario especially, and I may say also, from his remarks, that to follow the example set by the hon. member for South Oxford, *ex pede Herculem*, that really his opinions went to show that the National Policy was a great injury to the farmer. If the hon. gentleman were not speaking from a party point of view, if he were not entirely eaten up with partisan rancor, why did he not declare also that owing to certain circumstances which are now pervading the world over, lands have decreased in value in countries that are pre-eminently free trade countries? When he talks of the decrease in the value of lands in Canada, and the loss this has been to the farmers, why did he not also call our attention to the large decrease of the value of lands in England, Ireland and Scotland? These are free trade countries. If the National Policy has any influence or effect upon the value of land so also has free trade, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman's attempt to fasten the decrease of values on the National Policy was altogether irrelevant, uncalled for and illogical. I was somewhat amused also with the observations of certain hon.

gentlemen opposite, I refer particularly to an hon. gentleman who has the honor of representing a section of the country from which I come. When he was speaking I could not help thinking of a cartoon I saw in *Punch* many years ago. The famous English statesman Disraeli at one time of his life was a champion of protection to the farmers in England. This cartoon represented Disraeli, who was a man small in stature but of course quite pugnacious in character, and behind him there is an English farmer of very ponderous proportions, tall, well-built, strong and muscular looking; and the little man before him is turning round and saying: "Now, do not be afraid my good fellow, I will protect you." It is very singular indeed that this gentleman should constitute himself a champion of the farmers of Canada and ask them to keep their courage up because he will protect them. So many illustrations of the ridiculousness of the position which hon. gentlemen opposite crowd upon me that it is almost impossible to enumerate them, but there are one or two points to which I will allude. The Minister of Agriculture made a quotation from the reports of Mr. Blue. He quoted very correctly. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) called in question the accuracy of those reports.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. PORTER. The appropriateness of them.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. PORTER. I agree very much with the statement made that these statistics are scarcely reliable, and that many people intimately acquainted with the circumstances, attach very little value to them. In regard to fertilisers, I agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) that the time has not yet come, but is perhaps near, when artificial fertilisers will be necessary to the carrying on of successful agriculture in our country. Not only do I agree with him in that opinion, but also in the opinion that the farmers must look very particularly and carefully after the stable manure on their own farms, which is undoubtedly the best manure they possess. But if it is necessary to obtain artificial manures, I consider it is in the farmer's interest that the best quality of such manure shall be supplied to him, and it is not safe to risk the importation of manures from those who would no doubt take the farmer's money and sell him a poor article. I consider the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) would move in that direction, and is not therefore at all beneficial to farmers. In fact, I think it would be very injurious to them. The duty now paid on these articles renders it much more likely that the farmer will obtain a better quality of fertiliser, and at the same time it fosters an industry in our own country which will supply him with that article, and in that way both agriculture and manufacturing are benefited. I have no sympathy with those hon. gentlemen who make such vigorous attacks on the manufacturers on every occasion; indeed they appear to have a dagger somewhere about them, and the moment a manufacturer is presented to them they stab him to the heart. Not a word can be said with regard to the trade question, not a single discussion can take place on any commercial matter but the manufacturer is brought before the House and hanged, drawn and quartered. I object to that policy. I consider the manufacturers of every country are a most necessary class of the population. It was very well observed by the member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) that we wish to have a consuming people as well as a producing people, and we know very well that if the manufacturers were banished from the country, if they were repressed by improper legislation or compelled to abandon manufacturing by untoward circumstances, the farmers would suffer great hardship and misfortune. So I consider the vituperation of manufacturers on all occasions

not of service to the country, but on the contrary a very great injury. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not thus rendering a service to the farmer, but on the contrary are injuring him most seriously. The products of his farm are more profitable if consumed at home, and the nearer home the better for the farmer. So I consider all these are irrelevant issues introduced into the question of fertilisers, and the hostility which hon. gentlemen opposite manifest to the manufacturers is unwise and not in the interest of the farmers of this country.

Mr. MASSON. I do not intend at this hour, after this matter has been discussed so long to enter into the wide field into which hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to drag the discussion. I do not intend, in other words, to discuss the National Policy, nor yet to prove, which I think has been frequently proved, that the National Policy is of great benefit to the farmer, not only in giving him a comparatively higher price for the products of the farm, but also, as has been explained to-night, in enabling him to purchase his goods at much lower prices. That, however, is not really within the question before the House. The motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), as I understand it, has reference solely to fertilisers, and in introducing that motion he claimed that he and the party surrounding him were the farmers' friends and champions. Great importance is given to the question because it refers to an important class, namely, the farmers of this country. We hear the changes rung upon the farmers of Ontario, what a most important community they are—and I admit they are important. I consider them to be of very great importance. The farmers are of very great importance, not only to one Province, but to all the Provinces, and especially so to Ontario. So to measure the importance of this question I thought it desirable to ascertain to what extent the farmers were importing artificial manure, and turning to the Trade and Navigation Returns I found that the farmers of Ontario for the year ending July, 1888, imported artificial manures to the value of \$347, on which was paid a duty of \$69.40. That, to a certain extent, shows the importance of this question, the duty collected from importations of artificial manure into Ontario during that year being only \$59.40. The whole Dominion imported from various sources artificial manures to the value of \$12,025, on which a duty of \$2,405 was paid. So, in so far as the farmers feel the necessity of importing artificial manures the quantity imported does not show that they consider it of very great importance. It may, however, be said that if the duty were removed a larger quantity would be imported. I do not think the quantity would be very much increased, because certain classes of manure are imported free, and we find that of vegetable manure imported into Canada duty free the farmers of Ontario imported only to the value of \$18, and the whole of Canada imported \$53 worth. On the other hand we have fertilisers of our own and we find that they have been exported largely. Ontario exported of "bleached ashes"—a very readily applied fertiliser and one admitted to be of very great value, especially to those farms we hear gentlemen opposite speak of as being run down and reduced in value—last year to the United States \$12,571 worth, and Canada exported to the United States, in other places, \$16,222 worth of the same material. If we turn to "bones," another class of fertilisers, the raw material of fertilisers, we find that Ontario sent to the United States \$15,234 worth, and that Canada sent to the United States and to other parts \$22,261 worth. These questions show the great interest that the farmers of Ontario must necessarily take in the free introduction of fertilisers. The mover of this resolution expressed a wish that the debate would be confined to this subject; but how did these gentlemen who with him are supporting the motion

carry out his wish? I find one gentleman launching out with the statement that the farmers are the highest taxed people in this country. That statement has been refuted time and time again. Wherein are the farmers the highest taxed people? They buy what they have to buy cheaper than they could buy before this policy was introduced, and then of the articles which they buy, what do they pay taxes on? Go into their houses and look at what they eat and ask yourselves on what do they pay taxes; on very few articles of the farmers diet are taxes paid. Look at what they wear and you will find that on few articles of their apparel do they pay duty. Look in their houses and farm yards and see on what articles which they purchase do they pay duty. On very few articles indeed. I ask members on the other side of the House, is it right that they should come forward on every available opportunity—not only when fertilisers are being discussed but when any subject is before the House, to come forward as if they were champions of the farmers and say that the farmers are the highest taxed class in the country. We were told apparently with very great glee that the farm lands had depreciated in value. Two gentlemen speaking of their own personal knowledge told us this, but to my personal knowledge they are not farmers and their knowledge of the value of farms is rather as mortgagees. It is well known to all farmers that when once a mortgagee gets hold of a farm the land does depreciate in value and I suppose it is as mortgagees that these gentlemen speak. Now, I do not think the question as to whether farms have decreased, or increased, in the Province of Ontario, or what has been the cause of the decrease or the increase, unless it can be proved that the duty placed upon fertilisers has decreased the value of the farms. If that is so, it is a proper part of the discussion; but to bring it in for the purpose of decrying the country and of sending broadcast over the Dominion and the world, the statements that the price of farm lands in Canada, and Ontario particularly, are diminishing year by year in value, is as unnecessary as it is unfounded. For what purpose is this done by gentlemen on the other side? What great gain is it to hon. gentlemen opposite that they should take every available opportunity to decry their country and say that our farmers are going to the dogs, that their farms are diminishing in value, that they do not get what they should for what they sell and that they have to pay too dearly for what they buy. I do not intend to take up time in going over these statements, but I say that as far as is necessary, I would give each and every one of those assertions a most emphatic denial. I point to the country, I point to the farmers of Ontario, I point to their homes, to their houses, their barns and the stock on their farms, to prove that they are better off to-day, that their wives and daughters are better clad, and that they live in more luxury and with greater ease than they did even eight or ten years ago. It is admitted by every gentleman who referred to the matter on the other side, that we have abundant resources in this country for the manufacture of these fertilisers, and for what reason then (even though it be to offer the farmers of Ontario \$69.40) should this duty be taken off? This motion is only part and parcel of a plan of which I see little pieces cropping up in this House to decry the National Policy. They have attacked that policy year after year since its introduction in 1879 to the present time. Formerly they attacked the policy as a whole, but in those attacks they failed, and now they are going to try to attack it piecemeal. We find one hon. gentleman striking at the National Policy in relation to fertilisers, and another gentleman on another item and so on. That is their system of attack in detail. We have one gentleman attacking the duty on corn, but I suppose we will have the opportunity of discussing the corn question, when I think it can be satisfactorily shown that the farmers are not anxious that corn should be admitted free.

Mr MASSON.

Mr. SEMPLE. We have heard a lecture to-night about hon. gentlemen on this side of the House not adhering to the text. That assertion was made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter), and I think if there is any member in this House that this accusation might be justly applied to, it was the Minister of Agriculture. The question under discussion had reference to fertilisers, and he who is at the head of the farming community and at the head of the Agriculture Department never uttered a single sentence in regard to the subject. Hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the large deposits of phosphates overlooking this city, and which were so easily obtained for fertilisers, but the Minister of Agriculture never experimentally gave them a trial, or, if he did, he did not give us the result of his experience. The practical Department of Agriculture in the Province of Ontario the Opposition there tried to make of it a factious question. They tried their best to make political capital out of the Department of Agriculture in Ontario, but in this they failed, and I am very happy to say that as far as the department under my hon. friend is concerned, he has had no factious opposition. We wish to see the Department of Agriculture a success, and I rejoice to find that there are so many members in this House who are looking after the farmers' interests. There are some who are looking after a certain class who go around to sell patent rights on hay forks, lightning rods or something of that kind, and when a person has been victimised, and not over one in a township is, a committee is appointed and witnesses are brought here to have a good time at the expense of the country at large. Now, the men who do these things are not so much to blame as the capitalists. These agents understand human nature, and know where to go to get their victims. The men who shave notes at 40 or 50 per cent. and move in high society, they are more to blame than the individuals who go to the farmers with a fair story and induce them to buy what is of no value. An hon. member spoke of the small amount of revenue obtained from the duty on fertilisers. If that is the case, it is a good reason why the duty should be taken off. One reason why so few fertilisers are used is their cost, and if there are such fine advantages for manufacturing them in this country, why need the manufacturers be afraid of competition? But it seems to me that these gentlemen do not wish to give the farmers the benefit of cheap fertilisers. The miserable sum realised from the duty is a good reason why it should be taken off, and doing that would show that there is a disposition to do something for the farmers. It is well known that, in former years, after the country was cleared the soil was rich, but it has been cropped so largely that now in order to obtain a good yield it is necessary to use fertilisers, which would not only result in larger crops, but would increase the value of the land. Now, I think this is only a small thing to ask on behalf of the farmers. The total value of farm property in Ontario is \$975,000,000, including the implements, buildings, and live stock, and such being the case, the farmers should certainly receive some consideration. It has been asserted that farm lands have not decreased in value. I know of one case where a farm of 170 acres was bought five or six years ago for \$10,000, and was recently sold under mortgage for \$6,500. This gives some idea of the reduction in value of farm land. The valuation made by the assessors does not give a true idea of the value of the land, because the assessors very seldom change the valuation of farms from year to year; they simply take the valuation as they receive it on the rolls. But people who live in the country and watch the prices at which farms have been sold are in the best position to judge. The Minister of Agriculture stated, I think, that the mortgages on farms in Ontario amounted to \$86,000,000. I have received a return showing that, in that Province, there are 66 loan and investment societies which hold

mortgages on farms to the amount of something like \$90,000,000. I am sorry that it is so, but it is a fact, and we may as well look at the facts of the case as to boast about prosperity where it does not exist.

House divided.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Edwards,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Meigs,
Bain ( <i>Wentworth</i> ),	Ellis,	Mills ( <i>Bothwell</i> ),
Barron,	Fiset,	Mitchell,
Béchar, d,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gauthier,	Neveu,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Paterson ( <i>Brant</i> ),
Bourassa,	Guay,	Perry,
Bowman,	Hale,	Platt,
Brien,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Innes,	Robertson,
Campbell,	Kirk,	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Lang,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Langelier ( <i>Montmor'cy</i> ),	Somerville,
Charlton,	Langelier ( <i>Quebec</i> ),	Sutherland,
Choquette,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cook,	Lavergne,	Turcot,
Couture,	Lister,	Watson,
Davies,	Livingston,	Weldon ( <i>St. John</i> ),
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Welsh,
Dessaint,	Macdonald ( <i>Huron</i> ),	Wilson ( <i>Elgin</i> ),
Doyon,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—71.
Edgar,	McMillan ( <i>Huron</i> ),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Audet,	Dupont,	Masson,
Bain ( <i>Soulangee</i> ),	Ferguson ( <i>Renfrew</i> ),	Mills ( <i>Annapolis</i> ),
Baird,	Foster,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Freeman,	Moncrieff,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Boisvert,	Gordon,	Patterson ( <i>Essex</i> ),
Bowell,	Grandois,	Perley,
Boyle,	Guillet,	Porter,
Brown,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hesson,	Roome,
Cameron,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cargill,	Hudspeth,	Small,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Smith ( <i>Ontario</i> ),
Carpenter,	Jones ( <i>Digby</i> ),	Sproule,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Landry,	Stevenson,
Chisholm,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Cimon,	La Rivière,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Laurie,	Thérien,
Cockburn,	Lépine,	Thompson (Sir John),
Colby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tisdale,
Corby,	Macdowall,	Tupper,
Costigan,	McOulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	McDonald ( <i>Victoria</i> ),	Vanasse,
Conlonbe,	McDongald ( <i>Pictou</i> ),	Wallace,
Daly,	McDougall ( <i>C. Breton</i> ),	White ( <i>Cardwell</i> ),
Davin,	McKay,	White ( <i>Renfrew</i> ),
Davis,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Dawson,	McMillan ( <i>Vaudreuil</i> ),	Wilson ( <i>Argenteuil</i> ),
Denison,	McNeill,	Wilson ( <i>Lennox</i> ),
Dewdney,	Madill,	Wood ( <i>Brockville</i> ),
Dickey,	Mara,	Wood ( <i>Westm'rd</i> )—101.
Dickinson,	Marshall,	

Motion negated.

#### ADJOURNMENT—COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

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

Mr. LAURIER. There is on the Order Paper a very important motion of my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on commercial treaties. Perhaps we can arrange for a day to take up that question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I had some communication with my hon. friend in reference to that, and I think we agreed that next Monday would be a convenient day.

Mr. LAURIER. And continue it from day to day ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that we can do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably in that case we had better make it the First Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, make it the First Order of the Day. Let my hon. friend move that it be the First Order after Routine.

Mr. LAURIER. I move, then, that the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, with reference to commercial treaties, be taken up as the First Order after Private Bills on Monday next.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:40 p m.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 14th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### BALLOT BOX COMMITTEE.

Mr. HESSON moved :

That the names of Adam Brown and Dr. Landerkin be added to the Committee appointed by the House to enquire into and report on the ballot or voting box constructed by direction of this House.

Motion agreed to.

#### MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) to amend the Militia Act. He said: The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Militia Act and to make further provision for the payment of expenses incurred in calling out the Militia in aid of the civil power. Before the Militia is called out, a deposit must be made by the municipality to meet the expenses to be incurred by the calling out of the Militia. Another clause provides that the permanent corps or the training schools shall not be called out without the sanction of the Minister of Militia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill amending the North-West Territories Act, so as to secure to the Territories Government powers as full as those of the Provinces, with the exception of the power of borrowing money ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to bring in such a Bill this Session.

#### REBATE OF DUTY ON CORN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion :

That whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export, should also receive a similar rebate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair, last evening, I had called the attention of this House for a few minutes to the resolution I have the honor of submitting. I had given some reasons why I thought the farming community should be placed in the same position as any other class in Canada; and I pointed out what I considered to be an injustice to the farmer in this regard. I thought that if a duty was imposed for the pur-

pose of raising the price of the productions of the farm, it was very unjust to the farmers that this duty should be commuted to any class in the community that were importing it as a raw material to enter into their manufactured goods. I think that if it is right, if it is just, and if it is in the interests of the country that the distillers should get the duty refunded to them, I cannot understand how this House can refuse to refund the duty to any other class in the community. If the distillers were manufacturing an article that could not otherwise be produced, and if it was an essential element to the welfare of this country, then there might be a reason for overstepping the ordinary course that should be pursued by this House. But the article they manufacture is not of so much importance as the productions of the farmers, and I pointed out then how unfair and unjust it was to the farming community that they should be brought into competition with those who are allowed a rebate on the duty. If it is right to allow the distillers a rebate on the duty, it must certainly be right to allow the farmers a rebate also, providing they wished to use the corn for the purpose of feeding stock that they intend to export. I cannot understand why it is that the distillers should be thus favored. It is well known that they have a very high protective tariff, that has been imposed by this Government for the purpose of preventing others from entering into competition with them, and I cannot see why it is that they should have, not only a high wall of protection thrown around them, but also have a rebate given to them over and above that. I have not a word to say against the distillers, nor against any other class of people in this community. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, will say anything that is to be said against them, although he is not working in the line of temperance that he formerly used to advocate very strongly in this House, and I believe he does not advocate it just as strongly now as he did some years ago. The giving to one class of the community their raw material free, and taxing the raw material of another class, is a principle which this House should not readily assent to, though it is a well-known fact that on many occasions a majority in this House—

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

CHARLES WESLEY COLTHER, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Haldimand, introduced by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Charlton.

Mr. LANDERKIN—That is another protest against class legislation, Mr. Speaker. That is another evidence of a desire on the part of the people to have extended trade relations, and it is a further evidence that they desire to have fair play accorded to their representative. The gentleman who was just introduced into the House has been elected on three occasions before, but by some hocus-pocus arrangement he has been deprived of rights that he was elected by the people to enjoy. It will be gratifying to the Government to find that the principles that we are advocating in this House are meeting with a hearty response in the country. This is the third indication we have had of it during this Session, and still they are coming. I will refer briefly to some of the views that are advanced by our friends from the other side of the House, in reference to the tariff. When the tariff is increased on an article, and when the Minister of Finance tells the House that the increase of that tariff will reduce the price of that article, nearly every one behind that hon. gentleman will say, that is so. When the tariff is taken off an article and the hon. gentleman says that it will lower the price of the article, every hon. gentleman behind him will say, that is so. If the tariff is put up, or if the tariff is put down, the same effect is produced in the minds of the hon. gentlemen who support the Government in this House. We were told when this tariff was introduced that it was the most perfect tariff it was possible for the mind of man

Mr. LANDERKIN.

to conceive and to place before the country. It was the acme of perfection, one of those systems which was likely to stand and be loved and revered by the people of this country for all time to come, that there was no necessity for tinkering with it, that it would become an established fact and the law would remain on the statute-book as the promoters placed it there for time immemorial. But what is the fact? Day after day we have depositions here asking for changes in this beneficent law, asking that the duty be reduced in many instances, and in other instances be raised, and we have had abundant depositions during the present Session. I will, if the House will permit me, point to a number of the depositions that have waited on the Government this year with a view to obtain changes in the tariff. We had a deputation waiting on the Government from Cape Breton asking for an increased duty on bituminous coal. Another deputation came asking that the item under which worsted yarn came in should be changed and a duty be imposed on dyed or finished wool. Another deputation from Montreal asked for an increased duty on fine leather. Another from Hamilton asked an increase in the duty on bent felloes. A deputation came from Bryson asking that thoroughbred dogs be put on the free list. We supposed they were going to let loose the dogs on farmers' sheep. There was a deputation from London asking an increase on chains and dairy material. From Toronto we had Mr. Polson, who wished that certain iron and steel articles used in steamship building be placed on the free list. When the Government increase the duty they say they lower the price, and when they take off the duty they say they lower the price. Such are the utterances of the supporters of the Government in this House. Here is a gentleman asking that the duty be taken off. I do not know what excuse hon. gentlemen opposite will give, but I admit they are clever at giving excuses. If there is one thing I admire about the Government and their supporters it is their ability to make excuses; and whether a duty is increased or decreased the same excuse is given, and it goes down with the Government supporters. Then we had a deputation from the boot and shoe manufacturers of Ontario protesting vigorously against any duty on fine leather. So we had a deputation asking for an increase of the duty, and another asking for the removal of the duty on fine leather. We had a deputation from Goderich asking an increase of the duty on flour. We have had a resolution brought into this House asking that fertilisers be placed on the free list, and we have also had a deputation of Tory members asking that fertilisers be not placed on the free list. A rather very important matter under the National Policy apparently is that relating to dogs, for we first had a deputation of dog fanciers on the subject, then a deputation of Tory members asking that the duty on collie dogs be removed. We have also had a deputation asking that the duty on small fruits and berries be re-imposed. Then we had a deputation, introduced by Col. Denison, asking for greater protection on piano actions, and last a deputation in favor of combines. Thus we have had depositions asking for greater and for lesser protection. I do not propose to ask any change in the tariff in the resolution I submit to the House. I do not propose to strike off a duty or to add a duty. I propose to allow the duty to stand, but I ask this House to take such steps as will ensure that not only the farmer but every other class be placed in the same position. I ask nothing for one class that I am not willing to give to another. I ask that the advantage given by the Government to one class in the community over every other class should be removed so that every class shall have a fair field and no favor.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I desire, as the hon. gentleman has brought this subject to the notice of the Government and the House, to say a few words in regard to the

question of the duty on corn. While I cannot endorse every statement the hon. gentleman has made, especially with regard to the general effect of the tariff and the dissatisfaction which he seems to think prevails in this country in regard to its various provisions, I shall yet be glad to assist the hon. gentleman in so far as I can in any honest attempt to improve the tariff, which I believe has had a very beneficial effect upon the country at large. I would be very glad indeed if the Government, in revising the tariff as they may find it necessary, could see their way clear in some way to remove the duty on corn when imported for feeding purposes. As hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware, the raising of stock and dairying have become very important branches of agricultural industry in the Maritime Provinces. While the climate and soil of the Lower Provinces are admirably adapted for root crops, and while we have hay in abundance there, the farmers engaged in fattening stock are obliged to import a considerable quantity of other feed in order to carry on their operations successfully. They have long felt the duty on corn to be something which weighs heavily on their industry, and there is a general desire that this duty should be removed. It is true that their importations at the present time do not indicate a very general use of corn, but if the duty were removed the consumption of corn for feeding purposes would be largely increased. I scarcely think that the plan proposed by the hon. gentleman on the resolution now before the House would be practicable or workable, but some arrangement might be made by which corn for all purposes except for distilling would come into the country free. It is in the interest of the Maritime Provinces that the duty on cornmeal should be reduced or removed entirely. Some years ago I advocated the adoption of some such policy. I desire, as this matter has come up again, to express these views, and I trust the Minister of Finance will take up this matter seriously and adopt some means by which this duty can be removed.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has, in the first place—if he will permit me to refer to one of his remarks—pointed to the new member who was introduced this afternoon as one of the proofs that this country is against the present fiscal policy of the Government. He also alluded to the fact that there were two other proofs that the people were against this fiscal policy. It is quite possible there were those proofs; but were there not also proofs of approbation of that policy? I think my presence here speaks for itself. There are others beside me who also discussed that question before their constituents, and they, like myself, have been sent to this House to defend this fiscal policy. The hon. gentleman's position is a little illogical and inconsequential. He stands before us as the mover of a resolution which he declares is not to interfere with the tariff, in fact he appears before us as a free trader, and yet he does not wish to see the duty removed from corn. I want to go further. I stand here as a defender of the National Policy. I hold, however, that corn is a raw material for manufacture. And speaking of that, I believe it is a reasonable position for a defender of the National Policy, as I am, to take, that the duty should be removed from corn altogether.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." Why does he not propose it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to explain to the hon. gentleman that my motion covers that, and refers specially to the duty as regards class legislation. I did not say I was opposed to corn being put on the free list.

Gen. LAURIE. If you amend your resolution so as to make it read that the duty should be removed altogether, I will be happy to support it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Move an amendment.

Gen. LAURIE. I prefer to let this resolution stand. I have plenty of time to take further action in this respect. This House will sit for some time yet, and it will be quite within my power to do so at a future time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do it now.

Gen. LAURIE. Why should I do it now? I believe I am within my own discretion in this matter, and I can do it when I think proper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Move the amendment now.

Gen. LAURIE. I am obliged to the hon. gentlemen for the promptings I receive, and I hope when the time comes that I shall have their support for such a motion. I can see that this, to a very large extent, is a Maritime Province question. When we come to consider the figures of the importation of corn, and to what Provinces it is imported, we will find that it is mainly to the Maritime Provinces that this importation is made. I find that in the last four years 512,000 barrels of cornmeal were imported into Canada. Of that I find that Ontario only imported 25,000 barrels, Quebec, 6,500 barrels, Manitoba and the North-West, 3,958 barrels. In all, the Upper Provinces, from Quebec to the west, have imported 35,000 barrels of cornmeal; while the Lower Provinces, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, imported 477,000 barrels. Therefore, I say it is largely our question and I trust that the members from the Upper Provinces, who recognise that we are prepared to meet them in supporting a duty on articles which they produce, will be willing to concede their support to us in obtaining, free of duty, articles which they do not produce. As I have shown before, the total import of American manufactured cornmeal into Canada was 512,000 barrels, of which 477,000 barrels were imported into the Lower Provinces. During this same number of years we ground in our own mills only 200,000 barrels, so that out of the total consumption of 677,000 barrels in the Lower Provinces, we ourselves ground less than one-third. I claim, Sir, that it would be a very great advantage to us if the duty was taken off this grain so that our people could be employed in grinding that corn in our own mills. I do not ask that the duty should be taken off cornmeal, but I ask that corn should be recognised as a raw material, that it should be free of duty, and that we then should have an opportunity of grinding it ourselves. If we examine the question further we will find that if such were the case that our own mills would have 200 per cent. more employment than at the present time, to the amount of \$50,000 in labor for putting up that grain and grinding the meal in our own mills. I have already brought the matter to the notice of the Government, and I am informed it is under consideration. I sincerely trust it will receive such consideration as will result in the removal of the duty on corn and in the recognition of what I believe to be the true principle of the National Policy, that raw material should come in free to be manufactured here so that our own people may be employed. As regards the request that I should make an amendment now, I beg to say that I prefer to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, in the hope that when they take it into consideration they will see their way to foster our industries to the extent and in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion I would say that the object of the farmer is to improve the soil and to produce as much growth as possible on a small quantity of land, as well as to raise live stock for the market. As this question includes the fattening of stock for the English market, allow me to refer to its bearing in this aspect and to say that this is a very important industry in Canada at the present time and one that is rapidly increasing in importance. I find that in

1878 we only exported 29,900 head of cattle, and of that number only 7,400 were sent to the English market as fat cattle. There was the large number of 17,000 sent to the United States. When we consider the extent of this trade at the present time we see the importance of this industry and the rapid increase it has made in Canada. We find that in 1888 we exported over 100,000 head of cattle, and of that number 54,000 were sent as beef cattle into the English market and 40,000 were sent into the American market as stockers. When we take those figures into consideration, it must be apparent to every gentleman at all acquainted with agriculture, or with the condition of the country at the present time, that this is a very important and a rapidly growing industry and one that requires every encouragement from the Government and from all other sources that possibly can give it encouragement. We find, Sir, that the quantity was more in 1885 and 1887 than it was during 1888. We find that during the year 1888 the whole amount of cattle exported was only \$5,000,000 worth, while in 1887 it had reached \$6,000,000, and in 1885, \$7,337,000 worth, showing that the export of cattle has not increased during the last year or two. The view of a great many of the most progressive farmers of Canada, to-day, is that fattening cattle does not in reality pay the farmer. If any means could be adopted for giving the farmers a cheaper feed for their cattle it would be a great benefit to the farming community. If the feed that they are not able to raise on their own farms could be cheapened, and an arrangement made whereby they could sell their own produce and invest in cheap feed, so as to give them better returns in raising cattle, it is the duty of the Government to adopt such means. We find that at the present time corn, in the United States, is sold at 33 cents per bushel, and within the last two or three weeks it has been sent to the western part of the Province of Ontario at 59 cents a bushel in bond. But, when we add 7½ cents per bushel to that price, it raises the price to more than 46 cents, and it is not in the power of the farmers to pay such a price for it for feeding cattle and to get a profitable return. Let us enquire into the facts and see whether or not the imposition of duty on corn has had the effect of reducing the consumption of corn brought into the country. I find that the duty has reduced the consumption of corn by one million and eighty eight thousand bushels between 1878 and 1880. With those facts before us we will see that it is certainly the duty of the Government to give us some relief, especially when we find that there is another class of the community not so important a class as the farmers; a class that does not increase the welfare of the country in the same ratio as the agricultural class do, and who yet are more favored. I refer to the distillers. Since they are favored with a rebate of the duty upon the corn that they manufacture into spirits and export from the country, I do not see why the farmers should be denied the same privilege, seeing that they are the greatest producers of wealth and the greatest exporters of produce out of the Dominion of Canada. There is another view which has to be taken in connection with this subject. We must remember that the distillers, besides getting a rebate on corn, have the grains left to feed their cattle, and the distillers use this feeding to a large extent. They have this also free of duty of any description, which is a further injustice to the farmer. They can even enter the markets, and, by buying stock steers and feeding them, enter into competition with the farmers of Canada. We are certainly entitled to that consideration at the hands of the Government, and I was very much pleased indeed to see the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) rise and state that he would favor, not only the rebate of the duty to the farmers of the Dominion, but the removal of the duty entirely. He stated that the Lower Provinces are more affected by the duty on corn than the people of the other Provinces; but I say that no

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron),

Province is more interested in the removal of that duty than the Province of Ontario. I find that in the year 1888, the whole amount of duty paid on corn imported into the Dominion, was \$173,384, of which the Province of Ontario paid \$143,215, leaving only \$30,000 to be paid by the other Provinces. But when we come to corn meal, I find that in 1888, the amount of duty paid in the whole Dominion on that article was \$53,837, of which Ontario only paid \$3,419, while the Province of Nova Scotia paid \$42,221; and that is a duty on the food of the fishermen and workmen of that Province. Now, Sir, when we take into consideration that, according to Sir John Laws, one of the foremost agriculturists of the British Islands at the present time, one ton of corn meal has a manure value of £1 11s. or \$7.44, we can see that it is of the utmost importance to the farmers of Canada to get a cheap feed for cattle and also to increase the supply of manure, seeing that we do not produce this article of food in our own borders, to make it as free as possible to our people. Now, we find that last year 40,000 stock cattle, and the previous year 45,000, went into the United States from Canada; and one reason why the feeders of the United States are able in this way to purchase our cattle, pay a duty of 20 per cent., and take them into their own country, is that they possess this cheap food. It is not because the United States require our cattle, for they are large exporters of cattle themselves. We find that the United States export to the British market 241,360 head of beef cattle; so that the 40,000 they take out of the Dominion of Canada and fatten in their own country, either goes to the English market to compete with our beef there, or they supplant a certain number of their own cattle. Therefore, in order that we may be able to hold our own in exporting beef and carry that important industry to a successful issue, it is the duty of the Government to give the farmers this relief. It is only in justice to ourselves that we ask this. But it may be said that there are certain portions of the Dominion which would be injured by the removal of the duty, as proposed by the hon. member for Shelburne. Well, I take exception to the statement. There is no proof that the duty has increased the price of corn to producers. By the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that in 1878 corn was brought into Canada at 47½ cents a bushel, and exported at 66½ cents, showing a profit of 19 cents per bushel; and I find in an abstract which has been placed in the hands of every member, that in 1881 corn was 55 cents per bushel in the United States, while it was 66 cents per bushel in Montreal; but when we come down to 1886 we find that corn was 49 cents per bushel in the United States and 49 cents in Montreal. Certainly it is proof positive that the duty on corn has not benefited those who produce corn in Canada, but rather the opposite, when we find that the producers of corn in Ontario under the National Policy did not get as high prices as they did before the National Policy came into existence, when compared with prices in the United States. There is another proof that the imposition of duty on corn has injured the trade of the country. We find that in 1878 there was a profit of \$790,000 made upon corn, which for one item is certainly no insignificant sum, whereas in 1888 there was only \$138,000 of profit on corn; so that besides not benefitting the farmers, the duty injures the trade of the country. There is another very important industry in the country which at the present time requires to be nurtured in every possible shape, that is, the dairy industry. The experience of those who have entered into that industry for the last two or three years is that it is an actual necessity to sow a very large amount of corn for green feed and ensilage, which is being adopted very rapidly in Canada, therefore I hold that it is the duty of the Government to allow corn to come in free, seeing that all the seed we get for sowing, both for fodder and ensilage, comes from the

United States. Any gentleman who has paid any attention to the dairy industry within the last few years knows that the farmers must supplant their pastures if they are to be successful. Now, I am just going to speak of another feature of the National Policy, and then I am done. I have been actually astonished at statements that have been thrown across the floor at us on this side of the House. One of those statements is that the farmers of the country pay almost no taxation. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), no longer ago than yesterday, stated that the farmers paid almost no duty. "Go to the farmer's house," he said, "and see his table, and see what quantity of things are on that table on which duties have been paid." I would ask if the farmers of the Dominion of Canada do not set as respectable a table as any other class of the community? I would ask if the farmers of Canada only feed upon the husks of the food that goes to supply the tables of those not engaged in that industry? And yet, Mr. Speaker, I find farmers sitting on the other side of this House who are willing to swallow the bait and take down every indignity thrown at them as a class. Then, again, we are told that on their clothing the farmers of this country pay no duty. Why, Sir, let the hon. gentleman examine the tariff, and see if the clothes worn by the farmers and farm laborers of this country do not pay a higher duty than the clothing of those in other positions. I say we are taxed more heavily on these goods than any other class in the Dominion, and I say it is an indignity thrown against the farmers of this country to point to their table or their dress as an indication that they do not pay an equal amount of duty to that paid by any other class in the country. We were asked last night by the hon. member for the south riding of Ontario (Mr. Smith), what we would do with our cattle if we did not get a large population into the country to consume them. I beg to inform that hon. gentleman that the export of our fed cattle is rapidly on the increase, and that whatever other effect the National Policy may have, it has had no effect at all in keeping our cattle at home, despite the assertion by the hon. the First Minister, when introducing that policy, that not only our agricultural products, our butter and our cheese, but our cattle, would be consumed in our own country, when all these tall chimneys would be in full play. Well, we have had ten years' experience of the National Policy, and yet to-day we export more of that class of produce than we ever did, and the exports are continuing to increase. We were told by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture that we can purchase goods 20 to 25 per cent. cheaper now than we ever did, but we cannot purchase them as cheaply as the reduction in the old country markets, which I have visited three times within the last four years, would warrant. I have been told there that the improvements in machinery and in methods of manufacture have reduced goods more than 30 per cent; so that, even admitting the statement of the hon. gentleman to be correct, we do not get the full benefit of the improvements in manufactures which have been obtained in other parts of the world. I hope the Government, therefore, will see their way, if they cannot remove the duty on corn, to give to our farmers a rebate upon the amount used in feeding cattle, as soon as they prove satisfactorily to the Government that the cattle have been exported.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken made reference to the debate of last night, and to the statement which fell from me that the farmers, as a class, pay but little of the import duties. I expected that the hon. gentleman, when he challenged that statement, would at least have advanced some argument in behalf of the contrary contention, or have brought down some details or some facts to show wherein our agricultural

community pay anything like the import duties that other classes do. He referred to the workingmen in our cities. Well, I say that the laboring classes in our cities pay more of the import duties than do the farmers. When I pointed to the table of the farmer, the hon. gentleman contended that I wished to infer that it is not as well furnished as that of other classes. I did not mean anything of the kind, but we all know that the farmer produces a large proportion of what he eats, and that no duty is paid on that. It is only begging the question to go off on tangents of that kind and make broad and sweeping assertions which are not backed by any fact or argument. Let hon. gentlemen opposite point to the articles of diet, and of clothing, let them point out what there is to be found around the farmer's place which is imported. The hon. gentleman said that the farmer pays a duty on woollen goods. I would ask, do the farmers, do the laboring classes, or even the professional classes, as a rule, wear imported woollen goods? No, thanks to the National Policy, our Canadian woollen goods have taken the place of the imported articles, and are worn by all our laboring classes and farmers and by our professional men. As to this resolution before the House, I agree with one portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), that it is impracticable, and to that point of the resolution I will address myself first. We are asked that a rebate be given on imported corn which is fed to cattle that are exported, and not on that fed to cattle slaughtered and used in this country. Now, that would mean that the farmer would import a certain quantity of grain to be fed to cattle to be consumed in this market, and a certain quantity to be fed to cattle to be exported. There would have to be an inspector in every farm-yard, as there is in every distillery now, to find out how much of the corn was consumed for the one purpose and how much for the other. It is clear that it is utterly impracticable. We have inspectors in the distilleries for various purposes, so that there is not much expense in having them take note of the quantity of corn used there; and there is a great distinction between the two classes as regards the consumption of corn. One of the classes being composed of men who are under the direct scrutiny of the Government from the time the raw material comes in until their product is exported, it is in their case easy tracing how much corn is used for that purpose; in the other, the effect of making any distinction would be to allow corn in free for all purposes. For once the corn came into the hands of the retailer he would sell to people feeding for export and for home consumption. How could the line be drawn? A young animal is fed for two years—when can it be said he is to be fed for exportation? If he is to be fed for the calf for exportation, all that he consumes should be free of duty. The whole thing is impracticable, and if there is any object in the hon. gentleman's resolution, it is to bring about covertly the free importation of corn. What the effect of the free importation of corn would be to the farmers of Ontario is perhaps a matter that requires very close investigation. I have for some time been trying to satisfy myself as to what the result would be, and I have come to the conclusion that it would be a serious disaster. The reason is this: corn, as a grain for feeding purposes, would then come directly into competition with our oats and other coarser grains, the prices of which would be thereby reduced. On a former occasion in this House I went into considerable detail as to the effect of the free importation of oats. I then made, as a summary of my remarks, the statement that the difference between the price of oats in Chicago and the price in Toronto and Owen Sound and other lake ports was, on an average, from 12 to 14 cents, that it was seldom under 12 and frequently over 14 cents. I find in yesterday's paper that in Toronto to-day oats are quoted 36



to 37 cents, and in Chicago they are quoted at 25 cents, which shows a difference of from 11 to 12 cents. What is the cause of that? Why are oats lower in Chicago than here? The reason is that in Chicago they have to come into direct competition with corn which is quoted to-day at 34 to 35 cents in that market. Therefore the relative properties of feeding being greater in corn than in oats, it is not to be expected that oats would continue to fetch 36 to 37 cents in Toronto, if corn which is selling at 34 to 35 cents in Chicago was allowed to be imported free. The result of that would be that, in my opinion, the effect of the free importation of corn would be to reduce the price of oats in Ontario at least 10 cents a bushel. Now, if that would be the effect on the price of oats, we have to consider the quantity of oats grown in Ontario in each year. We export from two to three million bushels of oats a year, but that alone would not be affected to the extent of 10 cents a bushel. Every bushel the farmer has to sell, amounting to between twenty-five and twenty-eight million bushels, would mean a loss to him of 10 cents a bushel. That would be a serious matter. But that is not the only grain which would be affected by this. In many parts of Ontario they grow large quantities of peas, and I think they do the same in the other Provinces. Twenty years ago, the north-western States of the Union, the State of Michigan particularly, grew a great quantity of peas. Michigan is not so situated as to enable the people to grow corn. They cannot grow corn, but they can grow oats and peas. Ontario, up to the present day, does grow a large quantity of peas, and the farmers find it not only a good profitable crop, but a good crop in regard to the improvement of the land. What has been the effect of the growth, or the increase in the growth, of western corn on the pea crop of the United States? It has actually driven it out of existence, so that last year our neighbors took off the duty on peas in order to allow peas to be brought in and allow the Boston belle to have her pea soup. You find now that peas are not in the American market reports, they are not in the market in Michigan or in any of the northern and eastern States. It is a serious matter for farmers to consider. These few men who have gone largely into stock raising and are specially interested in stock feeding, because that is what is more referred to than stock raising, want to get the corn admitted free for food. They wish to buy their grain and feed their stock at the expense of their neighbors who are not interested in that way, and who trust to the sale of their grain. We have no evidence that the grains we grow in Canada do not turn out as good cattle and as well-fed cattle as any cattle can be. We know that our cattle take the markets of England, and that the cattle which are so fed are well received here in Canada. Why, then, should half a dozen people in a township—because I doubt if there are many townships in Ontario where you will find more than half a dozen, or a dozen at the outside, who devote their attention to stock feeding and do not grow the grain they feed—be benefited at the expense of all the others? I heard one man say that if he could buy corn, he would sell his oats. Yes, but he could not sell his oats at the same price, for the lumbermen, and all those who want corn cheap, would not buy oats at all unless oats were proportionately cheap; so it is absurd to say that we would gain by the importation of corn. I think the result in a few years of carrying out this proposal would be that the value of oats would sink to the level of the Chicago market, that is, 10 or 12 cents below what oats are worth now, and that our peas would be driven from the country. I do not wish to detain the House much longer, although this is very important. It is only one of the kicks which hon. gentleman are giving at the National Policy. They have attacked it as a whole and have been foiled. The country has repudiated them and sustained the Government on the general ground, and now they are making an attack upon

Mr. MASSON.

it in detail, they are attacking it piecemeal, and this is one of the attacks on which they hope to catch the farmers' vote. If this were adopted, the farmers of Ontario would not have to thank those hon. gentlemen a year hence. The hon. gentleman who took his seat just now said that the duty had not increased the price of corn. If that is so—and I had not time to check his statements in order to see whether that was true or not—why it is that the Americans are forcing their corn on the market? Whenever they get a drop in the home market and have corn on their hands, they thrust it in to take possession of our markets. We import large quantities of oats and corn. My hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) stated that Nova Scotia and the Provinces by the sea did all the importing of corn. Perhaps he referred more to cornmeal. It is Ontario that does most of the importing of corn. Of the 2,331,667 bushels of corn which were imported according to the last returns, Ontario imported 1,909,540, leaving all the other Provinces a little less than half a million bushels. What is that imported for?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Distillation.

Mr. MASSON. A great deal of it is imported to be ground, but, if the people of Nova Scotia import it only for the purpose of grinding, the duty of 7½ cents per bushel would not much increase the amount paid by any family, and would not be a very serious burden. The hon. gentleman says he is willing that allowance should be made for what we grow in this country. We in Ontario have allowed duties to be put on as part and parcel of the National Policy. The people of Ontario have yielded item after item in favor of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MITCHELL. What are they?

Mr. MASSON. And those people have insisted on the exchange being made.

Mr. MITCHELL. Tell us what they are.

Mr. MASSON. They want to set off all these duties by the duty on wheat.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman permit me for one moment? Will you tell me what they are.

Mr. MASSON. If the hon. gentleman will only possess his soul in patience, I will answer in due time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Tell us what they are, then.

Mr. MASSON. There is one matter which is clear to every person in Ontario. There is one duty from which we hoped to reap a benefit in time, but at first it was entirely to the benefit of the Lower Provinces, and that is in reference to iron. The duty which was put on iron was put on with special reference to the Lower Provinces, where they have both the coal and the iron. In Ontario, we have the iron, and we hope to develop smelting works and all that kind of thing in time, but the Lower Provinces are reaping the benefits now and they ask us to be satisfied with the duty on wheat and to crowd out all the other products. Ontario sends supporters to the present Government in quite a large number. Quite a large majority support the right hon. gentleman here. Compare those behind the Treasury benches here with those who support Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Ontario Opposition, and representative of the same party in the Ontario House, and see the great difference, one with a handful at his back, a large majority against him, while here the large majority is on the other side. All that results from the support given to the National Policy of the Government in the matter of protection to the farmers. That is the matter which they control, it is the rural districts which have made the change, and not the manufacturing centres. We find the representation of the cities much the same in both Houses, but when you come

to the rural districts you find the farmers supporting the Conservative party, because they see and can understand that it has affected favorably their home markets, as compared with other markets. When they see, as the farmers in my riding did see, Chicago oats, at the opening of navigation, coming into their harbor on the first vessel that entered it, and a drop take place in one day from 40 cents to 28 cents—that is something that they recollect. Now they see the price in their market from 12 to 14 cents above the price in the Chicago market. They point to the National Policy and say, that is how we keep our markets up, and have our home market protected for ourselves and for our own benefit. It is for these reasons that the National Policy has received the sanction and support of the farmers of this country. Now, I think that the free importation of corn would not be to the advantage of the Ontario farmers. The other point which might be taken out of this resolution is that it is unfair that the distillers should have a rebate on their corn which they produce into spirits for exportation. Now, I am willing to agree, to some extent, to that part of the resolution. I do not myself see any particular reason why the distillers should be allowed that rebate. I know the theory on which it is based, which is, that if so much grain is imported into this country as a raw material, and is manufactured here into spirits, and these are exported, the operation gives labor to so many men in this country. I do not think that when we look over the distilling business and find it is in the hands of a few men, large concerns, scattered here and there over the country, and when we find the exporters reduced down to about two—at least in the Province of Ontario; because when others export they do so in small quantities only—I cannot see that it can be a great benefit to the distillers. When we find that so few persons are benefited, I cannot see that there is any real corresponding benefit to the rest of the community. As pointed out by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), a large portion of that material, and perhaps the most profitable portion of that material, is brought in duty free, or the duty is entirely rebated—that is, the refuse that is used for feeding cattle, and we find that this is used in competition with other feeders; so that I do not myself see any particular reason for that rebate being continued. I only give that as my individual opinion. I can see the theory on which it is based, but, practically, I do not see that it is of much benefit. Although I am not a supporter of my hon. friend's motion, made last night, for total prohibition, I am not one who would say that the distillers are a class that should be particularly favored, and for that reason I do not see why a rebate, that amounts to a very large sum of money, should be given back to these men, merely for the purpose of increasing their profits. I think also that the excise duties increase the price of their produce. That duty is a direct tax, and they take advantage of that, and these gentlemen, I believe, take an undue advantage of it, that they increase the price on all their brands to the full amount of the excise duty. Therefore, I do not see any reason why this rebate should be continued—speaking personally on the subject. However, the resolution in its present form, as I have said, is certainly impracticable, and the only result that might follow from adopting it would not be beneficial to the class that it is intended to help. Now, I know that our friends down by the sea make a cry about their fishermen. Their cry is much like that about the farmers—they are the two classes without any protection. Now, if I am right, I think the fishermen do receive protection; I think there is something like fishery bounties and all that sort of thing. Surely if that is so, it is an offset to the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel on corn that they have to pay. I do not see that they can ask to have their bread buttered on both sides, and then a little jam thrown in. In Ontario we are quite willing to bear our own share where

burdens are to be imposed; but where favors are to be received, we want our own share. I think it is to the interest of the farmers of Ontario that their coarse grains should be protected, and I think that our friends down by the sea should not object to that protection.

Mr. FISHER. I have been much pleased to hear the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I was much surprised, however, to hear that hon. gentleman, who, I believe, represents an agricultural constituency in the Province of Ontario, describe the fishermen of the Lower Provinces as a class of people who desire to have their bread buttered on both sides and a little jam thrown in to help them. He said that in that respect they were similar to the farmers of this country, who wanted more protection from this House. Sir, it comes very ill from an hon. gentleman who pretends that he represents a farmers' constituency, to intimate that the farmers are so unjust, so illogical, in their demands for fair play. I do not believe that is in any sense a fair or a right representation, either of the fishermen of the Lower Provinces, or of the farmers of this middle part of the Dominion of Canada. The farmers are perfectly ready and willing, and able to stand by themselves and work for themselves, to earn their own living and to be contented with it. But in earning their living they do not wish to be obliged to work at a disadvantage with the other people of the country; and when, as the hon. gentleman himself stated, we find that in this particular instance the farmers are working at a direct disadvantage in competition with a certain class of the community, the distillers, I think it behoves that hon. gentleman, who represents, I suppose, many more farmers than he does distillers, to work for their interests, and to see that their interests are promoted. In connection with this question of the distillers, I cannot refrain from pointing out at once that there is a very unfair competition on the part of the distillers, who obtain their corn free of duty, against the farmers who are made to pay a duty on the same corn. We all know very well that in this country there is a large number of distillery-fed cattle exported to the old land. These cattle are fed with the refuse of the distillery, and in that refuse we know that there is a large portion of the solid ingredients of the corn which the distillers have imported, and upon which they have not paid the duty, and which they feed to those cattle in the distillery barns, and in this way they enter into competition with the farmers who are obliged to buy corn and pay a duty on it, and then feed it to the cattle which they send to England. I contend that the distillers stand to-day in the position of having obtained an unfair advantage over the farmers, with whom they come in direct competition, in regard to feeding cattle. It is an unfair state of things, that the distiller who feeds animals for the English market should not be obliged to pay duty on the corn which he partially uses in that feeding, while farmers who feed animals on an adjoining lot are obliged to pay the full duty upon their corn. The burden of the argument of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, against the original motion is that it is an entirely impracticable motion, that it is not possible to enforce it because it would be impossible that the corn fed to animals exported could be accurately measured. I agree, to a certain extent, with the hon. gentleman, not that it would be an impracticable motion were it carried, but that it does not go quite so far as I would like to see Parliament go. I quite agree that this motion would not dispose entirely and adequately of the injustice under which the farmers lie, as compared with the distillers and other protected industries. As a matter of fact the motion would only apply to those farmers who are feeding stock for export. It happens that I come from a section of the country where the feeding of cattle is not

largely carried on; but we have another industry which is perhaps even more important: I allude to the great dairying industry. Any one who is familiar with the export trade knows very well that the products of cheese and butter are greatly in excess of the value of the meat we send to the old country. I contend that if farmers choose to buy cornmeal and corn and feed it to cows instead of to oxen designed to be slaughtered, they ought to obtain a rebate of the duty paid on that corn just as much as the farmer who feeds it to stock or the distiller who puts it into whiskey. Believing this to be the case and granting, as I do frankly, that it would be rather difficult to find the exact measure of the corn which would be contained in the butter and the cheese or the animal exported to the old country, and wishing to go further than the original motion, I propose to move an amendment to the motion to place corn on the free list. I think that would meet any suggestion as to the impracticability of the motion and also remove the objection I myself feel that this motion does not go far enough in protecting all classes of farmers in this country and removing all discriminations against them and in favor of the distiller. The hon. gentleman who just resumed his seat made several remarks with regard to the question of corn being free. In that connection he specially dwelt upon the danger that such action would interfere with the ruling prices of peas, oats and barley in this country. In regard to the section from which I come, I do not think it would matter very much, because we in the Eastern Townships are not a grain-raising community; but I am quite willing and desirous of protecting all portions of the farming community, although I may not be personally interested. If I thought serious injury would arise to the great bulk of the farmers I would not urge this proposition, but I have full confidence that it would not do so, and I regard the hon. gentleman's argument in regard to the prices of peas, oats and barley as wholly unavailing. In the first place, before the tariff was instituted, before the duty was placed on corn, our peas, barley and oats entered into competition with corn and maintained their prices in comparison with corn at that time, and as a matter of fact, as we export a very large portion of our barley and oats, and a considerable quantity of peas, the prices of those articles in a general way are regulated by the export prices. It matters not whether corn is bought a little cheaper or dearer. If it is the fact that the prices of those grains are largely dependent on export prices, then the price of corn for feeding purposes would not influence their prices. Where there is one farmer who buys other grain for feeding purposes there are a dozen who endeavor to buy corn for feeding purposes for cattle and the ordinary prosecution of his business. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that for fattening purposes, and largely for dairying purposes, corn is one of the cheapest feeds for animals, and in a general way it would pay our farmers better to sell their peas and barley for other purposes, to sell their barley for malting purposes and to export their other coarse grains and buy corn, and in that way they would reap the full benefit, not only of their skill in growing, but of their business skill in securing as much profit as possible. In the present stage of our farming this is absolutely necessary. Not only must our farmers be efficient tillers of the soil, but they must conduct their business according to the best business methods known in the country. The hon. gentleman who just resumed his seat also alluded to another fact, which is well known to all of us and in regard to which our farmers and the country may well be proud—that our cattle entering England have a great advantage as compared with the cattle of the United States. It has been our good fortune to avoid contagious diseases in our cattle, which are not scheduled in England on landing as are those of our neighbors to the south, and this is an advantage which I hope and feel confident we shall be able

Mr. FISHER.

to maintain. If that is the case, there is all the more reason why our farmers should be able to reap the fullest and best advantage in regard to cattle feeding, and if we are able, by importing feeding stuffs from the United States, to fatten our cattle and send them to England under better conditions and more favorable circumstances than our rivals in the United States, then let us not only retain the trade we already have, but let us, I was going to say, steal from our neighbors a certain portion of their cattle business. If we can raise beef in this country, and retain the manure from the cattle to enrich our soil, we are reaping a double advantage, and Parliament should afford every facility possible to our farmers to reach that position. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, have declared they are in favor of free corn. I sympathise with the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurier), and also with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), and if they desire to have the opportunity to express their opinions on this question, by their vote, I will give them that opportunity as soon as possible. I believe the people of the Maritime Provinces, and the people of my own Province especially, as well as the farmers all through the country, are going to be benefitted by having the free importation of corn, so as to be able to buy the raw material in the cheapest market and from it manufacture beef, cheese or butter. I move in amendment:

That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following substituted:—"That corn be placed on the free list."

Mr. CORBY. I understood the member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) to say that the duty collected on corn in Ontario was \$ 02,000. Let me tell him that the distillers in Ontario out of that sum pay over \$90,000, and this leaves a comparatively small amount for the farmers of the Province to pay. Hon. gentlemen have spoken about the amount of rebate on exported spirits and the rebate on the corn to the distillers. There is not more than \$150 allowed to the distillers in Ontario as rebate on exported spirits. The distillers have been referred to very frequently in the course of this debate by hon. members, and I just state these facts to show the exact position in which they stand with regard to the duty they pay and the rebate given them.

Mr. FLYNN. While I agree with the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), I would go a step further in this matter and express a desire that the duty should be taken off cornmeal. There is no portion of the population on which that duty bears more heavily than on the people of the Maritime Provinces and it affects more especially the poorer class of the community. Let me point out that the duty on cornmeal is altogether out of proportion to the duty on flour. While the duty on the finest grades of flour is only 50 cents a barrel, the duty on cornmeal, which, as a rule, is about half the price of flour, is about 40 cents, making it nearly double the duty on flour. We were told at the time the National Policy was introduced in 1879, that if a duty was put on flour and cornmeal we were given a compensation, inasmuch as a duty was also put upon coal, and that if the people of the Maritime Provinces had to pay a duty on flour and cornmeal, the people of the Upper Provinces would have to pay a duty on coal. We all know that the duty on anthracite coal was struck off two years ago, and I considered then, together with some gentlemen who supported the Government in the policy of taxing cornmeal, that when the duty was taken off anthracite coal it should be taken off cornmeal as well. I move that the following words be added to the amendment of the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher):—

And that cornmeal be admitted into Canada free of duty.

Mr. CASEY. Before proceeding to the motion actually before the House, I cannot help spending a few moments

in calling attention to some remarkable statements made by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). He said that the farmers pay very little duty on the articles that they consume, or use. He told us that he believed that even the laborers in cities pay more to the revenue of the Dominion than do the farmers, and he asked us to look at the farmers' tables, and to see that they produce nearly everything they eat, and that therefore they must pay much less duty than the laborers in town. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that a man does not live on bread alone, nor on meat alone, nor on maple sugar, nor on "garden sass," nor even on milk alone. There are a great many things that even a farmer wants to use that he does not grow on his own farm. For instance, he does not grow sugar, nor tea, nor spice, nor coffee, nor tobacco, and there is a thing that some farmers use—though perhaps they should not use it—but on which they have to pay a tax—that is, spirituous liquors, or fermented liquors, at all events. I think it would be found, as a general rule, that people pay into the revenue of the Dominion, in the first place, according to their wealth, and in the second place, according to the number of the family they have to provide for. If the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) means to intimate that the farmers of his county are not, on the average, richer than the laborers of the city, I think he has mistaken the condition of the farmers of the county, and that he will have a little trouble explaining that to them. What if the wealthy farmers who live on 200 acres of land—and some of whom are worth \$1,000 or \$20,000 in hard cash, if they were sold out—are told that their representative in this House says that they pay no more into the revenue of the Dominion than the laborers in Toronto.

Mr. MASSON. I did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's statement is in the *Hansard* and he cannot get out of it by any means in his power. He says that the farmers produce all they eat. Suppose that they eat nothing but the produce of their flocks, and herds, and fields, does he suppose that they eat off the bare table with their fingers? I do not think that the farmers of Canada, as a rule, eat with their fingers, and least of all in that highly intelligent constituency of North Grey, which has sent such a representative here as the hon. gentleman. I cannot believe that they eat their food out of their fingers. They have surely a table-cloth on their table, and they are taxed on the table-cloth. They have some nice delf plates (if they do not go in for china to put their food on) and they are taxed 66 per cent. on those delf plates, while the china brought in for the use of the rich people of the city—the laborers, for instance—is only taxed 30 per cent., but the farmers' crockery has to pay 66 per cent. duty. The farmers generally have knives and forks in their houses, and there is a heavy duty on cutlery. They generally have spoons, and there is a duty on spoons. They generally have chairs to sit upon, and there is a duty of 35 per cent. on furniture. They generally have a best room with a carpet upon it, and there is a heavy duty on the carpet as well as on the furniture in that room. There is a duty on the wall paper that goes on the wall, and I believe a duty on the very glue that goes into the whitewash which is put upon the walls of the house. There is a heavy tax on the glass in the windows, a tax on the stove, a tax on the tongs, a tax on the poker and a tax on everything he uses in his house, from the ground floor up to the attic. If he uses iron anywhere, or nails, there is a tariff on these. Everything in and about his house is taxed—everything that the farmer uses, from the cradle he rocks his baby in to the coffin he buries his grandmother in—or his mother-in-law, as my hon. friend suggests, although perhaps he would not mind that tax so much

as some others. Then, if we go out of doors, we find that there is a duty of 35 per cent. on his farm implements. Hon. gentlemen say that is nothing, because we do not import farm implements, and competition has run the price down so that the farmer pays no more for them than he would if there was no duty. Does anyone suppose, when American implement makers can send implements to Manitoba, even with the duty, that we could not get our implements cheaper if that duty was off? I do not say that we would import them, but the manufacturer would sell them cheaper, and in most cases he could afford to do it and make a fair profit. On the more elaborate machines, such as harvesters and binders and other patented machines, I do not know that there is such a large profit; but on cheap forks, hoes, scythes, axes, and other ordinary implements, a specific duty amounting in many cases to from 75 to 100 per cent. is imposed. Everything the farmer uses is taxed, and if he does not pay the duty into the Dominion treasury, he pays it into another treasury where it does not benefit the country at large. It would be much better if he paid it into the Treasury of the Dominion than into the pockets of a few manufacturers whom this Government have put over him with the right to collect taxes from him. Well, Sir, I think that is enough for me to say in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). Now I wish to speak briefly on the general question. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), who introduced this motion, is merely attempting to carry out the alleged principles of the National Policy as explained to us when that measure was introduced into this House. It was to be a policy for the encouragement of all sorts of industries—the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing, and every other. It was not to be a policy for the manufacturer alone, but a policy to encourage all industries equally, and to make them all prosperous. It was pointed out that as a general rule the raw material of each industry would be admitted free or at a very low duty, while the finished product would be protected sufficiently to yield the producer a profit. This was to be done equally all around: every man's raw material was to come in free, and every man's finished product to be protected. I may say incidentally that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has no doubt found out by this time, perhaps more fully during the last few days than before, how difficult it is to decide what is raw material and what finished product. He has found that one man's finished product is another man's raw material, and I fancy he has not had a bed of roses to lie upon in deciding the question. But that is the Nemesis which has come upon the Government for undertaking to admit every man's raw material free while protecting every man's finished product; and I must say it serves them right; when they have found a way to square the circle, they will be able to do that. But this policy has been carried out with some attempt at fairness in the case of the manufacturers. Many articles are admitted free because they are the raw material of the manufacturers. The total importations under the free list amounted last year to over \$33,000,000, nearly all of which were the raw materials of some industry or necessary articles for carrying on manufacturing industries. For instance, over \$3,000,000 worth of cotton wool, over \$1,000,000 worth of tin, and \$1,250,000 worth of steel rails, were allowed to come in free, these being all raw materials to those who use them. But this rule was not carried out with regard to the farmer. The manufacturer of cotton, the manufacturer of woollens, the manufacturer of various other articles, and railway men, got the largest proportion of their raw materials and plant in free; but the manufacturer of beef has still to pay a duty on the raw material of his industry, and I insist that this industry should be recognised as much as any other. Too often, on both sides of the House, in dis-

cussing the question of the National Policy and cognate matters, the word industry has been taken to mean merely a manufacture. Now, what is an industry? Is it not any occupation which gives employment to capital and men, and which produces wealth in the country? I think that is the only sound definition of an industry. Now, which of all the industries in Canada is the most important? Undoubtedly, as the Trade and Navigation Returns show, the farming industry. For the last ten years we have been protecting the manufacturing industries, both natural and artificial, paying millions of dollars every year out of our pockets for that purpose, and now let us look at the results. How much net wealth has been realised for the benefit of the country by these protected industries? Let us judge by the exports—by what they have sold abroad, and brought value for into the country for the enrichment of the country. Last year the manufacturing industries of the country exported only \$4,161,000 worth of goods. Now look at the exports of the farmer. Leaving out \$2,000,000 worth of furs, the exports of animals and their products have amounted to \$22,732,000, and the exports of agricultural products to \$20,875,000, or, in all, \$43,607,000 worth of products of the field and farm. Compare the two—compare the exports of \$4,000,000 by the manufacturers, with the exports of nearly \$44,000,000 by the farmers, and tell me which is the leading industry of the country—and whether the farming industry or the manufacturing industries, taken altogether, are the most deserving of protection. Why, one is about eleven times more important than the other, as shown by the products they have sent out of the country for which we have received value. Again, compare the exports of \$44,000,000 of farm products with the exports of \$16,609 worth of whiskey and other spirits with which we are more particularly concerned just now. Which of these industries, the \$44,000,000 industry, or the \$16,000 industry—apart from all moral questions connected with the two—which of the two, in regard to wealth and importance, deserves the most consideration at the hands of this House? The former, I should say, most decidedly, and yet here, as in every other case where any kind of manufacture comes into rivalry with the manufacturing interest, the former has been favored. The distiller has been allowed, not only to manufacture corn free in bond into whiskey for exportation, but to use the bye-product of that free corn to feed cattle with, and thus compete with the farmers' cattle. There is where the greatest injustice comes in. The distiller is not only given a rebate of duty on the corn converted into whiskey, which he exports, but he is allowed to keep the greater bulk of that corn still for the purpose of feeding cattle. I have been through the place of Mr. Walker, of Windsor, and saw as many as 2,800 head of cattle, which were being fed there. Gooderham & Worts have still a larger number, and all these swill-fed cattle being thrown on the market at the end of the feeding season, greatly derange the market to the disadvantage of the farmers. Swill-fed cattle destroy the farmers' market, yet the distiller has had a large portion of the food which he has given to those cattle free of duty, while the farmers are compelled to pay a duty on what they feed to their stock. Not only is the raw material admitted free in this way to distillers, while the farmer is not allowed to import his free, but raw material of a great many other kinds, which compete with the farmer, is also admitted free. For instance, \$1,320,000 worth of wool, \$1,619,000 worth of hides, \$258,000 worth of walnut timber, were imported last year free of duty. Other articles also which I might mention, if the list were not too long, come under the same category, making a total of over \$3,250,000 of raw material for the use of different industries which has been admitted free and which comes into competition with farm produce. In the face of all these facts, on the basis of the National

Mr. CASEY.

Policy itself, even if we are to admit that the principle of that policy is sound, we are compelled to ask, in regard to the motion directly before us, whether the farming or the distilling interest does most good to the country. We are compelled to ask which adds most to the wealth of the country, which gives most employment to labor, and which uses the greatest amount of capital to the greatest advantage. If the House decides that the distilling industry is, on all moral and material grounds, to be preferred to the farming industry, they will maintain the scandalous discrimination which now exists in favor of the distiller against the farmer. If they decide otherwise, they have two courses open to them. They may put all corn on the free list or compel the distiller to pay the duty as the farmer does. Of the two, I prefer to put corn on the free list altogether. I take this stand as the representative of a county very largely interested in growing corn. The county of Elgin grows a great deal of corn, but we do not grow it largely for export; we generally manufacture all the corn we grow into beef and pork on our own farms and export it in that shape. That is the most profitable way to handle corn, even in the counties of Kent and Essex, or anywhere else where it is largely grown. You get a better price when you export in the shape of meat, and you have the bye-products of the manufacture left to enrich your farm. For that reason, I have no hesitation in supporting this motion to put corn on the free list, even though it should have the effect of somewhat reducing the cash value of that article in my own county. But I do not believe it would reduce it to any appreciable extent, and even if it did, I would vote for the motion, as it is better for our farmers to turn the corn into meat than to sell it direct. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said the admission of corn free would reduce the prices of other coarse grain. Oats and peas are the only other coarse grains, which would be affected thereby. I do not see any quotation of peas in to-day's *Empire*, but I find that there is only 2 cents or 3 cents difference in the price of oats between Buffalo and Toronto, and that represents the freight between the two points. There is no reason to suppose there would be any considerable difference in the price of oats, for, after all, corn and oats do not come into opposition to anything like the extent some people imagine. A bushel of corn is of greater value for feeding purposes than two of oats, and is used for purposes for which oats are not used at all. There is, therefore, not much danger of competition between the two. For all these reasons, I have great pleasure in supporting the original motion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to remove this scandalous injustice from the Statute-book. I would also support it with the addition proposed by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher); and even if the addition proposed by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) were added to it, I would support it even more heartily for the sake of the people in the Eastern Provinces who would benefit thereby.

Mr. GIGAULT. The majority of the members of this House and the electors of Canada consider that the protective tariff has had a beneficial effect upon the country. I am of that opinion, and I believe that if we are to retain the protective tariff, it must be general and be applicable to all agricultural produce competing with our own Canadian agricultural produce. We must not deal with this question from a provincial standpoint, but in dealing with it we must try to promote the general interests of the country. For that reason, I was sorry to see the hon. member for Shelburne, (Gen. Laurie), take the stand he did. We have no coal mines in the Province of Quebec. Would that be a reason for us to oppose a policy which develops the coal mines of Nova Scotia? We do not produce in the Province of Quebec enough wheat for our own con-

sumption. Would that be a reason for us to oppose a duty upon foreign wheat? Certainly not. So I believe that the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), if he is favorable to the maintenance of the protective tariff, is wrong in attempting to remove the duty upon foreign corn. The duty upon foreign corn is beneficial to the farmers of Canada. It is not only my opinion I express here, but I express also the opinion of some Liberal members of this House, because in 1878 they made a motion in this House to impose a duty upon foreign corn and oats. On the 9th April, 1878, Mr. Béchard moved in amendment:

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that a large quantity of corn and oats having been imported into Canada within the last few years, this House is of opinion that the interests of Canadian farmers would be promoted by the imposition of a duty upon the importation of those products."

There was a division upon that motion, and, among the members who voted for it, I see the names of Messrs. Barthe, Béchard, Bourassa, Coupal, and some other members. The member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), in making his motion, made a speech and a good one. He said that the Canadian manufacturers were protected, but that unfortunately the Canadian farmers were not protected, and for that reason he wanted to have a duty imposed on foreign corn and oats. Well, I am of the same opinion as the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). I believe in a protective tariff which protects not only the Canadian manufacturers but also the Canadian farmers, and I believe that the imposition of a duty on foreign corn is very beneficial to the Canadian farmers. The free traders resort to some queer reasoning in opposing the protective tariff. They say that the duty on wheat has not the effect of raising the price of wheat. They say we raise more wheat than we can consume, and therefore the imposition of a duty on foreign wheat is completely useless. On the other hand, they say that the imposition of a duty on corn is useless and is detrimental to the interests of the country because we do not produce enough corn for our own consumption. Sometimes, when they oppose the National Policy, they do not want us to favor the development of manufactures for which we have not the raw material, such as cotton manufactures, and yet not a long time ago, when we wanted to favor the development of industries for which we had the raw materials, they said that the imposition of a duty upon foreign artificial fertilisers was useless and that they were not in favor of such a policy. I need not add any more, but, like the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), I say that the existence of a duty on foreign corn is of a nature to favor the interests of this country.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the motions before the House are concerned, there is no member here who cannot vote for one or the other. Hon. gentlemen who are in favor of placing the farmer in the same position as the distiller in regard to this matter, can vote for the motion of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Those gentlemen from the Lower Provinces who think that corn should be admitted into this country as a raw material will have the opportunity of voting squarely on the question, and they cannot shirk the vote; while those who think that cornmeal as well as corn should be brought into Canada free of duty have also the opportunity to vote in favor of their view. During this discussion it was mentioned that the election of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) was a condemnation of the policy of the Government, and the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), whom, if any gentleman on this side of the House is to represent that county in this Parliament, I am as glad to see here as anyone, felt it to be his duty to inform the House that his election was an approval of the policy of the Government. There happens to be a newspaper published in his section—they are an intelligent lot of people there—and that paper is pub-

lished in the interests of the Conservative party, and I find that after the hon. gentleman's election the paper came out approving of that election, and I find that the mottoes—because they erected arches in that county in honor of the hon. gentleman's election—were such as these: "Sir John A. Macdonald," "General Laurie," "The Farmers' and Fishermen's Verdict," "Unrestricted Reciprocity."

Gen. LAURIE. It was: "Unrestricted Reciprocity Condemned."

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that was the motto?

Gen. LAURIE. I distinctly say so, as an eye-witness.

Mr. LISTER. I quoted from the issue of the 26th October, 1888.

Gen. LAURIE. If the hon. gentleman looks at the same paper three issues later, he will find that was corrected. That paper is not printed in my county. The hon. gentleman is entirely incorrect.

Mr. LISTER. It does not matter where it was published. It was printed in the hon. gentleman's Province, and I have no doubt that in that election he was, as he has avowed himself over and over again to be, a free trader, that he was as much in favor of unrestricted reciprocity as the man who was opposing him; and three days afterwards it is all very well for him to say that this was a mistake. To-day he is in favor of free corn, and to-day he will have the right to vote against the Government, and let him see that he does not shirk it. That hon. gentleman, that warrior, is too honest to deceive the electors of that county. Surely he would not tell them that he was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, when in his soul he was opposed to it, and yet that is what he wants us to understand to-day. I am not going into an argument as to the whole trade policy of the Government. This motion is only for the purpose of placing the farmers on the same ground as the manufacturers and others who are allowed to obtain their raw material free of duty. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Corby) should not have any objection to this motion, because a very small portion of the whiskey manufactured in this country is exported; but I was surprised to hear the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson)—that staid and logical gentleman—argue as he did. I hope in the discussion of his cases he brings more logic to bear than he brought here in regard to this matter, when he told the members of this House, and told the country, that the laborers, and the farmers, and the consumers of Canada pay no duty, because they wear garments which are manufactured in this country and because these garments are made from wool raised in this country. Does he not know that for every dollar received by the Government upon goods brought into Canada, \$3 are paid into the hands of the manufacturers of Canada? Does he not know it to be a well accepted fact when the duty is placed upon a commodity manufactured in this country, the effect of that duty is to bring the price up equal, or nearly equal, to the cost of the manufacture, plus the duty, and that the consumers of the country have to pay that? Does he not know that natural competition does not come to bear in the sale of these goods, because, in a small country like ours, the manufacturers are able to combine for the purpose of keeping up the prices, so far as the consumers of the country are concerned? He says that the duty does not keep the price itself up. If it does not keep it up, if it is not obviously keeping up the price, why is it that the duties are imposed and the tariff becomes a tax on every man that eats, drinks, or wears anything? Every man that buys any commodity protected by that tax contributes to the

revenue of the country, and is taxed to the extent of the impost by the Government. So when he tells the people, and the members of this House, and when he tells the country that the effect of the duty is not to raise the price, he states what is manifestly not the case. Sir, the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) has introduced a Bill for the suppression or regulation of combines. Why is it needed? Because the manufacturers of the country, highly protected as they are, form combines for the purpose of extorting from the people of the country all they can, and he has introduced an Act making these things illegal, in order that there may be a fair competition, so far as the manufacturers are concerned. Everybody knows that is the case, everybody knows that these are the facts, and they are so plain and so clear that it is impossible to controvert or to contradict them. The people of the country are taxed, and they are praying those taxes to the manufacturers of the country. It is not only the man who wears imported clothing, but it is every man who wears anything that is manufactured in the country, or who uses anything that is manufactured in the country, that is taxed; that man pays the duty as well as the man who buys a foreign article, the only difference being that the man who uses the home-made article pays the duties into the pocket of the manufacturer instead into the public treasury. Now, Sir, these are merely side issues of this question. The only point here, as I stated before, is whether the farmer should be placed upon an equal footing with the rest of the community, or whether they should be placed in a position of unfairness, having their interests prejudiced. Sir, so far as I am concerned I am prepared to support the motion and the amendment.

Gen. LAURIE. My hon. friend from Lambton read an extract from a newspaper of which he vouches for the accuracy. Now, I am a little surprised to find that my hon. friend assumes that I defended unrestricted reciprocity. He must surely be a little puzzled when he finds that the name of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and mine were associated with unrestricted reciprocity, as being supporters of it. I think, at any rate, it could hardly be said that the electors of Shelburne discovered that the First Minister was a supporter of that policy. At the same time, I wish distinctly to state that this question was the principal issue raised at that election between my opponent and myself, it was the question of all others that was placed before the electors. My opponent was supported by the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia, who, over and over again, advocated unrestricted reciprocity. I asked him what he meant by it, and the only answer that I could obtain from him was that he meant unrestricted reciprocity, and he supposed that was an answer. Now, Sir, I challenged the question. We met on that issue, and I am here; and I say that is the distinct answer of the electors of Shelburne to the question whether they approved it or not.

Mr. LISTER. Thirty-five majority—that is not much to brag about.

Gen. LAURIE. Quite enough for all practical purposes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As this is a very important question affecting the interests of the people in the county that I have the honor to represent, I am sure the House will bear with me for a few moments while I defend the position that I intend to take upon this question. Looking at it upon its face, I do not see how any hon. gentleman can object to the proposition made by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that is, that whereas the distillers are allowed a rebate upon corn imported for the manufacture of spirits for export, it is only right and fair that the farmers should be placed in the same position. Now I take this ground, that

Mr. LISTER.

if the first proposition is a good one, if the first proposition is right, there certainly ought not to be any objection to placing the farmers upon the same footing. If it comes to a question of granting favors to any particular class, I think there can be no doubt whatever that the favors should be granted to the larger number, and to those who are doing the most good to the country; and there can be no question, looking at it in that light, that the farmers should have the favors if there are any to be granted. But not only should they have those favors on that ground, but also because they employ a larger amount of labor, they give employment to a far greater number of men than the distillers, and if any favors are to be granted at all they should certainly go to those who are doing the most good to the country. Now there is another thing. The farmers, as has been stated before, are a class of manufacturers, and if the object of this motion is to facilitate the manufacture of wheat for instance, for the home market, there ought to be no impediment and no obstruction of any kind put in the way of the prosecution of that laudable enterprise, but it should be encouraged by all the means that we can bring to bear upon it. But while I take this ground, I also contend that it is a great injustice to the farmers of this country that the distillers should be allowed to import their corn free. I say it is a crying shame that a class of people that are making such large profits as the distillers of this country—for I venture the assertion that there is not single branch of industry, there is no large manufacture that can be engaged in, that will return such large dividends as the manufacture of spirits—therefore, I say, it is wrong for the Government of this country especially to favor that particular class of individuals. I also take the ground that it is wrong because it is lowering the price of corn that is raised by the farmers of this country. There is no question in my mind that the imposition of the duty upon corn does increase the price to the farmers of this country. I think there can be no question whatever about that, when we look at the quantity of corn imported and exported in this country we find that the quantity of corn raised in the Province of Ontario averaged for the last five years, about 5,630,000 bushels, and we have also entered for home consumption, in the year 1888, no less than 2,311,000 bushels. I take this ground, that if we do not raise sufficient for our home consumption any duty you place upon an article will necessarily enhance the value of it, and so far as our farmers are concerned the price of corn is enhanced by the duty. I further take the ground that this is the only cereal there is the price of which is enhanced thereby. I have no hesitation in saying that the amount of duty placed upon wheat does not enhance the value of it to the farmers. Last year the imports of wheat for home consumption were 32,042 bushels, whilst we exported of wheat no less than 2,164,000 bushels. I question very much whether there is any hon. gentleman who will say that when we have 2,160,069 bushels more than we require, the placing of a duty upon the small quantity imported has any effect in raising the value thereof. It has been stated that the placing of the duty on oats increases the value thereof to our farmers. I do not think that statement can be substantiated. Why? Because we exported of oats last year no less than 566,000 bushels, while we imported only 10,422 bushels. It is, therefore, obvious that we had a larger quantity of oats than we required and consequently the prices we obtained for what we exported in all cases would regulate the price of the home product. Then again, it has been stated that the duty on peas increased the value thereof to the farmers. I differ with that statement, because I find in the Trade and Navigation Returns that last year we imported 7,660 bushels, while we exported no less than 2,166,000 bushels. So there again we had a large quantity to export and the same argument will stand there, that the price we receive

for our surplus is what regulates the price of the whole. Then again, it has been stated that our farmers are protected by the duty upon wool. I say the present wool duty is one directly opposed to the farmers of this country. We raise a certain grade of wool in Canada. We exported last year of wool no less than 954,006 pounds, but there is a duty on the particular grade of wool grown here of 3 cents per pound on all coming into the country. The fact is we do not import any of that particular wool; to be precise, we imported 508 pounds, on which a duty was collected of \$15.25. At the same time we imported of the finer grades of wool no less than 8,398,000 pounds. If the Government want to protect the interests of the farmer, and encourage the wool and sheep growing interests of this country, they would not allow these finer grades to come in free, but they would place a duty on all wool imported and thereby raise the value of the product grown in this country, thus giving a better price to our farmers. In regard to the amendment, I repeat that the only cereal raised in Canada to-day in regard to which the farmers are benefited by the duty imposed is corn, and as the county I represent is largely interested in the raising of corn I feel it would be against the interests of my constituents that I should vote for the abolition of that duty. I find that the quantity of corn raised in the County of Kent averaged for the last three years nearly 1,000,000 bushels. I am glad to say that, owing to the good weather last year, the crop has been very largely increased, and this year I think the quantity will reach about 1,500,000 bushels. This being the only article in regard to which farmers are benefited by the National Policy, I think it would be wrong on my part to vote for the abolition of that duty. If the Government will free all the articles, if they will place the farmers on an equal footing with other classes, if they will remove the duties from tools, implements, household goods and the articles used by our farmers and which they must necessarily buy, then I say they would be able to paddle their own canoe and compete in the markets with our neighbors to the south or with the people of any country. I consider it to be my duty, notwithstanding the fact that my friends and hon. gentlemen I very highly respect have seen fit to take another course, to support the original motion and retain the duty on corn coming into Canada and also on cornmeal. Cornmeal is a business in which the millers of Canada are some what largely interested. If you want to encourage them you must maintain the duty, and, therefore, for the reasons I have stated I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I did not expect to take part in this debate, but as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) has referred to a motion I had the honor to submit to Parliament in 1878, I desire to say a few words in explanation. When I made that motion I was satisfied that I was doing right, and I have no reason to regret it. I believe to-day that if my motion had been adopted and duties generally imposed on the importation of cereals in this country, the elections of 1878 would have resulted otherwise than they did. When I made that motion I did not intend that it should be made part of a great protective system to be adopted in this country. It was confined to the interests of farmers. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) says to-day that we must not touch that duty on corn because it is part of a large protective system which has been adopted by the Parliament of this country. If the hon. gentleman will look at the fact that distillers import corn free of duty, or that the duty they pay is refunded to them, which is equivalent to paying no duty, he will find, I think, that the great system of protection for which he has so much admiration has been greatly encroached upon by his own friends. I thought in 1878 that the manufacturers of this country were sufficiently protected for the development of their

industries, and I think so still. I am ready to stick to the policy, advocated then, of imposing a duty upon the importation of corn, provided that policy is applied to all classes in Canada; but I find that the duties imposed upon the importation of corn apply to farmers and other classes, except those who manufacture whiskey. If it is found justifiable to give a rebate to the manufacturer of whiskey who imports corn, it is equally justifiable to refund it to the farmers who are the most important body in this country. Therefore I am prepared in this case to support the motion which is made in accordance with the proposition of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landarkin), if the policy of refunding the duty on imported grain to the distillers is maintained. I have one word more to say. Times change. In 1878 there was no talk of reciprocity with the United States; to-day a good deal is said about it, and I have reason to believe that the people of this country will yet pronounce themselves in favor of reciprocity with the States. I am in favor of such a policy, because I think there is nothing which would so promote the interests of all classes in Canada as reciprocity or free trade with the United States, and the adoption of a liberal policy towards that great country would, I think, be the best way to induce them to establish free commercial intercourse with Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a good deal of attention to this debate, because the question involved in it is one that for years past I have annually brought before this House, either in the shape of a motion or by referring to it when the Estimates were up and we were discussing the duties which were to be applied. Sir, in the matter of cornmeal which, before the duty was put on, formed a very large element in the food of the people of the county from which I come, I feel that the imposition of a duty upon that article—which, as the member for South Grey (Mr. Landarkin) admits, is not raised in this country—was imposing a tax on the people of my county, which it was unjust and unfair to apply to the food of the people. In discussing this question on the many former occasions on which it became my duty to bring it before this House, I commented on it at greater length than I shall do to-day. I am not going at this hour of the evening to enter largely into the discussion, because the question has been amply and fully treated of by gentlemen who understand the bearing of it, quite as well as I do myself. I have risen on this occasion merely to reply to some of the remarks of the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) when he spoke of the compensation which the Maritime Provinces received for the imposition of the duty upon the food of the people of those Provinces. When the hon. gentleman made the statement that the people of the Maritime Provinces received full compensation for the imposition of those duties which protected the farmers of Ontario, I rose to ask the hon. gentleman would he please enumerate in what particular the Maritime Provinces derived any special benefit not derived by the other portions of the Dominion of Canada? but I was met with quite a number of voices calling "order, order," and I was prevented from getting a distinct reply from the hon. gentleman at the time. But later on he gave me an answer, and he enumerated three cases in which he said the people of the Maritime Provinces had a special benefit. He enumerated the duty on iron, he enumerated the duty on coal, and the bounties that are given to our fishermen. Let me answer those in detail. I do not see the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) in his seat, but I will state to the House what the facts of the case are as far as the duty on iron is concerned. He says that in Nova Scotia the iron and coal lie close together and that great industries will be developed which will give vast employment to the people. I challenge the gentlemen on the other side of the House to point to a single new development of the iron and coal industry which



the National Policy has created in Nova Scotia I do not think they can enumerate one, yet when some Sessions ago these heavy duties on iron were imposed we were told about the villages which were going to crop up through the Province, about the number of hands it would give employment to, about the population which would flow into us and about the capital that would come from abroad to establish that industry in the Province. I repeat again that I do not know a single one of that class of industries which has been established in the great Province of Nova Scotia by reason of this policy. I frankly admit that in Nova Scotia iron and coal lie close together, and I freely admit capital ought, on account of the close relationship of those two elements, flow into the country and a flourishing industry ought to be the result, but that result has not taken place. I think we might very well find a reason for that in the fact that our small community of five millions of people are unable to find consumption for the large outlay which would be necessary to carry on that industry and to compete with the manufacturers of other countries where they manufacture on so much a larger scale that all the facilities which exist in Nova Scotia are counterbalanced by the fact that the material can be transported from Liverpool or the Clyde, or the Bristol Channel, across the Atlantic for less money than we can carry it from Pictou to Montreal. Who asked for that heavy imposition of duty on iron which was applied some years ago? Were there petitions flowing from the people asking for this duty which levies a heavy tax on every farmer and every lumberman who requires the use of an axe, or sledge shoes or horse shoes to carry on his business, and which also imposes a tax on the fisherman who requires the iron and the nails in the construction of the boats with which he floats over the seas in pursuit of his calling? Did these people ask for the imposition of this duty? No, Sir, it was conceived in the mind of a gentleman who had a great deal of influence in Nova Scotia, and who thought that it would be a capital idea with which to tickle the fancy of the people of that Province, and to induce them to support the Administration of which the right hon. gentleman is the head. Were there petitions from the people to have that duty imposed upon coal? No, Sir, there were not, and I am not sure that there were petitions even from the coal owners. But I am satisfied that there were no petitions on the part of the general mass of the people of the Lower Provinces for the imposition of a duty on coal. I will tell the hon. gentleman from North Grey (Mr. Masson), that so far from the imposition of that duty on coal being a benefit to the people of the Maritime Provinces, it has been a positive tax on every household in those Provinces that uses coal. Outside of Nova Scotia we have no coal in the Maritime Provinces; in neither Prince Edward Island nor New Brunswick is that industry carried on to such an extent as to make it a commercial pursuit. If any Province has benefited by the imposition of the duty, it is Nova Scotia, and my impression is that the operation of the duty is a tax even to the people of Nova Scotia. It is a benefit to the coal miners, no doubt, because it enables them to get that much more for their coal in the markets of Montreal and Quebec; but I do not think it can go much farther than Montreal, because beyond that point it begins to come into competition with American coal. But in every town and hamlet where there is a manufacturing industry in those Provinces, the fact of the imposition of a duty on foreign coal keeps up the cost of production and increases the price of coal to the people who consume it. I think I have dealt with the first two points in the argument of the hon. member for North Grey. Now, I wish to say a few words on his third point, which is, that the people of the Maritime Provinces received compensation for the duties they have had to pay on their food, in the fishery bounties which were given to them. Is my hon. friend so ignorant of that

Mr. MITCHELL,

transaction as not to know that the money which went into those fishery bounties did not come out of the revenues to which Ontario contributes. It is a portion of the money which the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, as well as Newfoundland, claimed they were entitled to; and Newfoundland received directly a million dollars as her share alone of the compensation which was due for the fisheries having been opened to the American people. Does any man pretend to say, then, that that payment should be considered as an offset for the duties they have to pay on the food they consume? That money was paid by a foreign country, and our fishermen got only a small portion of what they were entitled to. Now the people of my county are not a manufacturing people. They are a hard working, industrious people, composed chiefly of fishermen, lumbermen and farmers, a great many of whom do a little lumbering and farming together and others a little fishing and farming together. There is scarcely a manufacturing industry in the county, beyond one or two very trifling ones, and I say it is unfair of the Government to initiate a policy, and maintain and carry out a policy, which imposes on those people, a great many very poor people, the necessity of paying a tax upon the cheap food they used, and the importation of which has been stopped. I could quite understand that if this were a corn-growing country, we might have a duty imposed on corn; but when there is no corn grown in the country to any extent—for the corn grown in the county of my hon. friend behind me is chiefly consumed in that district, and cannot come into competition with the corn imported—the duty is of no benefit to anybody. The hon. and gallant member for Shelburne referred to the statements read by the hon. gentleman in my eye. He said it could scarcely be possible that Sir John Macdonald and himself could be coupled together as being in favor of reciprocal trade. He pointed to Sir John Macdonald as a man who was opposed to it. Sir, Sir John Macdonald is an opportunist. He knows that when he started the theory of a protective policy, he openly stated over and over again that he did it for the express purpose of using it as a lever to force the Americans into free trade or reciprocal trade. Over and over again that was stated by him, not only in Ontario and Quebec, but by a resolution in this House. Sir, do you suppose that I with my free trade notions would ever have consented to go on and impose duties as they have been imposed under that policy? One of his statements was that a maximum of 25 per cent. would be levied; and when I was led into supporting that policy, I was led to believe that no duty would be imposed on the food of the people at any rate. Sir, I suffered from that; I lost my election in 1878 for supporting the National Policy, and from that time to this I have never ceased, as many here know, in my endeavors to induce the Government to remove what I believed to be a gross outrage on the people of the Eastern Provinces. This discussion has taken a very wide range, but I felt that I would not have been doing my duty if I had not taken some part in it. I did not expect it would take this shape, and I was not prepared for it, for I intended, and may still take an opportunity, to deal with this question on going into Supply, if it were not taken up by some other gentleman. Sir, I do not think any one will say that what is now called the National Policy at all resembles the thing that was propounded when the right hon. gentleman was lecturing throughout the country in 1878. Did any man then dream that there would have been an average duty of 45 per cent. on iron, one of the articles most necessary in this civilised age? Did any man ever contemplate that the farmers of the country would have to pay 35 per cent. on their implements, 35 per cent. on their cotton goods, that vast fortunes would have been made by the refiners of this country, and that the people would have

to pay twice as much for their sugar as it can be bought for in Liverpool or London? No, Sir; no man imagined anything of that kind. If anything of that kind had been imagined, there is one man who would not have supported a man who attempted to get into power by such false pretences. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but I want to reiterate the arguments I have before used on the floor of this House in regard to this matter, for a great many members of this Parliament are new men and young men, who may not have heard the matter put forward so fully before, not merely by myself, but by other hon. gentlemen as well. I ask hon. gentlemen who are listening to me to take the matter home to themselves and place themselves in my position. I would ask them if they represented, as I do, a county composed of an industrious people who have no facilities for manufacturing and are mainly consumers, would they like to see the taxes on everything these people eat and use or wear grow from year to year until in some cases, as I have been informed by a respectable wholesale merchant, a man of truth and reliability, they have reached 125 per cent. on certain classes of goods imported and not manufactured here. If the Government are going to let cotton in free, which is a raw material and not grown in this country, why not let corn in free, which is also a raw material and not grown in the country? If they are going to give rebates to the distillers, why not give the farmer a rebate on the raw material with which he feeds his cattle for exportation? If they want to protect the farmers, let them do it, but do not let them deceive the farmers in this House and in the country.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) contended before recess that no good results had come to the iron trade from the tariff imposed by this House, but that the iron industry had languished—

Mr. MITCHELL. What I said was that no new iron industry had been developed and no new coal mine had been opened since the increased duties were put on under the National Policy.

Mr. BROWN. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman, but at all events I challenge his statement even as he now puts it. The whole drift of the hon. gentleman's speech was to prove that the iron tariff was a failure. I am not going to refer to his remarks respecting the coal industry, as that subject will be referred to by those who are more competent to speak concerning it; but in addressing this House on the progress made in the iron industry under the tariff I know of what I am speaking and can substantiate by facts what I say. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite, in their caucuses, to lay their heads together and seek to discover some side wind by means of which they can attack the National Policy and make literature which they think will pass current with the people. But they have been attempting to pass for silver money of brass in this country during the last twenty years, and the people have too well discovered the worthlessness of their coin to be deceived by these issues which they raise after a good deal of sitting and hatching. On three great occasions the people have ratified the National Policy in a most unmistakable manner, and are not going to be shaken in their faith by any side issues which hon. gentlemen opposite may bring up, they have nailed their spurious coin to the counter. The hon. gentleman sought to convey to this House that the iron tariff had been a failure. When this subject of the tariff was before us, I ventured to make a prediction, and I then read the views of those engaged in the iron industry in the western part of our country as to

the effect which would result if the iron tariff were placed in the position in which it now is, namely, that it would greatly stimulate the efforts and the energy of those engaged in that trade and increase the output immensely. Those predictions and views have been fulfilled, and when the hon. gentleman says that the iron industries of Canada have languished I want to tell him—

Mr. MITCHELL. I never said that.

Mr. BROWN. It is the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite to torture language and to torture facts, and to allow the public to draw their own inferences from these distorted statements. But so long as I occupy a seat in this House I will never allow an opportunity to pass, when I see endeavors made to convey false impressions to the people, without rising in my seat to denounce such endeavors. In Hamilton, perhaps the city in which there are more iron manufacturers than anywhere else in Canada, we have rolling mills, iron pipe foundry, forge works, bridge works, besides other iron industries, and I am prepared to state that in every case these companies have very largely increased their capacity, and in some cases have actually doubled their capacity since the introduction of the iron tariff in 1887, are all fully employed and have orders ahead.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman persist in misrepresenting me? I do not think he would like to do it willingly, and I will set him right again. The remarks I made about the coal and iron industry were in reply to the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), who stated that the lower Provinces had got compensation for any duties on corn and provisions by the fact that they had received protection upon their coal and iron mines, and I simply dealt with those two questions. I never dealt with the question of whether under protection the manufacture of pipes or of re-rolling old iron had increased and developed or not.

Mr. BROWN. All right; the hon. gentleman attacked the policy and declared there had been no results. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman who will follow me in the defence of their position in the Maritime Provinces will show to the hon. gentleman exactly how they stand in regard to the remarks he has made as far as those Provinces are concerned, inasmuch as the iron question was touched and the idea conveyed to the House that the iron tariff has not been productive of any good. I wish to say to the House that seven of the firms engaged in the iron industry in Canada, which has been developed and brought to a state of great vitality by the iron tariff, have \$3,000,000 of money invested in their business and give employment to 2,500 operatives, who work full time. When that tariff was passed these men felt they had to battle against one serious element. The Government allowed the importation of iron for a number of months, and the importers brought large supplies from England. These men had, therefore, to fight against these large importations. Now, however, these importations have been exhausted, and the mills are supplying the country with iron from Halifax to Vancouver—not only with good iron, but, notwithstanding the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite that the people would be taxed and ground to death under this tariff, they are supplied with iron at less money than it can be imported for. I have a letter in my hand from the Ontario Rolling Mills, of Hamilton, in which they say:

"We are now selling iron to large importers at considerably lower prices than they could import for, and are giving them entire satisfaction, which feeling is often expressed to us by some who were the most rabid at the time the tariff change was made on iron and steel."

The predictions of hon. gentlemen on this side have all come true. We stated that proper protection to native industries would not raise the prices to the consumer, but that the competition among those industries would result

in lowering the prices. Why, in this article of iron we are able to supply the people with as good and perhaps better iron at a lower price than it could be imported at. Statements have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the prices which the people have to pay in consequence of the high tariff under the National Policy. I do not propose to enter into that subject at all. It has been threshed out over and over again in this House. It has been threshed out before the people, and the people have given their decision in a manner unmistakable to hon. gentlemen opposite. These hon. gentlemen may try as hard as they like by side issues to counteract this decision, but until they change their policy so as to suit the views of the people, they will remain in the cold shades of opposition for many a long year. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any length on this subject of corn, but, as an outside observer and one not very conversant with the subject, I may say that it occurs to me that any proposition for the admission of corn into this country in the way hon. gentlemen are advocating would very materially injure the interests of the farmer. What is the fact to-day? Western corn can be laid down in Canada for 46 cents a bushel of 56 pounds, paying a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel. Peas can be laid down for 54 cents a bushel of 60 pounds, and oats for 23 cents to 30 cents a bushel of 34 pounds. Is it not transparent that, if the duty were taken off this article of corn, the price of peas and oats would relatively fall, and would not that be an injury to the farmer? The low price of corn, moreover, affects the interests of barley, and that is a very important matter for Canadians to consider. By some recent discovery in the United States, they are making a proportion of corn with a proportion of barley, and are so affecting the price. A reduction in the price of corn would seriously affect the interest of the farmers in respect to their other coarse grains. I would like to hear from the members who represent such counties as Kent and Essex, what they have to say as to the admission of corn free into this country. A great deal has been talked in reference to this corn question, and I am sorry to see that there crops up now and then a certain amount of provincialism. I am happy to believe that this House is being educated to a higher view than provincialism, and takes the view that we have to regard the whole Dominion and not any particular section. No man is fit for a seat in this House who seeks to confine his views to the narrow confines of the part from which he comes. We should legislate for the whole Dominion, and I feel that I am as much representing Vancouver or Halifax as the city of Hamilton. That is the spirit which ought to animate all the members in this House. What affects the one should affect the whole. That is the broad view which we should take, and we should not legislate from any narrow or selfish standpoint. I only rose to establish the view that our industries have prospered under the tariff of 1887, and I have on my desk before me the testimonies of men engaged in all these industries that this policy will be capable of greater development so that it will be able to meet the demands of the whole country no matter how great the trade may be, and to develop the iron industries of the country and keep the labor within our own borders. We have now the proud satisfaction of knowing that iron and steel for our wants are now produced in this country, and I hope the day is soon coming when every steel rail required on a Canadian railway will be manufactured in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am pleased that my hon. friend has given me an opportunity, legally and properly, without my being called to order, of replying to the extraordinary speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown). He opened by saying he was going to refute the statement and the misrepresentations made by the member for North-

Mr. BROWN.

berland, and he went on to speak of certain misrepresentations hatched in caucus—I suppose he meant by myself. Let me tell him that I have never attended a caucus since I attended the one in 1873, when I refused to vote for the election of Sir John Macdonald as our leader two days after we fell. Since then I have not attended a caucus on one side or the other. That should relieve his mind of the idea that I have been hatching anything in caucus. What is the general effect of the speech of the hon. gentleman? He has created a figure of straw to battle with and to knock it down. He has put words in my mouth which I never uttered. He has answered statements which he says I made which I never made. His whole speech was a tissue of answers to what I must call misrepresentations of what I did say. What I said I will repeat, and I say that every statement I made before recess on this subject was founded upon facts, and the expressions that I gave utterance to were the honest convictions of my mind. What I did say in relation to the iron and coal industries of this country—and what I said had reference alone to those—was in answer to my hon. friend the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), who stated that he was speaking of the removal of the duty on corn and cornmeal which was sought for by the Maritime Provinces. He stated that the Maritime Provinces had no reason to complain, that they had received compensation by the duties which were put on coal, by the duties put on iron, and by the bounties that were given for the fish they caught. I answered the hon. member for North Grey, and, while I admired the force and vigor of the hon. gentleman's speech, I felt that, when he referred to these compensations, he was speaking of a subject he did not quite understand, and I want him to understand it now. I took up first the question of bounties. I said that the bounties which were given to the Maritime Provinces, as he ought to know if he does not, were given as compensation for the privileges which were taken from the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces when the Washington Treaty was made and the American fishermen were allowed to come in to compete on our fishing grounds. Is that any matter of compensation when we are entering into another question of a great and gross grievance which exists in regard to which our people are unfairly taxed? No; the money which was granted by the arbitrators at Halifax was the money of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and the proportion of it which they received was nothing like what they were entitled to. It is enough to prove what I said on that subject to point out that of the total amount of \$5,500,000 which was awarded, \$1,000,000 was granted to Newfoundland for giving up her fishing rights. The balance came to Canada, but the Maritime Provinces claimed that it was their money, and should be spent among the fishermen there whose business had been greatly reduced by the facilities afforded to the Americans to come and compete with them. The amount which was voted by way of bounty was given as the just right of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, and I have never recognised and never will recognise that that is to be put against any class of duties which have been unjustly imposed upon them, because they received those bounties from money which was their own. I come next to the statements, or rather the misstatements made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown). He has taken me to task, and has put words in my mouth which I never uttered. He said he would prove that the iron industry is flourishing. I never expressed an opinion, whether it was flourishing or not. What I said, and what I repeat is that, since the imposition of the duties under the National Policy, not a single new iron industry, or a new coal mine had been opened or developed in the Maritime Provinces, that, as far as my own Province is concerned, we have no iron industries or coal mines, and the same is true, in regard to Prince Edward Island, and that

if any benefit was derived, it was a benefit derived by the Province of Nova Scotia. Then, Sir, I said: What benefit was derived by the Province of Nova Scotia from any additional stimulus that was given to the coal mines? I said, and I repeat it now, that if there were any benefits derived from the bounty upon coal given in Nova Scotia, it was a benefit and an advantage to the coal owners, the coal proprietors, the monopolists in coal, and not to the masses of the people at large. That was my contention. I say the same thing about iron. There has been throughout Canada no new development of smelting works at all. The only one I know of existing is that in Londonderry, and I would ask: Is it for that single institution that this whole 5,000,000 of people, that all this Canada is to be taxed from 40 to 45 per cent. on an average for the purpose of building up one mammoth industry and making millionaires of the men in connection with that industry? These were the contentions that I made, and I defy my hon. friend, I defy any one on that side of the House to refute the propositions I have made. I do not wish to have either the iron men or the coal men get up and put words into my mouth that I did not utter. I never said for a moment that the imposition of these duties upon coal coming into the country had not benefited somebody. Who is it? It is the coal owners, the owners of the mines, those dozen men, or dozen proprietors, who own, probably, a dozen mines throughout Nova Scotia—they get the benefit. Does the people of Nova Scotia at large get the benefit? No; I will be told they give advantages to the workingmen who work in the mines. True, they do. I have no doubt that, to that extent, it benefits a few people in Nova Scotia, but does it benefit the people of Nova Scotia at large? Does it benefit New Brunswick? Is it any benefit to Prince Edward Island? These are the three Maritime Provinces to which my hon. friend referred. I say no, and so far from benefiting them, the effect is exactly the contrary. Every ton of coal that is used by every workingman, by every citizen in those Maritime Provinces outside the immediate range of the coal slides, is a tax upon the people who have to consume it and use it. I think that ought to be an answer to my hon. friend. I say the same thing about the iron men. My hon. friend quotes letters from Hamilton. Since I came into this chamber to-night I received a letter which I have in my pocket; unfortunately it is marked private; it is the opinion of an iron man as to the effect of this National Policy. He says it is a ruin to the trade, and will be a ruin to the country. Sir, I do not doubt that my hon. friend can get sheaves of letters from these protected men from the city of Hamilton from which he comes, and which he represents so well—because I think he does represent them well when he makes such bold, bare-faced statements as he has made, putting words in my mouth that I never uttered, and drawing conclusions from my remarks which they will not bear, and creating an impression in this House and among this audience that I have made statements that are not warranted by the facts, and which he has attempted to refute. Does any man doubt that the industries in Hamilton have been increased? I know they have, I admit it. But how have they been increased? At the expense of the people of the country, at the expense of every farmer in the country who requires iron in the prosecution of his business—for his ploughs, his harrows, his cart-wheels, for the nails when he builds a stable. Does any man doubt but that the great nail-makers, both in Montreal and Hamilton, and in other cities, have been benefited? Yes; and how have the people suffered by paying additional prices for what they required to use. That is the way the thing works, that is the benefit to which my hon. friend refers as resulting from the National Policy—this national curse, I call it. Sir, does my hon. friend want any more information about it? Let him get it before he gets up to answer

the member for Northumberland, trying to repeat statements of mine which I did not make, to put words into my mouth which I did not utter, and endeavoring to draw conclusions which the facts and the statements would not warrant. While I am on my feet I may say a word about the National Policy. I did not intend to speak again upon the subject, and would not have done so had I not been forced into it. Let me explain to the coal men, some of whom misunderstood my remarks. I explained to one of them privately, who discussed the matter with me since I spoke before recess, and I assured him that I did not say what they seemed to have understood me to say. They seemed to be under the impression that I stated that the imposition of half a dollar a ton on coal was no benefit to the coal industry of Nova Scotia. I never said that, I said it was no benefit to people at large, that the coal owners got the benefit of the additional imposition of 50 cents. I admit that; but are we to be taxed that in order that a few coal owners may get the benefit, and grow rich at the expense of the people at large, fattening themselves out of the sweat and industry of the people? I say no; that is not what the National Policy was imposed for. The National Policy, I repeat again—I am sorry that the Premier is not present to hear me—the National Policy, when it was put forward, was not to exceed the maximum of 25 per cent.; it was put forward as an argument to be used to force the Americans to give us reciprocity in trade, or free trade. That statement was made publicly not alone by the right hon. Premier throughout his travels in Ontario and Quebec, and elsewhere, but it was made on every platform by every orator who followed him, or was associated with him during those campaigns—it was put forward for that purpose. What is it to-day? It is a protective tariff. He has abandoned the National Policy, he has abandoned the name by which he used to call it, and he calls it by the honest name which it deserves, a high protective policy; and let us all understand that when we are dealing with it we are no longer dealing with the National Policy with which the hon. gentleman started out, and with which he inveigled the country into placing him in a position to enable him to impose higher duties than had existed before. That is the truth of the case, and I wish to say to my hon. friend that whenever he wishes to deal with my remarks I shall be only too glad to have him do so, and to be put right if I am in the wrong, for no man in this House is more ready to get up and own it when he is proved to be wrong; but do not let him make these statements about me, and do not let him draw conclusions that my language has not warranted.

Mr. McKEEN. I simply wish to reply to a statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and in doing so I have no desire whatever to misquote or misrepresent any assertion he has made. If I understood that hon. gentleman aright, he stated to this House that the duty on coal was no benefit to the Maritime Provinces, but was a positive tax on the Provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I do not wish to misquote the assertion made by the hon. gentleman, but that is the way I understood his remarks. Now, I think the hon. gentleman must have spoken without duly weighing the statements that he has made. No one who is cognisant with the progress that the coal industry has made since the inception of the National Policy, but must be aware of the great advance made by that industry during those years. What have we got, Sir? Take the 4 or 5 years previous to the National Policy, and you will find that our average sales of coal were some 700,000 tons at the outside. Since that time the business has advanced at the rate of about 50,000 tons per annum. In 1880 the output of our mines in Nova Scotia footed up the immense quantity of 1,600,000 tons. I am speaking from memory, and subject to correction, but I know

I am very near the mark in making these statements. Now, of the quantity that we mined last year I find that some 700,000 tons or thereabouts, came up into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. That coal came here under the protection of a duty of 60 cents per ton; there is no hon. gentleman who will deny that statement. Previous to 1878 our exports to Montreal and the St. Lawrence were under, if I mistake not, 80,000 tons and there has been an increase in the St. Lawrence trade of 62,000 tons per year since the inception of the National Policy. Will any hon. gentleman undertake to say in the face of these figures that the National Policy has done nothing to develop the coal industry of our country? Why, we have in Nova Scotia fourteen mines now in active operation. They are capable of supplying even much larger markets than those we possess. In reply to the statement that the duty of 60 cents per ton operates against the consumer or householder in New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, I can say that the competition existing in Nova Scotia between the mine owners is such as to keep down the price of coal. I venture to ask the hon. gentleman to make enquiries with regard to the subject, and he will find that during the last ten years householders in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have supplied themselves with fuel at lower rates than ever before. I am speaking from memory, but I know that at no time in the history of the coal trade has coal for domestic purposes been sold at lower rates than during the last ten years. The question is whether the coal trade to-day is of any benefit to Nova Scotia. These 700,000 tons enable you to carry on your works. The only outside market which the coal owners in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton possess, namely the St. Lawrence region and Newfoundland, is due entirely to the protection of 60 cents per ton. I think these statements will be borne out by the opinions of the largest coal consumers of Montreal. At the present time, on account of low rates of freight and a direct line opened to Pittsburg mines, foreign coal is offering at lower rates than ever before. I contend that it is necessary to our coal interests that we should have this protection. In regard to the statement that the duty has benefited only a few coal owners, such is not the case, for we have the fact that some 15,000 or 20,000 of men, women and children are dependent for existence upon this industry. So we must admit that the whole benefit is not going into the hands of a few monopolists and capitalists. Every one admits that no industry can be developed in any country giving employment to a large number of people which will not benefit the country by the amount of money disbursed and by the employment given to the people of the different districts. Take for instance the town of Springhill. It has grown within two years, I am told, from having a population of 300 or 400, to a population of 5,000 or 6,000. I am speaking from memory now. Can anyone dispute the fact that the protection afforded has not done good in distributing money and giving employment to our people? It is absurd for anyone to argue the contrary. The statement has been ventured here that this is a positive tax for the protection of coal owners. It will be admitted by every one that a revenue is necessary to carry on the business of the country, and, if such is the fact, I would like to ask why a revenue should not be paid on coal and iron as well as on other articles? This coal, if I understand the trade aright, is used not so much by householders in Montreal and in the St. Lawrence district as by the larger corporations. Is there any reason why those corporations should not contribute part of the revenue by the country affording protection on coal as well as on any other article? I have heard it contended, and I have heard it admitted even by free traders, that a duty on kerosene oil was right and proper, but yet that coal used for a similar purpose, namely, in the manufacture of gas, should not pay any duty. I do not see the force of the argument.

Mr. McKEEN.

I contend that protection for revenue purposes or any other purpose, which enables us to develop the coal industry, is right and just in the interests of all concerned. I did not intend to offer any extended remarks on this question. I take exception to the statement made by hon. gentlemen with regard to the coal trade, and I will be borne out in the statement by every member from Nova Scotia, that this protective duty has done much to develop the coal industry. I do not know any other industry that has advanced in like proportion since the inception of the duty. What other market is open to us than those of the St. Lawrence and the lower Provinces? We have no show in the American market. In the autumn of last year I failed to place a cargo of coal in Boston at \$2.30 per ton, duty paid. That will show the condition of the American market, which is from time to time held up to us as being for our advantage. It is impossible to obtain any foothold in that market, and, therefore, the only market open to us outside of the Dominion is Newfoundland. I contend that any attempt to remove this duty would be perpetrating a wrong on any industry that is doing a great deal to develop the resources of the country. As regards the iron industry, I think the strictures of the hon. gentleman opposite will be replied to by hon. gentlemen who are probably more conversant with the business than I am; but I may say that we believe that in due time the iron resources of our country will be largely developed through the protection now afforded to the iron industry. We must not, however, be too impatient—industries cannot spring up in a day. We know that in order to secure the proper development of the iron industry and to build smelting works time is required. I have it on the authority of a gentleman who has been working up an iron property in the County of Pictou, that in the course of a few years or less time there will be large smelting works established there. I hope the whole House and country will not only see that the protection is continued to the coal industry but that they will be heartily in accord in having that duty continued. As to the motion before the House, I am not acquainted with, and know little about corn or cornmeal; but I know this, speaking from a miner's standpoint, and every miner in the country would support me in that statement, that we would to-day rather pay a duty of \$1 per barrel on cornmeal than have the duty removed from coal.

Mr. CHARLTON. As the representative of one of the corn-growing counties in the country lying north of Lake Erie, I, perhaps, will be excused by the House if I say a few words in relation to the motion now before it. However, I crave permission at the outset to make a few remarks in reply to the observations of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) with respect to the coal duty. That hon. gentleman informed us that some 15,000 or 20,000 people derived their subsistence directly or indirectly from the business of mining coal in Nova Scotia. That business, I believe, is confined to three counties in that Province, and the duty designed to protect fifteen or twenty thousand people in three counties in Nova Scotia is made to bear with extreme severity upon many important manufacturing industries, and upon the interests of the general public in the Dominion at large. Our importations last year of coal amounted to 1,325,000 tons, the value of which was \$3,644,000, and upon the whole of this vast amount of coal imported a duty was exacted for the benefit of a portion of the population of three counties in one of the Provinces of this Dominion. Now, Sir, the imposition of that duty upon coal has a direct tendency to render unsatisfactory any attempts at engaging in iron manufacture in this country. Coal is a raw material, and from coal is produced the coke which it is necessary to use in the reduction of iron ore into pig iron; yet the Government by imposing a duty upon

coal and upon coke, a product of coal, used in the manufacture of iron, have almost if not entirely neutralised the protection it affords, by a duty upon pig iron and by bounties. I hold, Sir, that coal is a raw material, and that the imposition of a duty upon it bears unjustly upon the whole population of this Dominion who require to use coal as fuel, and with unjust and undue severity upon the iron interest and the other industries in this Dominion where coal is used either for the conversion of ores into metal or as fuel for propelling machinery. I repeat that I consider this an impolitic and an unjust tax. Now, Sir, with regard to the corn question on which I rose to say a few words. A good deal has been said to-night about the disastrous effects caused to the agricultural interests of this Dominion by the importation of corn free of duty, and about the necessity for the imposition of the duty in the interest of the farmer. I propose to go back to the period anterior to the imposition of duties upon corn, and to point out the effect upon the agricultural interests of the Dominion that the admission of free corn had in the year 1877. This was the year when the largest amount of corn was imported of any year in the history of the country, and a year when the effect of the importation of a large amount of corn on the agricultural interests of Canada may very fairly determine the question as to whether the importation of corn is a disaster to the farmer or whether it is not. I go back to the year 1877, because it is just anterior to the introduction of the National Policy. In the year 1877 we find that the net import of corn, after deducting cornmeal, was 5,176,000 bushels, and the average price was 51 cents a bushel. The importation of that corn enabled this country to sell the whole of the export of oats for that year amounting to 2,970,000 bushels which was equivalent in weight to 1,800,000 bushels of corn. Thus 1,800,000 bushels of corn filled the place that would have been filled by the entire export of oats and which would have to be retained in the country but for the importation of the corn. Then again 1,745,000 bushels of peas were exported that year, and that export was replaced with 1,870,000 bushels of corn, to fill the place that would otherwise have to be filled by the peas. The balance of the import of corn, amounting to 1,506,000 bushels, took the place of 1,736,000 bushels of barley that would have been required for food for stock or for other purposes had the corn not been imported. Had it not been for the importation of corn we would have had to use all the oats and peas we exported, and then we would have had to feed up 1,736,000 bushels of barley to fill the place that was taken by the corn we imported. The net result of this importation of grain is as follows:—We bought 1,800,000 bushels of corn at 51 cents a bushel, and sold 2,970,000 bushels of oats at 42 cents a bushel, leaving a difference in favor of the country of \$250,000. We bought 1,870,000 bushels of corn at 51 cents a bushel and sold 1,745,000 bushels of peas at 85 cents, leaving a difference in favor of the country of \$523,000. We bought 1,506,000 bushels of corn at 51 cents and exported 1,736,000 bushels of barley at 71 cents, leaving a difference in favor of the country of \$466,860. We imported 292,843 barrels of meal, at \$3 a barrel, and exported in its place a corresponding amount of flour at \$5.50 a barrel and the gain from this source was \$632,107, making a total gain in consequence of the importation of corn and the selling of the coarser grain, of which it took the place at a higher price, of \$1,873,000 in the year 1877. If you take from that sum the cost of the transportation of the grain from the port of entry to the points of distribution all over the country and the cost of transporting the coarse grain from the point where the grain was received to the frontier, and which I estimate at \$445,000, we find that the net gain to Canada in 1877 from the importation of corn was not less than \$1,438,000. The truth is that the importation of corn is an advantage to the farmers of this country, it is

only imported in large quantities because it can be brought in at a cheaper price than the coarse grain can be sold for. We have been told that the importation of corn depreciates the price of coarser grain, but the figures which I have given will contradict that assertion. Here was corn admitted at 51 cents a bushel, and during that year we find, from the Trade and Navigation Returns, that oats were worth 42 cents a bushel, barley 71 cents a bushel and peas 85 cents a bushel, and the difference that I have shown between the price paid for the corn imported and the price received for the grain exported of \$1,438,000. The farmer is not injured by the importation of corn for he is simply permitted to sell one kind of a coarser grain at a higher price and buy another at a lower price and make money by the transaction. He was permitted in the year 1877 to sell peas at 85 cents and buy corn at 51 cents. He was permitted to sell oats at 42 cents and buy corn in their place for 51 cents. He was permitted to sell 48 pounds for 71 cents, and buy 56 pounds for 51 cents. He was permitted in all those cases to make a large sum of money upon the transaction, and to trade oats or peas or barley for corn; and he or somebody else made nearly one million and a half dollars in 1877 because the trade in corn was wisely untrammelled by duties. To-day, at the present prices, if corn were admitted to Canada free of duty, with oats at 34 cents a bushel and corn at 40 cents per bushel (the price at which it can be laid down without duty in Toronto), there would be a gain of 12 cents on each bushel of corn exchanged. At the current rate there would be a gain for the exchange of peas for corn of 16 cents a bushel, and a gain of 24 cents a bushel on every bushel of corn exchanged for a bushel of barley. This, Mr. Speaker, is the state of the corn trade, and we see how much it is in the interest of the farmer to leave the importation of corn untrammelled by duty, for the farmer can sell his coarser grains at a high price, and buy corn at a lower price, and corn suits his purpose better as a food at the low prices. I do not know, Sir, that I have anything further to say in relation to this question, except this, that my experience is that the duty has had no effect whatever in raising the price of corn in the county in which I live or in any of the other counties of the corn producing belt; but the price of corn is actually lower now than the current rates that prevailed before the imposition of the duty. It has had no effect in raising the price when the farmers had a surplus to sell, although they do not raise it for the purpose of selling, but for fattening stock; but it has interfered with the privilege and right which the farmer formerly possessed of selling his oats, his peas and his barley at a higher price relatively than the corn cost him, and making large sums of money each year in the transaction of exchanging the one for the other.

Mr. HESSON. I do not propose troubling the House at any great length on this question which has been so thoroughly debated in years gone by. I had supposed that not only had the corn question been thoroughly threshed out, but every other question relative to the National Policy introduced in 1879. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have learned nothing from the past. They again attempt, though in another and I must confess a more dangerous way, by removing one brick at a time, to destroy, if possible, that noble structure which has been created for the advantage of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, this apparently very harmless and modest resolution of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has in it a sting which I think is of a very dangerous character to the National Policy. The hon. gentleman, in a way peculiar to himself,—for he is a very able man indeed—and in a way by which he would catch the popular ear if he were not answered, has endeavored to damage the farming community in this country, while at the same professing to be

their very best friend and supporter. Sir, I claim that this is not a question between the distillers and the farmers, as the hon. gentleman's resolution would seem to imply; but it is a wider and greater question than that. I am sure the House has heard enough on this question to have arrived at all events at this conclusion, that for the insignificant sum of \$300, which is about the amount paid by the Government as a drawback to the distillers for the corn they have imported in bond, the hon. gentleman would now attempt to draw a red herring across the track in order to remove, if possible, the keystone of this great National Policy which the people of this country have favorably pronounced upon. Now, Sir, it has been demonstrated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and ought to have been acknowledged by hon. gentlemen on that side, that the quantity of corn imported into this country under the National Policy has not been anything like the quantity imported under the old free trade system; and I think I shall be able to prove to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman in this House that it is not to the advantage of this country to permit any larger quantity of American grain of any kind to come into this country without the imposition of some restriction upon it. What are the facts? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has just taken his seat, states distinctly that under the free trade policy of the Reform party in 1878, corn was imported into this country at a cost of 51 cents a bushel to the consumer, and he admits to-day that in the face of a tariff of 7½ cents a bushel, it can be laid down in this country at 46 cents a bushel. The hon. gentleman should learn from that that no policy can be made so sure as never to require revision or consideration again. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have repeatedly hurled the accusation against us that we are continually tinkering at the National Policy. Well, Sir, if we do it is with the sole object of making it as perfect and complete as any policy can be made while the circumstances of the people and the country are changing from time to time; and what might not now be a very serious drawback to the farmers of Canada, might drive them to destitution and poverty and ruin in the circumstances in which they stood in those dark years from 1874 to 1878 under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, when Canada was a free market for the grains of the United States. I say it is a most dangerous position to assume in this country, and the Government I have the honor of supporting, I am glad to see, are endeavoring not only to benefit the manufacturers of this country who are an important branch of industry, but the farmers, who are the greatest and best of all. Hon. gentlemen opposite always pose as the friends of the honest farmer and his only friends. It is a most remarkable thing that the farmers have not been convinced by their arguments. They are wise in their generation; they are not the fools they are thought to be. I tell you from my own experience in the county where I have lived for nearly half a century, one of the best districts of Ontario, that I know the feelings of the farmers there on this question and they will never consent to send a member to this House who will not support a National Policy which will prevent all those products of American farmers from coming into our market and destroying the best and greatest interest of all, the agricultural interest of this country. Now, let us see for a moment what the effect would be. Hon. gentlemen stand up here in the presence of this intelligent House and pretend to be the farmer's friends, but they will again see the same result throughout this Dominion. I tell you distinctly that I know what the farmer's feelings are. I move among them a great deal, and having had the experience of farming among them myself, I know where they require the assistance of this House. I said I would endeavor so show the great interests at stake in this matter. I dare say that many hon. gentlemen from the

Mr. Hession.

eastern Provinces do not suppose that we in Ontario are producers of corn to any great extent; but I take up the report of the Bureau of Industries, published by the Reform Legislature of Ontario, which I believe to contain accurate statements, because they are made up from the returns of the farmers themselves to that bureau, and from that report I learn that in the past six years, from 1882 to 1877 inclusive, no less than 11,269,601 bushels of corn have been produced annually in the Province of Ontario; and when I tell the House that a large portion of that corn is grown in the western portion of Ontario, I am sorry to see hon. gentlemen from that district rise in their places in this House and to take upon themselves the responsibility of declaring that they are opposed to the protection of that great interest, the corn interest of their own Province. I am not here to advise those gentlemen, but I fear that in some counties in the west, the Counties of Essex, Kent and Elgin, which produce no less than 5,000,000 bushels annually, the people will not thank these gentlemen for asking that the Canadian markets be thrown open in order that American corn may be allowed to compete with our own productions. I say further that the coarse grains which are raised by our farmers are of the utmost importance, and the effect on them of the free admission of corn could not fail to be very injurious. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was bold enough to admit that the free admission of corn will displace our coarse grains, which would have to be sent to a foreign market; but our endeavor has always been to give our own people the control of our own markets, and I am sure it is not to the advantage of the farmer that he should be compelled to send his coarse grains to a distant market and take his chances there. I find that the oats produced in Ontario, during the last six years, averaged 54,419,000 bushels, that the peas and other coarse grains during the same years averaged a production of 12,932,450 bushels, and that the production of corn averaged 11,250,000 bushels annually. These great interests must be preserved, and if we have admitted some 2,300,000 bushels of corn into Canada during the past year, that import has yielded a revenue to the country, and our farmers have been protected to the extent of seven and a half cents a bushel. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not presume to be greater friends of the farmer than we are. We all know that we have to live by and through them, and I am glad to say, from my experience, that the farmers, throughout the Province of Ontario, stand in a better position to-day than they did under the old free trade policy, when our markets were completely at the mercy of the Americans, who could swamp them with their supplies, from time to time, as they chose. Of that 3,271,000 bushels of corn that came into Canada, 1,600,000 bushels went through the distilling process. From that the Government had a revenue of seven and a-half cents a bushel, and the whole debate in this House has arisen mainly upon the fact that the farmer has not got the advantage of the importation of free corn as well as the distiller. We find that the Government, whether wisely or unwisely, passed an Order in Council whereby any quantity of distilled corn or liquor exported out of this country and manufactured out of the imported corn shall have a drawback, I presume upon the value of the corn as imported, seven and a-half cents per bushel, and the total amount refunded by the Government is something under \$300. I have not touched one of the most important branches, in so far as the farmer's interests are concerned yet, and I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider what the effect might possibly be if American coarse grains were permitted to flood our market. In Chicago oats are worth 25 cents and in Toronto from 36 cents to 37 cents. What then would be the advantage of a market like that to Canadians? The American oats can be laid down in Owen Sound for 1½ cents to 2 cents a bushel,

and for 3 cents a bushel in Toronto. What advantage would it be to our farmer to compete with a market like that? What would be the advantage to him in the market of Toronto, where he is accustomed now to receive 37 cents or 40 cents a bushel for his oats, to be told that if he did not choose to accept 28 cents, American oats could be laid down there at that figure. Hon. gentlemen may say it is not fair to make a contrast between Toronto and Chicago, but the difference existing in prices is 12 cents and 13 cents, and the freight is only about 3 cents. Let us come nearer home and contrast the Buffalo market with ours. In Buffalo to-day sellers are asking 32½ cents and buyers are offering 29 cents to 30 cents for oats, while in Toronto oats are selling at 36 cents and 37 cents. Was that the case in the years between 1874 and 1878? Was there ever a year during that period in which the prices in Toronto were for oats and wheat and all coarse grains except barley higher than in the American market? No; just the opposite was the case. To-day, however, our prices are infinitely higher than the Americans for almost every product of the farm. I said that one of the most important interests had been omitted in the calculations of my hon. friends opposite. It is true that the farmer must have cheap feed for his stock, and that, if circumstances and seasons are favorable, he will make proper provision for the stock he has. He knows he has to rely upon himself. The more labor he can put on his farm and the more employment he can give to those who are about him, the richer the country will become, and it will be so much the better for him if he is not dependent upon the fluctuation of foreign markets. What do I find in reference to one of the most important industries in connection with the farms—that is the cultivation of root crops—according to this Statistical Record? I find that no less than 7,460,475 bushels of mangolds have been raised per year for the past six years; that the average production of carrots for the same period has been three millions and a half, and that turnips averaged thirty-eight millions and a quarter. Do hon. gentlemen reflect what it means to cultivate and raise crops of such importance and value to the farming interest of this country? What does it mean to the feeder of stock? It gives him a much better quality of land after raising such crops as those instead of depending upon the imports of corn from the United States, and not cultivating his farm except for the production of oats and peas and matters of that kind. When those crops are raised, which are of the utmost importance to the farmer, the farm is better cultivated and gives more employment to those who are upon it and the farmer is more independent of the American market. I do not desire to detain the House. This is not the last occasion on which we shall have the opportunity of discussing this question, but those hon. gentlemen have formed a policy which is probably wiser than that of attacking the whole National Policy at once. They are now attacking it here and there, and endeavoring to take a brick out of that noble edifice at a time, hoping that they will tumble the whole building down about the ears of the citizens of Canada. I believe there are men in this House who would be gratified to do that although the country might suffer very disastrous consequences. I fear there are some gentlemen who would not object to see a disastrous result and to see the farmers put in the position they were before of being under the heel of the importer, and to have it brought to their attention and to their memory that the Americans would purchase at prices which gave them better profits. The farmer had to submit to that at a time when they required that attention which it was the duty of the Government to give them.

Mr. BRIEN. I have never been, and I am not yet, a supporter of the National Policy, and I wish to be consistent with the position I took last year. I am still as much in

favor of reciprocity with the United States as I ever was, but, so long as this country sees fit to maintain a National Policy, I think this industry is just as important as any other industry in this country to be protected. We have been, of late, accustomed to follow the dictates of the National Policy, which tells us, as far as the action of the people is concerned in the past, that you are to get all you can and keep all you have. I think I shall be consistent, therefore, in voting against the motion and amendments which are now before the House. As far as the farmers of the country in general are concerned, I think there has been an injustice done to them in this matter. The farmer has not been granted the same privilege which has been granted to the distiller. I would not propose to the farmers to take the course which they might, which would be to ask for the abolition of the rebate on corn granted to the distillers, an increase on the duty on corn, and the formation of a combination of the southern counties to raise the price of corn. The total amount of corn raised in Canada in 1886 was 10,805,305 bushels, of which the county I represent raised 2,347,000 bushels, or about twenty-five per cent. of all that was raised in the country. In 1887 there were 8,404,000 bushels produced in this country, of which Essex produced again nearly 2,000,000. This is a very important industry, and it would be rather unfair, where all other industries in the country are protected, to remove the protection which is pretended to be placed on the corn industry. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) has stated the position, in which I exactly agree with him, that, by allowing a rebate on corn to the farmers, it would bring the American corn into direct competition with the Canadian corn. The fact is that the protection to corn has not had its proper effect because of the rebate allowed to distillers, the result of which has been that American corn has been brought into competition with Canadian corn; and, if that holds good in one case, it will hold good in another. Only 2,311,000 bushels of corn were imported into this country during the past year, and, if the southern counties improve in the future as they have in the past, they will be able to supply all this quantity. I say to my friends who are anxious to have the best corn in the world and to raise the best stock, that all they have to do is to come to the County of Essex, where they will have all the opportunity they desire of raising the best corn and the best stock, and I am sure that we will be able to find room for them and will be glad to welcome them there and so to gratify their ambition. I did not intend to make any lengthened remarks on this subject, but I desired to justify the position I take. It is not often that I find myself in accordance with my hon. friends on the other side, but on this occasion I feel, like some who have spoken, that my loyalty is to my constituents rather than my party.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The motion which has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is one of a series of resolutions which, according to the organs of the Reform party it is the intention of the Opposition, during the present Session, to place before the House and before the country, avowedly to endeavor to create the impression in the country, and more particularly amongst the large and influential class to which so much reference has been made to-day, that the present Government are dealing unjustly with them. Now, Sir, there are two points that have been brought to the attention of the House by the discussion which has taken place to-day. In the first place we have, I think, learned that my hon. friend, the leader of the third party, has entirely recanted the faith which animated him in 1877-78. You, Mr. Speaker, as well as myself, having had a seat in Parliament during those years, can remember very well what aid and assistance the hon. gentleman gave to the Conservative party during those



years, by his eloquent voice and by his vote in Parliament, in supporting the propositions which we then laid down, advocating the policy which the Conservative party have advocated from 1876, down to the present time. I am a little astonished that my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), the leader of the left centre, has not been able to give to the House, and to the country, better reasons than he has given upon the floor of Parliament to-day, for that recantation, the exhibition of which he has given upon the present occasion. A great statesman like my hon. friend, leading a great party as he does, ought to take a broader view of these questions than he has exhibited on the present occasion. If I understood him aright he took the ground that he would support the two amendments which were made, first the amendment to remove the duty altogether on corn, and, secondly, the amendment to remove the duty from corn-meal, not because he thought it would be in the interests of Canada that it should be done, but because it would be in the interests of the electors of the County of Northumberland.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not express an opinion about supporting either of them.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Well, then, if my hon. friend does not intend to support them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say I did not intend.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Certainly the hon. gentleman's speech indicated that he did intend to support them, and the reason why he intended to support these amendments was because it was in the interests of the electors of the County of Northumberland. I say Sir, that the leader of a great party such as the hon. member for Northumberland, ought to have taken a wider and broader view of this question than he has done. It is not my intention to enter into the general discussion which has arisen upon this motion with reference to the trade policy of the country as it affects other interests than those that are especially referred to in the motions which are in your hands. I listened with a good deal of attention to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have heard that hon. gentleman make many speeches upon the floor of Parliament; I have heard him first taking one line in regard to the discussion of a trade policy, and then another line; I have heard him make many calculations as to the effect of different policies upon the interests of the people of Canada; and to-night we have heard him again giving to the House a series of figures from which he proves to his own satisfaction, at all events, that the policy that prevailed during the time that the Mackenzie Administration was in office, was more beneficial to the farmers than the policy which at present prevails. He gave us certain figures respecting the effect of the importation of corn in 1877, having admitted, as he did at the time, that we imported during that year a very much larger quantity than we now import, and we allege that the diminution in the importation since the imposition of the duty, has inured to the benefit of the farmer. The effort which the hon. gentleman made in his speech before the House was to prove that no such benefit had inured to the farmer from the diminution of the importation of corn, and he told us that through the large importation of corn we were enabled to export from Canada in 1877 nearly 4,000,000 bushels of oats. But in his calculations, and in the information which he was giving to the House, he forgot to tell us that in that year 1877 we imported 1,697,000 bushel of the same article. You will find, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friend for North Norfolk will find, the same to be the case if he examines the Trade and Navigations Returns; that the export of oats from the country during that year was only some two millions of bushels more than we had imported, and Sir, the whole of that importation of oats has now ceased altogether. We do import

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

hardly a single bushel, during the past year we imported only 20 000 bushels altogether. Then he told us that we exported in 1877, 1,753,000 bushels of peas, but he forgot to tell the House and the country that we exported during the last year ending 30th June, 1888, of the same article, 2,164,069 bushels. The contention I make in regard to this matter is this—I do not speak from the standpoint of an eastern Province man. When we were discussing the National Policy in Opposition; when we were discussing the probable effect of the National Policy, I think the hon. member for Northumberland concurred that it would be impossible, unless the different Provinces agreed to a certain line of policy, and if each particular interest, if the interest of each particular Province was to be consulted—it would be impossible ever to arrive upon a basis protecting the interests of this great Dominion. We did arrive upon the basis of taxing Ontario for the benefit of Nova Scotia, the iron and coal industries of that Province; at the same time we agreed on the policy of advancing the interests of the farmers of Ontario and Quebec by imposing a duty upon the agricultural products which were largely imported previous to that time.

Mr. MITCHELL. When did New Brunswick and Prince Edward come in?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend goes back, I see he has enlarged his views from the County of Northumberland to the whole Province of New Brunswick. I will tell him where it affects the interests beneficially of the Province of New Brunswick. Let him go to the great cotton mill of Mr. Gibson down in the Province of New Brunswick, let him go to Moncton, and he will find that the National Policy has, to a considerable degree, beneficially affected the interests of his Province.

Mr. MITCHELL. What dividends have they paid? That is the point.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not aware what dividends they pay, but I know this much, that whether they have paid dividends or not, they have paid the hands that have been employed in those factories in the prosecution of these industries.

Mr. MITCHELL. Two or three hundred hands.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Whether it has inured to the benefit of the promoters of those industries, it has inured to the general benefit of whole Province of New Brunswick. But, Sir, it does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend to taunt us that no dividends have accrued to the promoters of those industries, when he and his friends have been telling us for the last ten years that we have adopted and maintained a policy which has been in the interest of the great cotton and sugar lords of the country, and against the interests of the people of Canada. I say if it has added to the distribution of money, if it has added materially, as it has added, to the employment of labor in the Province of my hon. friend, it has thereby materially advanced the interests of that Province. I am endeavoring, however, to confine myself more particularly to the question before the House. I say that as far as my observation goes, the imposition of a duty upon coarse grains coming into Canada has been more beneficial to the farmers of this country than any other portion of the tariff policy of the present Government regarding the importation of any other article into Canada. And when it is shown, as can be conclusively shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the importation of corn has been reduced from upwards of 8,000,000 bushels in 1877, down to a little over 2,000,000 in 1888; and that the importation of oats and other coarse grains has been reduced from 1,690,000 bushels in 1877, down to 20,000 in 1888, I think no more conclusive argument can be offered to the farmers of Canada that the policy of the Government in

reference to this matter has been beneficial to them, in that respect at all events. But I need not have labored to convince the Opposition that the policy of the Government with regard to this matter had been beneficial to the farmers. Why, notwithstanding the fact that from 1879 down to the present Session we have heard from the other side of the House of Commons the statement made year after year that it was impossible that the imposition of duties on grain coming into Canada could be beneficial to the farmer, yet today we have the extraordinary spectacle of hon. gentlemen supporters of the leader of the Opposition rising and telling this House candidly that while they agree with the motion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), they do not intend to vote for either of the amendments made to that proposition, thereby giving the most positive evidence it is possible for hon. gentlemen to give that they have been convinced by the logic of facts that the policy we adopted in 1876, and which I am glad to say the present Government has maintained down to the present time, has been beneficial in the direction in which we intended it to be beneficial. So much for the question as to the amendments which have been submitted. As regards the main motion itself I am quite free to admit there is a good deal of reason in the proposition laid down by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). It does not seem to be an unreasonable proposition that if we admit the system of drawbacks at all, it ought to apply not in a limited but in the fullest sense possible. I may say I am not favorable to the system of drawbacks; I do not believe the system is a wise one or one in the interests of any country; but whilst that system exists and is upon the Statute-book it must be applied by the Government, I presume, in the best manner possible.

Mr. MILLS. That is against the farmer.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Yes; the hon. gentleman says for the benefit of the farmer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Against the farmer.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Let me say this: that in the resolution submitted by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and that which was submitted a day or two ago, the Opposition have given evidence that they cannot rise very high in regard to matters of trade policy. I am not going to refer to the discussion which took place yesterday on the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), but I may say that the whole export of spirits, as I am informed and as I gather from the public documents, upon which a drawback is paid amounts to about \$16,000, and that the whole drawback paid to the distillers amounted to about \$300 or \$400. I do not pretend to say that because the trade is so small in its proportions it alters the principle in the slightest degree, but I do say that I believe if you are to apply the machinery of the Minister of Customs, which is somewhat cumbersome, and which we sometimes think a little arbitrary, to the feeding of cattle in bond, I think you would very soon find, and hon. gentlemen opposite would very soon find, that the farmers would say: For God's sake do not give us any drawback on the feed we give our cattle, but let us feed them as we choose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is hard on the Minister of Customs.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Perhaps it is hard on the Minister of Customs. I am standing here as an independent member, and whilst I give the Government an independent support because their policy meets with my views, I think I have a right to criticise even the actions of my own leaders.

Mr. MITCHELL. But you should be here.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The reason I am not there is because the policy, or rather the non-policy, of hon. gentle-

men opposite does not meet with my approval, and the general policy of hon. gentlemen on this side does meet with my approval; and whilst I am quite free to criticise their acts when they are not in the public interest, their general policy is such that it would be disastrous not only to the interests of my own constituents in North Renfrew, but to the interests of the whole Dominion if they were turned out of office and hon. gentlemen opposite took their places. For this reason, although I am free to admit there is a great deal of plausibility in the motion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), I believe it would be impossible to apply it in such a way as to benefit the farmers, and, therefore, I will vote against the amendment which has been submitted and against the main motion itself.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I do not desire to reply to remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but I should like to say a few words in regard to the view we take on this subject in the Province from which I come. The fact of the matter is that previous to the adoption of the National Policy our farmers were struggling and were very poor. They had to compete with farm produce brought across the lines, and farm products were brought in which slaughtered our market. At that time the wild lands on the Fraser River were worth about \$5 an acre, at the present time those lands are worth \$30 an acre; cultivated lands at that time were worth about \$20 an acre, at the present time they are selling at about \$75 to \$100 an acre. I was sorry to hear the other evening that land had depreciated so much in value in this part of the country, for such is not the case in our Province, and since the National Policy has been in operation lands have been advancing rapidly in price from year to year, until the day before I left a farm of 160 acres on an island in the Fraser was sold for \$100 an acre. That shows that the National Policy has been good for our Province, and we are in favor of it. We are in favor of it in its entirety; we do not want to do away with any part of it. If I made any other statement in this House all the farmers on the Fraser River would bring me to a severe account indeed. In my statement I will be supported by every hon. member from the Province, a constituency of which I have the honor to represent, and so far as the National Policy is concerned I will support it in its entirety. I believe it is a good way to raise the revenue which is necessary for every Government, and it is desirable to protect all the industries in the country, whether agricultural or manufacturing. With these few remarks, and without offering any comment on statements made by hon. gentlemen either on this side of the House or on the Opposition side of the House, I conclude by desiring that the House should know how we in British Columbia feel on this question, and the view held in the Province from which I come.

Mr. AMYOT. I think it proper that so long as the United States protect themselves against us we must protect ourselves against the States. I hold that this country would be greatly benefited if we were allowed to trade freely with the States, but for my part I want one thing or the other: either protection against the States or free trade with the States, the latter of which would mean a partnership between the States and ourselves to protect the whole 65,000,000 of people, which would be the united population, against the rest of the world, and the giving to us of an immense market in the whole market of the States, and giving the States the market of Canada. But I do not believe that we should smash up into fragments our system of protection so long as we do not obtain free trade with the United States. Of course, if you take in detail every article of the tariff, you will find

that some parts of the country would be benefited by a change, but we must take the tariff as a whole. Some parts of the Dominion produce a large quantity of corn, and if you admit the corn from the States free it will be detrimental to those who produce corn. If you admit cornmeal free of duty it will be against the interests of the millers of Canada and of those employed in those mills. I do not think, however, it is necessary to go into those details, but we should rather look at the question in its broad view. Last year I voted against admitting flour free of duty on the same principle. Of course those who do not produce wheat would benefit by having it a little cheaper; if the tariff makes any change in the final result of the market, but we must remember that those who produce wheat pay duty on coal and other articles. I hold that as long as we have not free trade with the United States we must protect ourselves. If you take the question of corn you find that you may manufacture it and export it, and if you take fertilisers, on which we voted yesterday, we find that we can manufacture them here and export them to the States or elsewhere with profit to ourselves. I believe that we should have free trade with the States, and that is the sentiment in the part of the country which I represent, but so long as we have not an entire system of reciprocity of commerce we must have reciprocity of tariff; we must protect ourselves as the United States protect themselves against us. It is the duty of us who believe in free trade with the United States to let that country know that we are ready to deal with them on that score, but so long as we do not obtain this reciprocity we must support the National Policy for our own protection. The National Policy was introduced in 1878 as a means to obtain reciprocity with the United States. I hope that very soon we will have that reciprocity for the benefit of the country, and that we may be able to trade freely with the intelligent and wealthy people of the great country south of us.

Mr. SPROULE. After the exhaustive debate which took place on this question I would not trouble the House were it not for the fact that I come from the same part of the country from which the hon. member (Mr. Landerkin) comes, who made the original motion in this House; and, in addition to that, ours is a part of the country composed largely of agriculturists who perhaps have benefited more from the National Policy or equally as much at all events as those in any other portion of the Dominion of Canada. I am much surprised at the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) making this motion; it is one of the peculiar motions which he brings forward for the purpose of catching the unwary. It is one of those motions that he makes for the purpose of endeavoring to convince the people of Grey that some great injustice is done to them by the Government of the country, or that by some piece of class legislation that others have benefited by the National Policy, and that they and they alone are left out in the cold. Whether the hon. gentleman framed this motion himself or by the advice of others, it is framed in the best possible way it could be for the purpose of deceiving the people. It says:

That, whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export, should also receive a similar rebate.

Take the bare and bald motion as it appears here and go to the country districts in East and South Grey, and say to the farmers that the distillers of the country are allowed a rebate on all grain they bring in for the purpose of feeding cattle which they sell in the same market as the farmer, while the farmer is obliged to pay 7½ cents a bushel duty and it is natural that they should feel that they are the injured parties. But the hon. gentleman would not tell

Mr. AMYOT.

them in addition to this bald statement about the small quantity of corn which is brought in for that purpose. He would conveniently omit to tell them that during last year the rebate on all grain brought into Canada for that purpose was only between three or four hundred dollars. He would lead them to believe that the large quantities of grain brought in by the distillers were entirely imported for that purpose, and, therefore, that the farmers of the country must receive some injustice because they cannot get that rebate. I regret that the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is so short-sighted as to suppose that he could delude the farmers into believing injustice is done them in this respect. If there is one part of the Dominion of Canada more than another where the National Policy applies directly in the interest of the farmer, it is in his constituency and mine. I have the honor to be one of his constituents and to live in one of the townships that helped to send him here as a representative of the people, and I can tell him that no longer ago than the present season a large portion of the oats grown in the Townships of Glenelg, Artemesia, Euphrasia, Holland and other townships were sent to the north shore of Georgian Bay for the purpose of feeding the horses and other stock belonging to the lumbermen who were engaged in operations in that part of the country. Were it not for this policy oats would be largely brought, as they were brought before the National Policy was introduced, from the State of Michigan, or some of the Western States of the Union. It is not so long ago since 1878; and I distinctly remember that lumbering men on the north and south shores of Georgian Bay brought nearly all their oats and pork from the Western States. I think the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) belonged at that time to a firm who imported the food for its men and horses from the Western States.

Mr. COOK. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that some of his men informed me that their supply of pork and oats came from the Western States previous to 1878, and they also told me that they could get rattlesnake pork from Chicago much cheaper than Canadian pork, and it was in the interests of the employer to import it. I do not wonder at the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) supporting this motion, belonging as he does to a large lumbering firm who are carrying on their operations on the north shore of Georgian Bay, because it would be to his interest and a benefit to his pocket that he could bring in the oats from Michigan instead of bringing them from East and South Grey. I know that before navigation closed in the present year buyers in my locality paid 5 and 6 cents a bushel more for oats than they could if we had not protection. They sent oats from the ports of Owen Sound and Collingwood to the lumbermen and got a better market for them than they could by sending them east. When navigation closed oats had to come down a little, but were it not for the fact that our oats are protected in this direction, persons could not pay the prices they are paying for them to-day. I remember distinctly, in the locality where I live, in the heart of one of the finest agricultural sections in Ontario not only corn from Chicago, but prairie-raised oats from the Western States, which were much cheaper than the oats our farmers could raise, were being brought in, and I remember distinctly that the value of oats dropped 20 cents a bushel in two days when two steamer loads of oats came into Collingwood and were distributed throughout the Counties of Grey and Simcoe to compete with the oats which were sold at higher prices by our own farmers. Will anyone tell me in the face of that fact that it would be in the interest of the farmers of South Grey to have the duty taken off corn, which would seek to come into competition with the coarse grains raised largely by the farmers there? Unfortunately it has been the experience of the farmers

there within the past few years that they have not been able to raise wheat as successfully as they could years ago; they are obliged to turn their attention to coarse grains. Peas, oats and barley are the staple crops in that country, and if you allow corn to come in free every bushel that is brought in will reduce the value of the oats, peas and barley the farmers grow, because these are the grains they use for feeding their cattle. We find them taking them to the mill and getting them mixed together, and if the duty were taken off corn as the result of this motion, I can tell the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that he would find no stronger opponents than many men who are now his supporters. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell the farmers that not one single article they have to sell is raised in price by the tariff. If that is the case, why do they ask that the duty should be taken off? If the removal of the duty will not bring down the price of the corn to the farmers for feeding purposes, why do they ask that it should be taken off? There is something lame, unreasonable and inconsistent in their logic, and I can tell the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that if he goes to the Georgian Bay, either on the north shore or the south shore, he will require a great deal more logic than even he can command, to convince any farmer that it is in his interest to have the duty taken off. They may tell him: If you belong to a Michigan lumber firm, you can buy there the pork to feed your lumbermen or the oats to feed your horses; but if you come here, as long as this duty is on corn, we will compel you to buy from us, and we will still believe that it is in our interest, notwithstanding what figures you produce; for the hon. gentleman seems to be an adept at figures and able to prove anything from them, at any rate to his own satisfaction, but, I am sure, not to the satisfaction of the farmers. I would not have spoken on this subject at all were it not that I come from the same locality as the hon. member for South Grey, and that I believe that it is strongly in the interest of the farmers that this duty should be kept up, and would be much to their detriment if it were taken off, as it enables them to obtain increased prices for these coarse grains which are the staple commodities they raise in that country, and which must be so for all time to come.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I desire before the vote is taken on this question to add a word or two to what I have already said in regard to the observations of some of the speakers in the course of the debate. I think it was the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) who said that if the members from the Maritime Provinces could not vote for the original motion, they would have an opportunity of voting against the Government on one of the two amendments which have been proposed. The original resolution provides for a rebate on corn imported for stock feeding; the first amendment provides that corn for all purposes shall be admitted free; the next amendment provides that cornmeal shall be admitted free. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to pursue the same policy with regard to this question that they have pursued on other occasions. They have not very clearly defined their position, and we on this side of the House, at all events, are at a loss to know, should hon. gentlemen opposite by any means assume power and have the framing of the tariff, which of these three different policies they would adopt. I shall not, however, be at all surprised if the hon. member for Lambton, and the majority of the members on that side of the House, be found voting not only for one but for each and all of these three different motions, provided they think they have any chance by doing so of defeating the Government. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time this question has been discussed in this House. It was discussed a few years ago when a motion was introduced on the other side of the House proposing to place corn on the free list. Those

of us who favor the National Policy, although we come from the Maritime Provinces, and would be glad to see this duty removed in the interests of the consumers of cornmeal in that Province, voted with the Government to maintain this duty. This question was one of the prominent questions discussed in the election contest of 1882, which I believe was the first opportunity I had of expressing my views publicly upon it. It was contended then by those opposed to us that this duty was imposed upon the people of the Maritime Provinces for the especial benefit of the farmers of the Province of Ontario. So far as I was concerned I accepted that statement as true, but I contended that it was a part of the general policy of protection adopted by this Government, that that policy as a whole would be beneficial to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and that, therefore, if we are disposed to accept it we must accept it as a whole. The electors of Westmoreland county on that occasion agreed with that view, and expressed their verdict accordingly. That is the position which I took then and which I have always held from that time to the present, and it is the position I hold to-day. Now, I would like to say just one word with regard to the first amendment, which proposes to place corn on the free list. That was no doubt moved with the view of compelling some of us who support the Government to vote against the Government on that particular question. So far as I am concerned, I desire to say this, that while I should be glad if any arrangement could be made which could relieve the consumers of corn and cornmeal in the Maritime Provinces from this tax, I consider that it would not be in the interest of the farmers of the Dominion, as a whole, to have this duty wholly removed. I find by looking at the statistics that the production of corn in Ontario amounts to some 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 bushels annually, that there is imported besides 2,300,000 bushels, that the principal part of this imported corn pays duty, and that the principal part is used in the manufacture of whiskey. Now, while I am a supporter of the National Policy and in favor of encouraging manufactures in this country, I am not in favor of extending any special encouragement to the manufacture of whiskey, and instead of admitting corn free for all purposes, including the manufacture of whiskey, if any change is to be made, I shall favor another change which has been suggested, and that is taking away the rebate which is now allowed on whiskey exported. I have nothing further to say on this question, except to refer to a remark which was made by some of our friends on this side, that we, from the Maritime Provinces, were disposed to discuss this question in a sectional spirit. I am not disposed to do that, and I think the views I have expressed will satisfy any hon. gentleman that I am not discussing it in any narrow provincial spirit. I am one of those who believe that the Maritime Provinces have received a fair share of the advantages which have resulted to the whole Dominion from the policy of the present Government. While admitting that in this particular instance a small tax is imposed upon them, yet the railway policy and the tariff policy of the Government, as a whole, have been beneficial to almost every interest in the Maritime Provinces. I am glad to say I believe the farmers of the Maritime Provinces appreciate the advantages of this policy. I am glad to say that they are in a better position to-day than they were in at any other time in the history of the country, and that they are giving the general policy of the Government a more hearty and generous support now than they ever accorded it before. I wish simply, in closing, to affirm the position which I took at the opening of this debate, and while I desire to see the duty upon corn imported for stock-breeding purposes and for manufacturing purposes removed, I am still a supporter of the National Policy, and I only desire this change, while it can be done in the interest of the farmers of the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. DAVIN. I intend to occupy the time of the House but a few minutes. Had I spoken before my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White), I might have gone into several of the positions taken up on this side of the House. But my hon. friend so admirably and so succinctly dealt with these that I shall only trouble the House for a few minutes while I call attention to one or two points in the debate, which seem to me remarkable. In the first place, it is now admitted that protection protects. That principle is now admitted by professed free traders. One hon. gentleman after another belonging to the Reform party has stood up and declared that he would stand by the duty on this one article so long as protection happens to be the rule; but they should know that, according to the political economists, they should, if they are to be consistent free traders, advocate the abrogation of the duties on that or any other individual article, because the theory of the true free trader is that protection does not protect. Then the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) tells us that, strange to say, the duty has made no difference whatever in the price of corn. That is exactly what we say in regard to a great many other things on which a duty exists to-day. It makes no difference in the price except, in some instances, to reduce the price. We have, therefore, two great admissions. Two or three gentlemen on the Opposition side have stood up and declared that they will vote with the Government, because they think it is in the interest of their constituents that the Government policy should be carried out in this one article, so long as protection exists. In other words, they believe that protection protects, and my hon. friend, who is in his heart a Protectionist, although he wears on his sleeve the badge of an assumed free trader, tells us that the duty makes no difference whatever in the price. I will keep my promise and not go into statistics, but will merely refer to what my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said about the protection of coal in the Maritime Provinces. If I were to go into statistics, I could show that ever since the present Government came into power the production of coal has gone on increasing, until to-day nearly 3,000,000 tons are produced all over the country. Another point which this debate emphasises is that there is an educational process going on which promises to rid us of a sinister aspect of the Reform party. Here to-night, as on other occasions, what do we see? Do we ever see the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side discuss a question from the general standpoint of the prosperity of the country? No. They take up some small patch of country and they peg away at that. They are creatures of detail; they cannot rise to a large conception; they have to look at everything in small figures.

An hon. MEMBER. Through a funnel.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, through a very small funnel. My hon. friend behind me speaks of a funnel, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), using a phrase that I used myself, compared me the other night to a funnel. I only wish I could taper the funnel a little so as to get some information into my hon. friends' heads, because the bottles are too small for the funnel. The two points to which I would call the attention of the House are two important points. They show that in this question, after it has been threshed out for the last ten years, the educational process is going on, the yeast begins to rise and the Reform party, such as it is, is breaking up. Several of them will come over to my right hon. friend to-night and vote for him for the first time. This debate has taken a wide range. I am not sorry for that. It shows that the whole National Policy hangs together; it shows that you cannot touch it here and there, but that it is part of a great system under which this country has made extraordinary progress. And when my hon. friend from Northumberland

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).

(Mr. Mitchell) who I am sorry to say is not here, for I like to see his genial countenance, gets very angry and prophesies that this country is going to the dogs, instead of making great progress, he furnishes another instance of Cannings' Needy Knife Grinder. They are asking the country what its grievances are. If the country were to ransack its head for the next three months it could not tell you a grievance. Everything is going on prosperously, and I say that the wide range the debate has taken shows how every part of the National Policy hangs together. What do I see? I take up a paper, and I see this, and it is a thing which happens again and again. I read here a dispatch from Windsor:

"N. B. Perkins and J. W. Hull, of the Globe Furniture Company, of Northville, Mich., are in town with a view to start in Windsor a factory for making church and school furniture for the Canadian market. They propose from the start to employ not fewer than 100 persons in supplying Canadian demands. The firm desires to secure the Canadian trade, and has concluded that it would be cheaper to manufacture in Canada than to continue paying 35 per cent. duty on their foreign made articles."

That sort of thing is going on the whole time. My hon. friend the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would bring out figures to you in reference to this matter. The figures would be laid down with all the regularity of soldiers brought out on parade. He will marshal them and look at them with affection, and it shows how much he admires the figurative work of his own hands. He will show that it would be better for our people to go over to Michigan and buy their furniture there, than that we should by a wise policy, force these people, if they are determined to have anything to do with our markets, to come over here. Before I sit down, I will refer simply to one incident in the debate which rather varied it. An hon. friend, who is a member of the House for the first time, and with whom I fought a battle in Haldimand some years ago—more years ago than I care to remember—was introduced to you, Sir; and the wit of the House, the Bernal Osborne of the House, my hon. friend here (Mr. Landerkin) spoke afterwards, and with that charming humor which is characteristic of him, he rang the changes on this, that the Reform party was winning seat after seat, that one after another the outworks of the Government were being stormed, that member after member on the Reform side was being brought in, and in fact there was a great deal of clucking about a very small egg; but knowing what I know is going on in that county—and I say it with all sympathy for my friend, for he was a strong foe, and I always have a kindly feeling towards a strong foe—and knowing what is likely to be the result twelve months hence in Haldimand, perhaps my hon. friend, with that facility of quotation which belongs to him, will be able to be equally happy twelve months hence, and when another member is being led in by my right hon. friend and presented to you, Sir, he will be able to address him, parodying the language which the Prince in "Romeo and Juliet" addresses to one of the great Veronese houses:

"Come, Montague, for thou art early up,  
To see thy foe and heir more early down."

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). This resolution is evidently one of a series by which the Opposition intend to attack the National Policy piecemeal. The debate has taken a much wider range than the terms of the resolution would indicate, and if it had been confined to the duty on corn and cornmeal, I would not have troubled the House with any remarks. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as has been his custom for one or two years past, has undertaken to make an attack on the great industries of coal and iron. He, who in the past, as he admits himself, was a supporter and founder of the National Policy, claims that we have changed our position and that the policy which has been approved by the people on many occasions is different from the policy which he supported

in the past. He has adopted a policy now which I contend is not a National Policy. He has singled out for attack now and on previous occasions all the great industries of the country which in any sense could be called national. He has dealt with the great interest of the farmer and with the great mining interest of the country. He has made the statement in relation to the iron duties, for instance, that they have not been asked for by the public and are not in the interest of the Maritime Provinces, and that no substantial progress has resulted therefrom. In relation to that matter, full statistics were produced during the debate on the Budget last year to show that substantial progress had been made in that direction, and since then the position has not retrograded but has improved. To cite only one instance, the furnaces at Londonderry, which in 1877 employed only 300 men, were last year employing 800 men; works which were then stagnant have been revived; and, of the two furnaces, one is in full operation and the other will be ready for operation in a very short time. Another industry is the steel works in the County of Pictou, which have been doubled in capacity, and the great impetus which has been given has been such as to attract attention to the facilities for the manufacture of iron in Canada, and I believe that in a short time these smelting industries will be so fully established as to produce all the iron required for consumption in Canada. My belief in that result is based on the fact that we have undoubtedly in the midst of us all the conditions for successful manufacture, conditions which do not exist to the same extent on any other portion of this continent. All these resolutions have been designed to draw the support of the farmer from the National Policy. It is contended that these duties which have been imposed bear heavily on the farmer, and, as an example, it has been stated that the duties on iron imported were last year from 40 to 45 per cent. As a matter of fact the whole duties last year on the iron which was imported did not exceed 30 per cent. excluding the free goods. In 1886-87 the duties were not over 22 per cent. I do not contend, and no consistent supporter of the National Policy or of a protective policy could contend, that in a new country protective duties do not in the first instance increase the price of goods in some cases, but I do contend that the labor which is employed in the country will be an offset at an early date to the enhanced prices. I can cite the example of the United States. Less than a quarter of a century ago, their iron industries were of comparatively small dimensions. To-day they are equal in amount, if they have not actually outstripped the iron production of Great Britain, and, in machinery and in the higher branches of iron manufacture requiring skill, they furnish their goods as cheaply at least as can be obtained in Great Britain. An examination of the Trade and Navigation Returns of the last two years will bear out this statement, and show that our importation of these articles is tending rather in favor of the highly protected country than of the country which has a policy of free trade. Then, in relation to the charge of the enormous impost on iron, that duties on iron range from 40 to 45 per cent. these percentages if they are not examined closely are misleading in the general estimate of them in the public mind. To arrive at the correct amount we have to come down to the actual payments in dollars and cents, and if the extra duties imposed upon iron are reduced to specific figures, we find that outside what would be considered an ordinary revenue duty in the minds of any free trader, the increased duties do not really, on the average, extend beyond from  $\frac{1}{10}$  to  $\frac{1}{5}$  of a cent. per pound on the raw material used in the manufacture. When such material is worked up the actual cost to the consumer is even less than that. As an example of the tendency of prices from 1878 to 1889 in relation to a few articles manufactured out of iron, I will cite some figures which have been furnished me this evening, which

show that not only are these articles manufactured cheaper to-day, and that may be, to some extent, owing to an improvement in operations, but the figures show, at all events, that these goods are supplied at very reasonable prices. Take the articles used by the lumbermen. First take ball corks. In 1878 these were furnished at \$1 per 100; now they are furnished, double the size, for 60 cents. Bolts assorted were furnished at \$5 per 100, while now they are but \$3. Horse shoes were \$5 per keg, they are now \$3.25. Boom chains were \$3.50 each, now they are \$1.20. Cross cut-saws were 80 cents a foot, now the improved lance tooth saw can be had for 70 cents a foot. Scouring axes were \$14 per dozen, now they are \$13. Chopping axes were \$12 per dozen, now they are \$9, and the pay of the mechanics employed in the manufacture of these axes is 30 per cent. higher to-day than it was in 1878. Nails were then \$3 per keg, and now they can be had for \$2.75. In regard to agricultural implements, mowers cost \$80 a piece in 1878, now they can be had for \$70. Reapers have diminished in price from \$120 to \$80; horse rakes from \$33 to \$28; self binders from \$175 to \$150. I think these figures go to show that, so far as the iron industry is concerned, no material injury has resulted to the people of Canada from the tariff, while substantial progress has already been made, considering the short space of time during which those duties have been in operation. The question of coal duties has been effectually dealt with by the hon. member for Cape Breton, and I do not intend to go over the same ground, only to make a brief statement, of the facts which will show that the coal duty has been an advantage to the Maritime Provinces, particularly to Nova Scotia; and they will also show that they have not only been an advantage to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, but also to the greater part of the Province of Quebec. In 1878 the total output was only 693,511 tons; in 1887, the output was 1,519,684 tons, or an increase of 120 per cent. being, in round figures, 826,000 tons. The Upper Provinces took in 1878, only 83,710 tons; in 1887 they took 567,148 tons, or over six times as much. The charge has been made in relation to the duty on coal that it has not been a benefit to the Maritime Provinces, but a positive tax to Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and that the prices there have been enhanced to the local consumers. I join issue with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on all these statements. I say that the duty on coal has not enhanced the price in the Maritime Provinces, but, on the contrary, it has enabled the consumers to obtain coal at a much cheaper rate than if the duty had not been imposed; and I ground my statement on the economic laws that the greater the production the cheaper the relative cost. If the duty had not been imposed, all the collieries would have been closed, to a very large extent, and instead of furnishing coal at a low rate, as they do to-day, the prices would have been very much higher, and only a few struggling coal mines would have been in operation. Take the market of Quebec which, after all, apart from the local market, is the chief market of the collieries of Nova Scotia. The duty has not resulted in any serious disadvantage to us; on the contrary, I think it has had a regulating effect and maintained the prices at a more equal rate, on the whole, than if no duty had been imposed. Without the duty the collieries could not have existed. Consumers would have been subjected to very irregular prices, dependent on the importation of coal, which at times would have been small, and at other times very great. To-day bituminous coal is sold at a low price, not only in the Province of Quebec, but in other parts of the eastern portions of Canada. Reference to the Trade and Navigation Returns will show that the average cost of the coal supply, the invoice price, is \$2.80 per ton, for imported soft coal. Impartial enquiry will prove that the coal industry has been materially benefited by the duty on coal, and that no disad-

vantage has resulted to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. Now, in respect to the duty on corn and cornmeal. I wish to say that I was elected as a supporter of the National Policy, and I intend to carry out the mandate which the people entrusted to me, and to support the National Policy as a whole; and to give no support, either by vote or by speech, which would tend to discredit the policy which has received the approval of the people in the past. The question that has been raised now is one, as I said before, intended to draw away the support of the farmers from the Government. The duty imposed on corn and cornmeal, if it had any object at all, was imposed mainly in the interest of the farmers. If they did not wish to see that duty continued, I should willingly bow to their decision, but I doubt if the farmers of this country have any such desire, and I think that the members of the opposition do not fairly represent the wishes of the farmers. No proposition ever submitted to this House was based on more untenable grounds than the proposition of the hon. member for South Grey for the removal of the duty on corn. The whole argument is based on the fact of certain drawbacks being allowing on corn used in the manufacture of an article for export. The whole sum representing the drawback does not exceed \$150, as I am informed, and whether that is a sufficient reason to change a policy in the interest of the farmers, which is good in itself, I leave the intelligence of the farmers of this country to decide. An effort has been made in all these resolutions to raise class against class, farmer against laborer, labor against capital. The same tactics of the Opposition have been tried in the past and have failed, as they will fail now. The interests of all parties are common, we have to give and take, and I, as representing a very large laboring element, being perhaps, the first representative sent to the House of Commons peculiarly charged as a representative of that body—I stand here and say that I stand by the National Policy as a whole because it is intended to give employment to labor in this country, and to exclude the importation of goods which can be manufactured here with reasonable hopes of success, because such an importation is a displacement of Canadian labor and is a loss to Canada. I will close by citing the observations of an eminent gentleman on the other side of the line who, in dealing with this question of breaking up in detail a policy which has to stand as a whole, said:

“For myself, I will stand for the protective system and the maintenance of such rates of duty as will ensure the development of the resources of the country, increase the number of its industries and perpetuate its national independence, commercial and industrial as well as political.”

Mr. CARGILL. As coming from the locality of the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution I may be permitted to offer a few remarks. The resolution appears at first sight to be a very reasonable one. The distillers are permitted to import corn for manufacturing liquor and a rebate of duty is given them on the quantity of the liquor which they export. That being the case, it is apparently very reasonable that the agricultural community of this country should be permitted to import corn for the purpose of feeding cattle for export. How does the object in view differ in the two cases? The object of the National Policy was first for the purpose of stimulating and fostering manufacturing industries. The object in placing a duty on corn imported into this country was to protect the agricultural community against the importation of coarse grains, which would have the effect of depreciating the value of coarse grains produced by our farmers. I say, therefore, that, although it is in the interest of this country to allow distillers the privilege of importing corn for manufacturing purposes, I hold that it would be detrimental to the interest of the agricultural community to allow all corn to be imported free. As I come from the locality of the mover of the resolution I might say that in that neighborhood we

Mr. McDougald (Picton).

have an agricultural community, many of whom are in affluent circumstances, but the great mass of them do not feed cattle. Consequently although this resolution, if adopted by this House, would be in the interest of a few, I consider it would be detrimental to the interests of the agriculturists in the Dominion. Apparently when we on this side of the House make any attempt to introduce legislation for the benefit of the agriculturists our efforts are turned into ridicule by our opponents, and one hon. gentleman opposite took occasion to say that we looked upon the agricultural community as being simpletons and unable to take care of themselves and therefore required the intelligence of the representatives in Parliament to look after their particular interests. When the hon. member for Hamilton introduced a motion for a committee to inquire and investigate into the combines which were in existence, which were said to be detrimental to the best interests of the country and were the means of compelling the farmers to pay much more for their goods than was necessary, I considered he was quite sincere, that he was doing it in the interest of the people; and our effort certainly is entitled to the commendation of all parties in this House when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who does not very frequently agree with legislation emanating from this side of the House, approves of our efforts in that direction. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen opposite declare that the farmers are a very intelligent class of people. I admit that, and I assign that as the very reason for a majority of the representatives of the agricultural community in this House being on the Treasury benches. It is certainly owing to the intelligence of the farmers and their keen perception of the beneficial results of the policy adopted in 1878 by the leader of the Government. I had thought that after the last general election the question of the National Policy would not in any manner be discussed on the floor of this House. The leader of the Opposition went throughout the country not only voicing his own sentiments but pretending to voice the feelings of the great Reform party of this country. He also took the liberty to mention specially the name of Sir Richard Cartwright. He said that he used the name of that hon. gentleman for the reason that their opponents were so much in the habit of quoting him as being hostile to the National Policy. I think it was termed the alternative policy; he had a policy adapted to the interest of each Province in the Dominion. I certainly thought when our opponents on that occasion sacrificed every opinion they formerly advocated, when they put their views in accord with the views held by representatives on this side of the House and in accord with the policy adopted by the Government in 1878, and then failed to enlist a sufficient number of electors at the polls to place them on the Treasury benches—when they not only had the benefit of the policy adopted in 1878 by the Government, but whatever benefit might accrue from anything they might add to it—when, notwithstanding all this the general electors refused to place confidence in them and to place them on the Treasury benches, they would have ceased attacks on the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of speaking on every occasion as if sympathising with the agricultural community. I venture the assertion that if an investigation were made and the banking accounts of the agricultural community compared with those of the manufacturers, the farmers, with very few exceptions, would prove to be infinitely better off than the manufacturers. I know farmers in our section who have accumulated an estate in real and personal property amounting from \$50,000 to \$100,000. I know quite a number in my county who have accumulated that amount. I venture the assertion that there is not a manufacturer in my native (Halton) county who can make so good a showing. I think that I would be perfectly safe in stating to this

House that some of the members on the Opposition benches who so frequently take up the cause of the agriculturists of this country the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) for one and the hon. member the agriculturist for East Huron (Mr. McMillan) that either of those men would not exchange their financial positions for that of any manufacturer who resides in their county. I make that assertion, and I am quite satisfied that I can prove it. The manufacturers they refer to as having become bloated monopolists, are men who acquired wealth previous to the induction of the National Policy. Take Harris & Sons, of Brantford, for instance, as well as others I could mention, and these gentlemen accumulated an immense amount of wealth before the introduction of the National Policy. Take the manufacturing industries that have sprung up in my own county town and in the rural sections of the county and you will find that they have hard work to struggle along and eke out a subsistence. I am satisfied they are in a much worse position financially than some of the agriculturists of the county. If this National Policy had not been productive of great benefit to the whole community of this country then I think they would have just reason to complain, but all the predictions made as to the beneficial results that would accrue from the introduction of the National Policy have been realised. We asserted that it would stimulate and foster the manufacturing industries of the country, and it has largely increased those industries and given employment to a vast number of laborers. Consequently there has been a vast increase in the home consumption to the benefit of the agricultural producers of the country. Gentlemen of the opposite side may say that prices have fallen, but other causes have brought about that. They certainly cannot deny the fact that a large increase in the consumption of agricultural products has taken place since the introduction of the National Policy. I know that the prices of everything consumed by the people of Canada are much lower to-day than they were previous to the National Policy, and that people can live much cheaper now than they could then. Although agricultural products have shrunk in value we know that everything which enters into the consumption of the agriculturist has reduced much more in price than the farm products have. Take, for instance, the binders manufactured by Harris & Son at Brantford. Before the National Policy the binders sold for \$300 and to-day you can buy one for \$150. That is a reduction of one hundred per cent., and agricultural products have not shrunk so much in value. If you go all through the list you will find the same thing occur. Although our opponents on the other side of the House oppose the National Policy they would be quite willing to join their fortunes with a country which has a protective tariff more than double what ours is to-day. These hon. members resent the imposition of the duty as a tax. They say it is a tax upon the people of this country. I will suppose for the moment that it is a tax and I will compare the taxes levied on the people of Canada with the taxes levied on the people of the United States, and we will see in what a much better position we stand. The constitution of the United States provides that the public lands and timber limits are vested in the Federal Government at Washington, the proceeds of the sales of which go into the treasury at Washington, not one cent being contributed towards state legislation. In Canada the receipts from the sale of those lands and of timber limits and mines belong to the Provinces of the Dominion. In addition to that our Government at Ottawa pay to each of the Provinces a subsidy equivalent to about 80 cents per head. In 1887 there were \$66,000,000 collected from the people of the United States for the purpose of supporting the state legislatures; that amounted to \$1.10 per head on a population of sixty millions, and it amounts to \$3.40 per thousand on every thousand dollars of the assessed value of real and

personal property through the entire United States. Now a farmer, or a mechanic or any other individual living in the United States assessed for \$5,000 has got to contribute towards the taxes of his country \$17 more than a man in a similar position in Canada. During the twenty years from 1867 to 1887 the highest annual average of the duties imposed by the Federal Government at Washington was 49½ per cent. and the lowest rate was 25 per cent., while in Canada the highest annual average rate imposed by the Dominion was 21 per cent. and the lowest 10 per cent. The amount of money collected from the people of Canada from 1867 up to the present time under the duty which we imposed upon them was \$231,000,000. Had we imposed the American duty upon the people of this country in place of Canadian duty we would have collected \$609,000,000; the difference being \$327,000,000. We are said to have a national debt of \$227,000,000 and deducting that from \$327,000,000 it would leave a surplus of \$100,000,000. We have paid during these twenty years \$70,000,000 to the different Provinces in the shape of subsidies, so that if the people of Canada had contributed in the shape of revenue the same as the people of the United States have done, we would not only have our national debt paid off but we would have a surplus of \$170,000,000. I am not in favor of interfering at all with the National Policy. I believe that the best interests of this country are to be promoted by not only the retention, but the extension of the National Policy whenever it becomes necessary. I understand that the millers of Ontario are grumbling considerably about their investments. They are complaining that they have not a sufficient duty on flour. Some years ago I put up a flour mill myself at considerable expense. At present I have that flour mill rented, and it pays me about three per cent. interest on the investment, and the tenant is unable to pay the rent; so that taking into consideration the amount of capital invested, I think more protection is due to the milling industry of this country, and I hope those hon. members from the eastern Provinces, who have been lauding the benefits which have been accruing to them from the National Policy, will take no exception to the Government putting a little extra duty on flour to increase the protection of the Ontario millers. I noticed a short time ago that a smelting furnace had been erected in British Columbia for the manufacture of lead. The present duty is \$3 a ton, and the Government are going to be asked for an increased duty. I hope the Government, in their wisdom, will see the propriety of acceding to the request, because the present duty in the United States is \$40 a ton. Now, the reason I am such a strong supporter of the National Policy, is because I generally look at things from a non-political standpoint. In order to get at the real merits of the case, I take that view of it, and I notice that in many of the towns and cities of the Dominion, Reformers and Conservatives alike, whenever occasion requires, are ready to vote to impose a direct tax upon themselves for the purpose of establishing a manufacturing industry in their own midst. The little town of Walkerton, in my riding, has given bonuses to the amount of \$20,000 for the purpose of stimulating manufacturing industries, and both Conservatives and Reformers unite in imposing upon themselves a tax for that purpose, and the tax is imperative they make the poor people of the town contribute. The marked difference between that policy and the policy of the Government is that the policy of the Government leaves it optional with the people to contribute or not to the support of the industries they protect. Those who do not choose to pay the duties they impose can get along without doing so. I think that is a very strong argument in favor of the National Policy. I think the town of Woodstock, in the County of Oxford, some years ago voted a bonus of \$35,000 to one manufacturing industry



there, the Patterson Manufacturing Company, and people in a town or city who will impose a direct tax upon themselves for the purpose of stimulating and fostering manufacturing industries should certainly approve of the policy of the present Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the question is put, I desire to say one or two words in reference to the question of drawback which has been paid to distillers and other manufacturers. The motion moved by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) deals with the one question alone; from that has evolved this discussion of the National Policy, and now we have three motions before the House. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to come to the Department and ascertain what the policy of the Government was, or to ask the simple question as to whether any application had ever been made by those who have to use corn or any other imported grain in the feeding of cattle, I would have been able to inform him that no application of that kind had ever been made, and consequently no refusal on the part of the Government could have followed. When an application is made for a rebate on corn or any other imported grain which is fed to cattle to be subsequently exported, I trust that I shall be enabled to deal with that question as I have with others of a like character. The hon. member for North Grey, and the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) and also the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), pointed out the difficulties which would present themselves in coming to a correct conclusion as to the amount of drawback which would have to be paid on grain fed to cattle intended for exportation. I do not propose to enter into the minutiae of that question at the present moment. I have simply to repeat that when the question comes before the department, I shall be enabled to deal with it, I hope, to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman who placed the motion on the Notice Paper. But I think his object was more to attack the Government through the Department of Customs upon this flimsy drawback—I use the word flimsy in reference to the amount which has been paid to the distillers—than to benefit those whom he has taken under his particular charge. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told the House that the drawback which had been paid to the distillers had materially affected the interests of the farmers of this Dominion. When I tell you that the only amount that has been paid to all the distilleries in the Dominion has been upon one exportation, and that amount not exceeding \$400, on corn which was used in the manufacture of spirits which were subsequently exported, and when you are told that this has so materially affected the interests of the farmers, it is difficult to come to a conclusion as to what the effect might have been—probably the ruin of the whole of them—if the distilleries had imported millions of bushels of corn, manufactured it into spirit, and then exported it out of the country. It seems to me nineteen-twentieths of the gentlemen on the Opposition side wish to convince the House that this is not a corn producing country. If it be not, then it is difficult to ascertain how the manufacture of corn into spirits, which are subsequently exported, could materially affect the farmers who grow other coarse grains. I am, however, glad to learn to-night that there are two hon. gentleman on the opposite side who have been converted to the National Policy, at least to the extent of the maintenance of the duty for the protection of the corn which is produced in the western section of the country. Now, I have no more to say at present upon the question of the drawback. When that question is brought before the Department, I repeat I shall be able to deal with it, notwithstanding the difficulties and the supposed reflections which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thought the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) cast upon the Minister of

Mr. CARGILL,

Customs. I may say, however, that I am not a little surprised at the motion made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). He, we know, is the advocate *par excellence* of the principle of prohibition. He, I have no doubt, is desirous of preventing the consumption of that which he says is so deleterious to the health of the human race in this country, and yet he objects to its being exported, and he attacks a policy which will enable the manufacturer to export it out of this country and prevent at least the hon. gentleman's friends and those who live in the country from consuming it. I do not know that he could have any other object in view than to make whiskey cheap, especially as it is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to increase the purchasing power of the people in this country in this respect, so that they will be enabled to get this fluid at a cheaper rate and thereby consume more of it. At least that principle was laid down in a report made to this House in 1878, presented and signed by an honorable gentleman, whose name is Wilfred Laurier. I do not know whether that was the gentleman who now leads so well and so valiantly the Opposition, but I think it was, if my memory serves me right, for I had the honor of a seat in the House at that time. That hon. gentleman, in presenting his report to Parliament, told the people that the reason there was not so much spirits consumed in this country as formerly was because the purchasing power of the people had materially decreased, but that he had hope in the future that as the purchasing power of the people increased so would the consumption of spirits increase, and thereby the revenue would increase in equal proportions. I suppose the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) is desirous of increasing the purchasing power of the people in this particular article.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says "no." Then I am surprised that he should ask to have an article placed upon the free list which would enable the distillers to produce spirits cheaper than they can while the duty is imposed upon it; and if they can produce whiskey with cheap corn, they will give it to my hon. friend or those who like it at a cheaper rate than they do now. Whether that will be his mode of advocating prohibition I do not know, but it seems to me it would be much better for his consistency if he would ask to have the corn put upon the free list for the purpose of feeding cattle, and of feeding the people if necessary, and to have a tax put upon that used in the manufacture of whiskey. That is what I supposed he would have done, but we have instead the bald proposition before us now to give cheap corn, as the hon. gentleman says, to the farmers and to the distillers; and it is the distiller that pays \$99 out of \$100 and more which is collected upon this article. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) pointed to my young friend from Hastings (Mr. Corby) and said that he certainly could vote for this motion. There is no question but that he could. If the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) would vote for this motion it would be putting annually from about \$3,000 or \$5,000 in his pocket, for that is about the duty he pays on the corn used in his distillery; but my hon. friend is too patriotic for that. He is conducting a business that can stand the tax, and he knows that the admission of free corn would injure the farming population who have sent him to this House, and he has their interest at stake rather than that of his own pocket. But hon. gentlemen might say that the higher the tax the higher would be the price of whiskey to those who drink it. For one I say that as high a rate should be imposed as can be taken out of the distillers, and if I buy whiskey I have no objection to paying well for it. I, therefore, do not follow the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) in the position he has assumed, that we should fur-

nish the raw material free in order that we may get cheap whiskey. I rose merely to explain the policy of the Government in reference to the question of drawbacks and nothing more. If the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) were here, I would say that I differ *in toto* from the position laid down, as to the benefits to be derived by the country from the granting of drawbacks to manufacturers who export their products. The principle of granting drawbacks on the articles exported is incidental to the principle of protection. If the manufacturers have a surplus and they desire to carry on their industries in order to keep their men employed, they must get rid of that surplus in some way, and so long as a foreign market is open to them, the Parliament of Canada and the Government should adopt, in my opinion, such a policy as will enable them to export their goods and compete in that foreign market with the manufacturers of other nations. I am glad to know that at present our manufacturers are exporting organs, sewing machines, threshing machines, nails and horse shoes, and almost every article which is manufactured in the country. Out of \$1,250,000 output of one industry in Toronto during the past year, about \$250,000 worth has been exported; and I have no doubt, if we extended the principle of drawbacks to that industry, the manufacturer will be enabled to double and perhaps quadruple his export trade. It has been advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, who profess free trade principles, that we should not only grant drawbacks on articles imported of the rate of duty paid, but that we should give them a drawback equal to the duty on the articles manufactured in Canada. That would be adopting the American system of bonuses, and it is a great question whether in our country we would be justified in extending the principle to that extent, but I am not sure if in the interest of manufacturing industries and of those employed by the manufacturers, that step would not be advisable if Parliament desired or thought proper to adopt the system. There is much more I would like to say on this question, but I think the debate has been well sustained. I am not sorry that the whole principle of the National Policy has been attacked, because the country will learn that the principle which was enunciated by the ex-leader of the Government in his speech at Malvern is being adopted at present. In that speech he said the people could not, under the circumstances and under the requirements of the country repeal the National Policy, as it then existed, but that there should be a certain readjustment, and in view of that readjustment the Opposition were to attack the duty on wheat, corn, and one or two other articles by which they hoped to catch a few stray votes in the Maritime Provinces. Beyond that their great intellects never thought of going, and the country by this time will have learned what the true policy of the Opposition is.

Mr. SCRIVER. With regard to what my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has said in reference to the position taken by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), accusing him of inconsistency in the motion which he made because, forsooth, if corn were introduced into the Dominion free of duty, the distillers would be able to make whiskey cheaper, I desire to say this: My hon. friend the Minister of Customs is, I think, a good temperance man. I believe he has been so for a long time, and I think he is a consistent one, but he forgets that he belongs to a Ministry that has favored distillers at the expense—I will not say at the expense, but as a class—in preference to other classes of the community, and I do not think that, under those circumstances, he can accuse my hon. friend from Brome of inconsistency. In fact, my hon. friend from Brome could hardly be consistent with his political views in regard to protection if he placed his motion in any other way than he did. It would not be consistent for him to discriminate against any

class. He moves that corn shall be admitted into the country free of duty, and it would not be proper for him or for the party to which he belongs to say that any class of persons using that article should be discriminated against. I think, therefore, that the Minister of Customs has failed to make his point against the member for Brome or to show that he has been, in his motion, or in any of the remarks he made, anything but strictly consistent. I desire to say just a word in reference to the broader motion made by the hon. member for Brome. It occurred to me, when the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) made his motion that, if it were possible that such a motion could pass, there would be a great practical difficulty in carrying it out, and I was glad, because of the principle involved, that the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) enlarged the motion by his amendment. I was glad, because I think it would be greatly for the interest of the greater part of the Dominion, and especially for the Province from which I come, if the farmers were permitted to bring in corn free of duty. I am satisfied from my own observation, and from what I have learned from other representatives of different parts of the Province from which I come, that the agricultural interest is not nearly so prosperous as it has been for some years past, particularly in the valley of the St. Lawrence, where the people depend almost altogether for their gains or profits on the raising and the sale of coarse grains. I was surprised to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) on this question. My hon. friend represents a county which, like most of the counties in the valleys of the St. Lawrence and the Richelieu, depends largely on raising and selling coarse grains, and the people have, by the processes they have pursued, greatly exhausted their farms. They not only raise and sell these coarse grains, but they also sell large quantities of their hay. If I am not mistaken, the county which my hon. friend represents is a very large exporter of hay, and has been for many years past, and I was surprised two or three years ago to hear him speak approvingly of the condition of things which existed in his county, of the prosperity which existed in his county, and the great sums of money which were realised from these products. My hon. friend is an able man and a shrewd man, and, although he is not a farmer, I have no doubt his observation has been sufficiently attracted to those practices to enable him to see the injury which they inflict, not only on his own county, but upon all the counties situated as his county is. I believe that the only possible salvation for these counties is a change in the system of agriculture. Their only salvation will be in following the example set by the county I represent, and by the people of the Eastern Townships counties generally, and that is, a system of mixed farming, and especially a system of dairy farming. I am sorry to say my neighbors to the north of me in the valley of the St. Lawrence and in the valley of the Richelieu pursue this system of farming to a very limited extent, and this process of exhaustion is going on, and its evils are becoming more and more marked; whereas in the Eastern Townships counties, and particularly in the County of Huntington which I represent, the dairy system which was very small a few years ago has assumed large proportions and has caused a great improvement in the condition of those counties. In the county which I represent there are some fifty cheese factories, and some \$300,000 were paid to the farmers last year for that product. The farmers are not only feeding the coarse grain which they raise themselves, but that which they import from other parts of the country; and, but for this duty on corn, they would import it from the United States, and have it ground with their own coarse grains and use it very largely. For that reason, the people generally of that district in the Province of Quebec, and, in fact, of all parts of that Province, are very largely interested in being allowed to import corn free of duty.

Mr. KIRK. Were it not for a remark which fell from the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) in the course of the speech he made, I would not ask the indulgence of the House at this late hour. That hon. gentleman stated that the people of the Maritime Provinces were compensated by duties placed upon industries belonging to those Provinces for the high duties they had to pay on articles belonging to other Provinces, and he instanced the article of iron, the article of coal, and the fishing industry. As to the first two, I shall have nothing to say, because they were well answered by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The hon. gentleman, however, thought proper to say that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces had their bread buttered on both sides and wanted some jam thrown in. How did he attempt to prove that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces had their bread buttered on both sides and wanted some jam thrown in? He said that this Parliament paid bounties to fishermen. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has already shown that the moneys paid to fishermen in the way of bounties did not belong to anyone but the fishermen themselves, and therefore, when Parliament voted the \$150,000 per annum to be paid to the fishermen, it voted only the money to which they were entitled, irrespective altogether of the National Policy, and not as a compensation for the moneys taken away from them for duties on other articles. They have had their bread buttered on both sides, it is true, and how buttered? The irritating policy of the Government towards the United States, the severe Customs regulations enforced against the fishermen of that country, have had the effect of preventing the United States Government from taking the duties off fish. When the fishermen of this Dominion send their fish there, they find that they must pay a high duty before they can offer them for sale. Their bread on one side is buttered there by the high duties they have to pay in the United States. Then, again, when duties were placed upon fish coming from the United States, this Government also placed duties upon fish coming from Newfoundland. The fishermen of this Dominion were to be protected from all quarters, and what was the result? They had their bread buttered on the other side in the interests of the Ontario millers and Montreal flour dealers; they have had their bread buttered on the other side by this Government throwing the market open to Newfoundland fish in order that they might obtain a free market in Newfoundland for flour. In that way the interests of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces were sacrificed to the interest of an Ontario industry; therefore it did not lie in the mouth of an Ontario representative to say that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces had their bread buttered on both sides in order to compensate them for duties they had to pay in the interests of Ontario. And then where does the jam come in? The jam comes in by the duties placed upon flour and meal. My hon. friend from Cape Breton is prepared to raise the duty to a dollar a barrel on cornmeal, providing the Government will only be good enough to leave the duty of 60 cents a ton upon bituminous coal. Well, I have heard of people willing to sacrifice all their wife's relations in order that they might save themselves. That is just the way with the hon. member for Cape Breton; he is willing to sacrifice every other interest if only his darling pet is well fed. Now this is all that I intended to say when I arose, although some time ago, at an earlier hour in the evening, if I had had an opportunity, I would have said something upon the other two industries mentioned by the hon. member for North Grey, but as it is so late I shall defer the remarks that I have to make until some other time.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not at all intend to enter into this discussion, but there is one remark that I wish to make

Mr. SCRIVER,

before it is closed. I have listened to the speech just delivered by the Minister of Customs, and though he has introduced my name in it, I fail to see in what connection he could do so, or what argument he could make out of it. The only point made by the Hon. Minister of Customs was as to the rebate paid by the distillers. The hon. gentleman stated that it was not worth while for my hon. friend who moved this motion, to make it, because, he said, if he had taken the trouble to go into the department he would have found that the rebate made by the distillers during the last year was something like \$400. He said: "Surely for the paltry sum of \$400 it was useless to make all the fuss that has been made on that side of the House"—speaking of this side. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not simply a question of fact introduced by my hon. friend, it is a question of principle. If the distiller makes profits on the rebate only to the extent of \$400, he can profit to the extent of \$400,000, and if the principle is there that rebate is given to the distillers who exports whiskey, why in the name of creation should not the same privilege be allowed to the farmer who exports cattle? The tariff is framed in such a manner as to encourage the distiller to manufacture and export whiskey; why not also frame it so as to encourage the farmer to import corn and to convert it into beef and export it? This is what is claimed by my hon. friend from Grey. It is a question of principle, and if the principle is allowed in one industry, why should it not be allowed in another industry? If the principle is allowed in a very small industry like the distilling of whiskey, why should it not be allowed in the largest industry of all and the most meritorious? It is the old question at issue between the Government and ourselves. I will not at this hour of the evening say more; we may come back to this question some other time, but I will just say this, that in these few words of the Minister of Customs lies the whole difference between the Government and the Opposition. The Government are favoring the mighty few, and we are working for the struggling masses.

House divided on amendment to the amendment (Mr Flynn):

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ellis,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Meigs,
Barron,	Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),
Beausoleil,	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Béchar, -	Gauthier,	Neveu,
Borden,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Bowman,	Godbout,	Platt,
Burdett,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Hale,	Robertson,
Oacey,	Innes,	Rowand,
Osgrain,	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Choquette,	Landerkin,	Scriver,
Chouinard,	Larg,	Semple,
Colter,	Langelier (Montm'ency),	Somerville,
Cook,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Couture,	Laurier,	Trow,
Davies,	Lavergne,	Turot,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Waldie,
Dessaint,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin), and
Edwards,	McMillan (Huron),	Yeo.—70.
Eisenhauer,		

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Amyot,	Dickinson,	Marshall,
Audet,	Dupont,	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Foster,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Freeman,	Moncrieff,
Bell,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Gironard,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Porter,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Prior,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Brien,	Hall,	Riopel,

Brown,  
Bryson,  
Burns,  
Cameron,  
Campbell,  
Cargill,  
Carling,  
Carpenter,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Chisholm,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Cockburn,  
Colby,  
Corby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coulombe,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Davin,  
Dawson,  
Denison,  
Desjardins,  
Dickey,

Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hudspeth,  
Jamieson,  
Kirkpatrick,  
Labelle,  
Labrosse,  
Landry,  
Langevin (Sir Hector),  
La Rivière,  
Laurie,  
Lépine,  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Macdowall,  
McCulla,  
McDonald (Victoria),  
McDougald (Pictou),  
McDougall (O. Breton),  
McGreavy,  
McKay,  
McKeen,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McNeill,  
Madill,  
Mara,

Robillard,  
Roome,  
Ross,  
Shanly,  
Small,  
Smith (Ontario),  
Sproule,  
Stevenson,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Thérien,  
Thompson (Sir John),  
Tisdale,  
Tupper,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace,  
Ward,  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wilmot,  
Wilson (Argenteuil),  
Wilson (Lennox),  
Wood (Brockville), and  
Wood (Westm'land)—112

Coulombe,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Davin,  
Davis,  
Dawson,  
Denison,  
Desjardins,

McDougall (O. Breton),  
McGreavy,  
McKay,  
McKeen,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McNeill,  
Madill,  
Mara,  
Ward,  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wilmot,  
Wilson (Argenteuil),  
Wilson (Lennox),  
Wood (Brockville), and  
Wood (Westm'land)—111

Amendment negatived.

House divided on resolution (Mr. Landerkin):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Barron,  
Beausoleil,  
Béchar, Borden,  
Bourassa,  
Bowman,  
Burdette,  
Campbell,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Choquette,  
Chouinard,  
Colter,  
Cook,  
Couture,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges,  
Dessaint,  
Doyon,  
Edgar,  
Edwards,

Eisenhauer,  
Ellis,  
Fiset,  
Fisher,  
Flynn,  
Gauthier,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Godbout,  
Guay,  
Hale,  
Innes,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Langelier (Montm'ency),  
Langelier (Quebec),  
Laurier,  
Lavergne,  
Lister,  
Lovitt,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
McIntyre,  
McMillan (Huron),

McMullen,  
Meigs,  
Mills (Bothwell),  
Mitchell,  
Neveu,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Perry,  
Platt,  
Rinfret,  
Robertson,  
Rowand,  
Ste. Marie,  
Scriven,  
Semple,  
Somerville,  
Sutherland,  
Trow,  
Turcot,  
Waldie,  
Watson,  
Weldon (St. John),  
Wilson (Elgin), and  
Yeo.—71.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Fisher):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Barron,  
Beausoleil,  
Béchar, Borden,  
Bourassa,  
Bowman,  
Burdett,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Choquette,  
Chouinard,  
Colter,  
Cook,  
Couture,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges,  
Dessaint,  
Doyon,  
Edgar,  
Edwards,  
Eisenhauer,

Ellis,  
Fiset,  
Fisher,  
Flynn,  
Gauthier,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Godbout,  
Guay,  
Hale,  
Innes,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Langelier (Montm'ency),  
Langelier (Quebec),  
Laurie,  
Laurier,  
Lavergne,  
Lister,  
Lovitt,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
McIntyre,  
McMillan (Huron),

McMullen,  
Meigs,  
Mills (Bothwell),  
Mitchell,  
Neveu,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Perry,  
Platt,  
Rinfret,  
Robertson,  
Rowand,  
Ste. Marie,  
Scriven,  
Semple,  
Somerville,  
Sutherland,  
Trow,  
Turcot,  
Waldie,  
Watson,  
Weldon (St. John),  
Wilson (Elgin), and  
Yeo.—71.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,  
Audet,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baird,  
Barnard,  
Bell,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Boisvert,  
Bowell,  
Boyle,  
Brien,  
Brown,  
Bryson,  
Burns,  
Cameron,  
Campbell,  
Cargill,  
Carling,  
Carpenter,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Chisholm,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Cockburn,  
Colby,  
Corby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
18

Dickey,  
Dickinson,  
Dupont,  
Ferguson (Renfrew),  
Foster,  
Freeman,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hudspeth,  
Jamieson,  
Kirkpatrick,  
Labelle,  
Labrosse,  
Landry,  
Langevin (Sir Hector),  
La Rivière,  
Lépine,  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Macdowall,  
McCulla,  
McDonald (Victoria),  
McDougald (Pictou),  
Wallace,

Marshall,  
Masson,  
Mills (Annapolis),  
Moffat,  
Moncreiff,  
Montplaisir,  
O'Brien,  
Perley,  
Porter,  
Prior,  
Putnam,  
Riopol,  
Robillard,  
Roome,  
Ross,  
Shanly,  
Small,  
Smith (Ontario),  
Sproule,  
Stevenson,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Thérien,  
Thompson (Sir John),  
Tisdale,  
Tupper,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Vanasse,

Amyot,  
Audet,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baird,  
Barnard,  
Bell,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Boisvert,  
Bowell,  
Boyle,  
Brien,  
Brown,  
Bryson,  
Burns,  
Cameron,  
Cargill,  
Carling,  
Carpenter,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Chisholm,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Cockburn,  
Colby,  
Corby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coulombe,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Davin,  
Davis,  
Dawson,  
Denison,  
Desjardins,  
Dickey,

Dickinson,  
Dupont,  
Ferguson (Renfrew),  
Foster,  
Freeman,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hudspeth,  
Jamieson,  
Kirkpatrick,  
Labelle,  
Labrosse,  
Landry,  
Langevin (Sir Hector),  
La Rivière,  
Laurie,  
Lépine,  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
Macdowall,  
McCulla,  
McDonald (Victoria),  
McDougald (Pictou),  
McDougall (O. Breton),  
McGreavy,  
McKay,  
McKeen,  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McNeill,  
Madill,  
Mara,

Marshall,  
Masson,  
Mills (Annapolis),  
Moffat,  
Moncreiff,  
Montplaisir,  
O'Brien,  
Perley,  
Porter,  
Prior,  
Putnam,  
Riopol,  
Robillard,  
Roome,  
Ross,  
Shanly,  
Small,  
Smith (Ontario),  
Sproule,  
Stevenson,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Thérien,  
Thompson (Sir John),  
Tisdale,  
Tupper,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace,  
Ward,  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Renfrew),  
Wilmot,  
Wilson (Argenteuil),  
Wilson (Lennox),  
Wood (Brockville), and  
Wood (Westm'land)—111

Motion negatived.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.35 a. m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th February, 1869.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending 30th June, 1868.—(Mr. Carling.)

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Central Counties Railway Company."—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the St. Helen's Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

## SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Department of Marine..... \$27,887

Mr. FOSTER. The total increase in this department is \$2,825. There are nine statutory increases of \$50 each, one increase of \$25, and one chief clerk, a transference from the High Commissioner's office in London, \$2,350.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the circumstances that led to the transfer?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chipman, who was the clerk transferred, had been in the High Commissioner's office in London, and had acted while Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Finance during last year as his private secretary here? In the re-organisation of the office in London Mr. Chipman was transferred to the Department of Marine, and he became private secretary to the Minister of Marine. Another transference of a clerk, at a less salary, has been made to the London office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, as a mere matter of convenience apparently to a gentleman who has served in the London office, the expenses of this department are to be increased by about \$2,000. I must say that appears to be about as unsatisfactory an explanation as I have ever listened to or heard offered in this House. Year after year these charges for civil government are swelling to an enormous extent, monstrosly out of proportion to the total amount of money expended, and now, apparently without rhyme or reason, we find at one bound the Department of Marine increased by over 10 per cent., from \$25,000 to \$27,885. It appears to me that this is a perfectly uncalled-for and perfectly unreasonable expenditure with which to saddle that department.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite true that this increase of \$2,350 appears here, but, if it appears here, it was taken from a place where it appeared last year and where the whole amount was paid last year, with the exception of the \$50 increases. It is simply a transfer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is no excuse for adding to the expense of the Marine Department. If an inferior officer at less salary can do the work in London, by all means let him do it, but that is no sort of excuse for adding \$2,350 to a department that is already costing quite as much as it is worth.

Mr. TUPPER. I would say in regard to this matter, and as offering some explanation to the hon. gentleman, that it would not be possible, or, at all events, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would propose that if an officer with a less salary could do the work in London, this officer should lose his salary altogether. This officer receives simply the same salary this year as he received last year. There is not one farthing increase to the public. The question of the transference is an entirely different matter. If the hon. gentleman proposes to take issue with myself or with the Government, in regard to the necessity of putting an additional officer into the Marine Department, that is an entirely different question; but the public pays no more in connection with this transference than it did last year, as was apparent from the explanation of the Minister of Finance. I may say to the hon. gentleman, whether he will accept the statement from me or not, that we have by no means too many officers in the Department of Marine to-day. It is a department controlling an enormous expenditure, made up of almost thousands of petty accounts, as the hon. gentleman will recollect was the case in his time. The accounts are increasing every year of necessity, as new lights and new causes of expenditure occur, and I may tell him—perhaps he is not aware of it—that the work of the department has largely increased of late, because we have adopted a system of more direct supervision over the expenditure at the different agencies; and I am happy to be able to say that since we inaugurated that system, while additional work has been thrown on the head office, I am prepared to show a saving of \$50,000 a year. I think that would be an explanation to a large extent satisfactory, even to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not hear the Finance Minister's explanation of this transfer. Do I understand that the gentleman transferred now to the Marine Department was engaged in business connected with the department before?

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, there is a distinct increase in the staff of the department.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, as I say, but not to the service generally.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not an answer.

Mr. TUPPER. The transfer imposed no additional tax on the people of this country. It was a transfer from one office to another, and the officer who took the place of this officer in the High Commissioner's office, was already in the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The answer to that may reasonably be given, that this officer was employed before the transfer, in work that was not required to be done, and he is transferred now to another department. Under these circumstances I must join in the language used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and say that there has been no good reason shown for this change. A year or two ago I rose in my place in this House and protested as vigorously as I could against the division of the

Marine and Fisheries Department, because I believed it was done for the purpose of perpetrating a job upon this country. That department was divided into two branches, with a deputy head for each, and I predicted then, what all previous experience had shown would be the result, that as soon as those deputy heads were appointed they would not be satisfied until they increased the expenses in each of their departments. No deputy head in Ottawa would be satisfied with having a less staff under him than the other deputy heads. I predicted then that in a few years we would have as large a staff in the Fishery Department as in any other branch of the service. The then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. McLelan) contradicted that, but what has been the result? Year after year the expenses of that department, which ought to be diminishing, are increasing rapidly. I hold that our predictions have been fully justified by the results since, and I must say that in the absence of further explanation there is nothing to justify the transfer of another official to the Marine Department, unless you can show that there was some extra work requiring his services. Is it to be contended that because so many men are in the public service that they are to be retained there for ever, and that the people are to be congratulated when officials are transferred from one department to another on the Minister stating that the general expenses have not been increased. That is no answer, and unless the work of the department required his services his transfer cannot be justified. We have yet to hear a satisfactory explanation from the hon. Minister. I should like to have his opinion—but if he has not studied the question I do not ask for his opinion—as to whether he thinks it is necessary to have that department divided into two and to have a deputy head presiding over the Fishery branch and another over the Marine branch. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) shakes his head as if he wishes to indicate that the division was necessary. I differ with him on that point. I may not have as good an opportunity of judging as he has, but, from all the information I can gather, I have come to the conclusion that the division was made for the purpose of perpetrating a job on this country and of appointing a man to the position of deputy head who was not entitled to it. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he has given his attention to that question and whether he is prepared to justify that division of the department before this House. I know that there is a large amount of work in the Fisheries Department, but it is work created to a great extent by themselves. A very large amount of the work consists in paying the bounties which they give to fishermen, and I have no hesitation in saying here that if the members of this House think that the distribution of those bounties is a great boon to the fishermen they are very much mistaken. I make the statement deliberately that not 50 per cent. of the bounties ever find its way into the pockets of the fishermen. It is anticipated by middlemen here and there and the amount is very small when the fisherman gets it. My colleague from King's County, who comes from the very centre of the fishery district, told me, the other day, that in many cases a man gets only two, three or four dollars. The fisherman has to go to the customs officer, some five or six miles away, to get it; some hitch occurs, and he has to walk back to make an affidavit before a justice of the peace. He tramps around for three or four days, and after an amount of redtapeism, having lost his time, he obtains a couple of dollars. I do not say that this is unnecessary, for it may be necessary to prevent frauds, which I know have occurred, but large numbers of them frankly admit that the system of paying those bounties is a false one, and that the fishermen do not get the benefit which the Minister and others who devised the system think they do get. Apart from the work entailed by this bounty system there is no other work requiring a

division of that department, in my opinion. I protest against the yearly increase that is going on in the different departments of the Government, and especially in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MITCHELL I am sorry I have got to differ with a gentleman with whom I am so much in accord on so many points. I do differ with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in relation to the necessity for the division of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries. In 1867, when I had the honor of organising that department, I recommended that there should be two deputy heads, but the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government then, and at the head of the Government of to-day, in his wisdom on that occasion thought, as there was no precedent for having two deputy heads, that he could not afford to let the Fishery Department have a second deputy. I must say that having the two branches under the one deputy did not work well. The deputy head of Marine did not understand the question of Fisheries, and the duties of the two branches are quite distinct, and have nothing whatever in common with one another. I feel that I should say, in justice to the Minister, that the division is one in which I entirely approve, and I do not think there was any job perpetrated when that department was divided. But, Sir, in relation to Mr. Chipman, I do not know the reasons which necessitated his transfer from the office at London to the Marine and Fisheries Department here. It may have suited his convenience to be so transferred. Mr. Chipman occupied a confidential position with the High Commissioner in London, and he is one of that hon. gentleman's constituents in Nova Scotia. He may have desired the change, and it is always very desirable to meet the wishes of the employees of the Government, and to place them where they can be more conveniently situated in connection with their relation to their families, than perhaps they would be if they had the Atlantic rolling between them. But a transaction of that kind should be made without any sacrifice to the public interest. I do not think that any additional help was needed in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and if it were, we ought to have some fuller explanation about it. While I am on my feet, I may as well ask the Minister two or three questions, and I trust he will give the information which I desire, in relation to matters connected with the fisheries of my county. For years, Sir,—

Mr. TUPPER. That will come under the next item. The Fisheries is a separate book, and this is for the Marine Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. All right; I will reserve it.

Mr. TUPPER. I have just a word to say on this matter. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has given a far better and more valuable opinion to this House in connection with the necessity of dividing this department than I can possibly give, my experience being limited. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has no experience in the matter, and what he has said in this case is his hard-and-fast opinion on the subject. Nothing but a little experience, which he may possibly have some day, will, I think, alter that opinion. For the present I will leave the defence of this matter in the hands of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). Next Session, or the Session after, I will be able to speak with more weight and authority from the result of experience as to what the interests of the service are with reference to that division. At present I can only say that the officers of both those departments are worked as hard as any officers in the service of the Government can possibly be worked. They have as much as they can do. I may say further to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), that I think he is not in touch with the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces in his criticism of the bounty system. I can tell him in

reference to the remarks he has made regarding the distribution of the bounty money to the fishermen, that so popular and so valuable to the fishermen is that bounty system that only this last season, when on many parts of the coast the shore fisheries were not as good as in ordinary years, we received letter after letter from the representatives of the district and from the fishermen themselves, praying that we would make extra speed in the distribution of that bounty; and although my experience in the department is limited, I can assure the hon. gentleman of this fact, that I have not yet received any charges of unfairness in the distribution of that money by the different officers. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that the department is bound to exercise the closest scrutiny, which involves some delay in connection with the different claims sent in, and he knows that of necessity some of these claims must be rejected; but there have been no serious complaints to the department before this season, when one of the Cape Breton members, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) called on me and informed me that there was some dissatisfaction in his district; and that hon. gentleman will bear me out that I at once told him that I would make the closest examination into the matter, as I will do. But that is the only complaint which has been made as to the distribution of these bounties since I have been in office. So that I think the hon. gentleman will not make much of that point. Now, I am not going to repeat what I said about the services of Mr. Chipman. The hon. gentleman says that I have not shown that his services were necessary. Well, if the hon. gentleman will come and spend a day with me in the department, that will be the best way to satisfy him; he will not take my statement, and I can give him no better proof that we did need the services of this officer. I gave him what I thought was an intelligent reason, that the work in the department had increased largely in consequence of centralising to a great extent the supervision of the spending power, and the fact that we exercise a greater control over the different agencies and the construction of lighthouses throughout the different Provinces than existed before, and with good effect. I think I shall be able to show to the House that we have saved some \$50,000 a year by that system. I thought, and I think now, that that is some explanation. A considerable portion, I readily admit, depends on my experience, and it is difficult to lay that all before the House in this way.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I was interrupted a little while ago, and as the hon. gentleman has dealt with the fishery question, I wish to take exception to two or three things he has stated. The hon. gentleman has passed the most severe censure upon his predecessors in that department that any public man can do. In a department that is not the first department of the Government, although it is an important one, he says he has saved \$50,000 and ascribes that to a better supervision over the different branches and over the construction of lights. I would like him to show where he has performed so much extra services in the construction of lights. I cannot find it in the blue-books, and I do not think any system he has adopted for the supervision of the branches of the department is very much improvement. I recollect when that department built thirty lighthouses year after year with a much less staff than it has to-day, and with much less cost to the country; and I do not think the hon. gentleman pays much of a compliment to the gentlemen who immediately preceded him, the present Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, the present Minister of Finance, the late Hon. Mr. Pope, or the late Sir Albert Smith; and, for myself, I can only say that I would like my hon. friend to institute a comparison and bring down a statement of the expenditure of the department to-day compared with the expenditure during the years when we did three times

Mr. TUPPER.

the amount of work in connection with lighthouses, while our expenditure was considerably less. I do not say this by way of attacking the expenditures of the department, but I merely wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention as a young Minister to the reflection which he has cast upon his predecessors as well as upon myself, and I do not intend to lie under any imputation that is not true; it is not my practice to do so. I think it would simplify matters if, while on my feet, I dealt with both the marine and fishery matters together, and with the permission of the Chair, I will do so, as it will save the necessity of my speaking again. What I wanted to find out from my hon. friend was, first, something in connection with local matters in my own county, and then, something on a great public question. Last night it was said that I am a local man. I am a local man, and I am proud to be so; but I think I am broad and expansive enough to deal with the interests of this whole Dominion, which I am helping to govern, for, although I am not on the inside, I govern it a good deal from without, and I intend to continue trying to do so in future. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in my county in relation to the restrictions put upon the fishing of smelts in the Miramichi River. If my hon. friend chooses to obtain the statistics of the quantity of smelts shipped from that river, he will see that it is one of the most valuable rivers for winter fishing in this Dominion, perhaps none more so. The complaints which have come from the fishermen have been very loud and very often repeated. I say this, not to reflect upon the management of the department by my hon. friend, but in order to get information. I would like my hon. friend at some future day to bring down copies of the Orders in Council relating to the charges in connection with the smelt fishing during the last ten years; it will enable me to judge whether or not my constituents who follow that pursuit have been unfairly dealt with or not. If the hon. gentleman will bring me down that information, he will save me the trouble of making a motion for it in the House.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. The next point I want to understand is the position we stand in towards the American fishermen, and assuming the *modus vivendi*, the benefits of which we heard so much about two years ago, is to be put in operation or suspended? I would like to know in what position our fishermen are going to be with regard to American competition in our fishing waters when the next season opens, and whether any negotiations or steps have taken place recently with the American Government for the purpose of bringing about an *entente cordiale* in relation to matters concerning which great difficulties have arisen and retaliation is threatened? I would like to ask another question, whether the policy of the Government is to enforce that absurd restriction of preventing the transport of fish over the railways of Canada to the United States? That is a question upon which I never agreed with the Government. When the fisheries difficulty arose some two years ago, when the first recent seizures were made, I felt that the Administration of the day were making a great mistake in pursuing a course which was going to give great offence to the people of the United States without at all benefitting the people of Canada. What possible harm could it do to us to have our railways employed in the transport of American fish? When the Treaty of 1818, under which we have been claiming those exclusive privileges, was made, there were no railways in existence in the country, there were no lines of transport, and no mutual arrangement for a bonding system and a transport system between the United States and Canada. All that has sprung up since then, and I blame the right hon. the leader of the Government for having ever made that extraordinary attempt to have a one-sided arrangement by refusing the

Americans the right to transport their fish over our railways while we asked them to allow us the right of transportation and a bonding system through their country into Canada. A large part of our imports come over American railways. They come from Portland by the Grand Trunk, from Boston by the South Eastern, from New York by the Delaware and Hudson, the New York Central and other lines, and we should have been in a very awkward position in former years, if that bonding system had not been in existence; and when the American Government very fairly granted us the right of bonding goods through their country, they pursued a course in the interest of the railways of the United States and at the same time in the interest of the people of Canada. Yet, on the first opportunity that we have had of making a claim to check and interrupt that friendly arrangement, that opportunity was taken advantage of by this Government over which the right hon. the Premier presides. He at once stopped the transport of fish on the plea that the stoppage would embarrass American fishermen. Sir, when that agreement of 1818 was made there were no railways, and vessels did not require to come into our ports to transport their fish, because there were no means of transporting them. Hon. gentlemen opposite ignored the progress of civilisation and commerce in dealing with that question. I hold that they made a serious mistake, and I think that my right hon. friend will recollect that two years ago, in the lobby, I told him so, but he did not agree with me, and as I am not one of his responsible advisers, he paid very little attention to what I said. We now see the effect of his course. It has created great animosity in the United States, and it is very hard to tell what the result will be. I saw a few days ago the important announcement that a Bill had been introduced in the Congress of the United States, according to which the fishermen of Canada are likely to be called on to pay one cent a pound on the fresh fish that now goes free into the United States. I would like to ask if this is a fair protection to our fishermen, and a fair consideration for that large and extensive interest, a good proportion of which I have the honor to represent. The Government made a fatal mistake when they raised that point of refusing to allow our railways to be used for the transport of American fish. There can be but one outcome of that. The Americans will, if it is persisted in, inaugurate a policy of retaliation. They will say to us: If you refuse to transport our fish or other goods—no matter whether fish or merchandise—from your ports to our country, we will refuse to transport your goods from our ports into Canada; and this will greatly embarrass and interfere with the successful prosecution of trade and business in this country, and cannot fail to result in calamity to the Government. Probably the Government will not pursue that course. I warn them that if they should, it will be detrimental to the interests of the people I have the honor to represent, and also to the true interests of the country. So much for the bonding system. As to the *modus vivendi*, I think we have a right to know what course the hon. gentlemen opposite intend to pursue in that regard. The High Commissioner, when he had a seat in this House, dilated, after what he believed was a successful arrangement in Washington, but which I always condemned, on the great advantage that would come from allowing this *modus vivendi* to go into operation. It is due to Parliament that the Government should state now what course they intend to pursue, whether they intend to enforce that bonding system they have commenced to enforce—and, I believe, they discharged a custom house officer in Halifax because he had allowed the transport of goods.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman has taken rather a wide range in the discussion of this vote. It is not, of course, my intention to follow him on the very important questions he has raised, and which the House will

understand would require the opinion not of myself, but of the leader of the Government were the time opportune to discuss them. The hon. gentleman will understand it is from no lack of courtesy that I shall refrain attempting to speak for the Government as to its policy in reference to the *modus vivendi* or the question of transport, or any of those important and general questions which he has raised.

Mr. MITCHELL. Your chief is there and can do it.

Mr. TUPPER. Exactly. I have no doubt if this were the proper time, he would be quite ready to give the hon. gentleman all the information proper to the subject. I may say also to my hon. friend that he must not conclude that, in giving the reasons to the committee which I gave in connection with the appointments under discussion, I wished to convey the idea that I was improving upon my predecessors. The system I allude to I do not say was a system inaugurated by me. It was the system inaugurated of late, and it was necessary in consequence of the growing expenditure—and the necessary growing expenditure—in that department. The decrease proportionately of expenditure was what I wished to allude to, and as the hon. gentleman thinks the duties have not increased since he had control of the department, let me call his attention to the fact that in 1874, when he went out of office, the number of life stations was 342, while to-day it is no less than 569. In 1874, there were 380 lighthouses under his charge; whereas to-day there are no less than 664. In 1874, there were 18 fog-whistles, and there are 23 to-day, and the hon. gentleman will well understand that even if there was not a change in the system of management, the duties have been largely increased, because, as he well knows, the duties of the department are not merely confined to the lighthouses, lightstations, &c. Now, in connection with the matter the hon. gentleman insists on bringing up, and to which I have no particular objection, only I thought the House would prefer it came up on the next vote, my hon. friend mentioned he intended to allude to this important question as well as the fisheries in the Miramichi district of New Brunswick. It is a most important matter, regarded as such by every Government of the day. And the regulations that have been in force have been adopted with the view of preserving that most valuable fishery, not for our own generation alone, but, if possible, for all time to come. He well knows the trouble and difficulty which have occurred in the endeavor, on the part of the Department of Fisheries from its first organisation, to preserve the other branches of the fisheries for all time to come, and in some cases, as he knows, our best efforts have not been crowned with very great success, especially in connection with the lobsters fishery, but those efforts have been very successful in regard to the smelt fishery. The hon. gentleman asks me to give him some information on that subject, and I have very much pleasure in doing so. In March, 1875, the Government of the day, with the object of preserving those fisheries, passed a regulation which prohibited the catching, killing, buying, selling or having in possession any smelts between the 15th April and the 15th May in each year, only then going so far as to adopt a close season. The fishermen, anxious, of course, at all times to catch as many fish as possible, without giving much attention to the effect of their action on the succeeding season, began to use certain contrivances which made a wholesale slaughter of the fish. So, in July, 1877, the Government of the day adopted regulations prohibiting the use of bag nets having meshes of a less size than 1½ inch extension measure. After that regulation was passed, seines were used, and an immense number of these fish were caught in a hurry, which never found a market, which were caught in a bad season, at a time when the weather was changing and a thaw occurring, and a large, unnecessary slaughter of these fish took place. On the 26th July, 1877,



the Government adopted a regulation absolutely prohibiting the use of seines for the purpose of catching smelts.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand my hon. friend to speak of seines being used in the winter?

Mr. TUPPER. No; I presume it refers to bag nets in winter and seines after that. But the fish were caught with the seines in such quantities that they really became a drug in the market.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am afraid my hon. friend is not very well posted in regard to smelt fishing. I never knew a seine to be used in the smelt fishery in the river Miramichi, which is the largest smelt fishery in the country.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a very serious reflection on the previous Government, who adopted this regulation prohibiting the use of seines for the purpose of catching smelts.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think my hon. friend will find that the regulation about seines applies to smelts.

Mr. TUPPER. I am simply quoting the Order in Council, which was based on a different idea from that of the hon. gentleman, namely, that seines were used, and that it was necessary to prohibit them. I think he must have got his view from the course pursued since that regulation was adopted, and he is quite right in saying that seines are not now used in the smelt fishery.

Mr. MITCHELL. And they never were used in the smelt fishery.

Mr. TUPPER. It is evident that the report to the Government was of a different character, and that it led to that action being taken. Later on in 1877, it being found that the smelts were caught in such large quantities as not to be marketable, and were consequently used for manure, the Government passed a regulation prohibiting the use of smelts for manure. No other regulations were passed until 1886, when, after attention had been drawn by the Inspector of Fisheries in New Brunswick to the fact that this valuable fishery—valuable both in itself and as attracting other and even more valuable fish to our coasts and rivers—was being depleted, the Government, on the 17th February, passed the following regulations:—

"No person shall fish for, catch, kill, buy, sell, or have in possession any smelts between the 15th day of April and the 15th day of May (both days inclusive) in each year.

"Smelts shall not be fished for, caught, or killed by means of any kind of bag nets having meshes of a less size than one inch and a quarter extension measure.

"The use of bag nets for the purpose of catching smelts is prohibited except under special license from the Minister of Fisheries."

That was considered necessary, in order to restrict the use of that very formidable engine in connection with the catch of this fish. My hon. friend may not recollect that, in some of the States of the Union, the use of these bag nets is totally prohibited for catching smelts. I have a statute to that effect before me now, and in Scotland the regulations prohibit the use of these fishing engines altogether.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will my hon. friend suggest any means of catching these fish without using bag nets?

Mr. TUPPER. A great many are caught by hook and line.

Mr. MITCHELL. A few are caught by hook and line, but not as a matter of commerce.

Mr. TUPPER. I am simply giving the regulations which were passed under the last Government, and under this, for the information of the hon. gentleman, and did not expect to enter into a discussion on the subject.

Mr. MITCHELL. If my hon. friend will permit me, I would say that as to catching smelts by hook and line, I am informed that they have shipped on some days, by the Northern and Western line—Mr. Snowball's line—over 100

Mr. TUPPER.

tons of smelts in a day. It would take a long time to catch that quantity by hook and line.

Mr. TUPPER. And that is the reason why bag nets have been prohibited in some places, because they lead to such wholesale destruction of fish. On the 27th October, 1887, the regulations now in force were passed. They are virtually a consolidation of the previous regulations, with one principal addition:

"No one shall fish for, catch, kill, buy, sell, or have in possession any smelts between the 1st day of April and the 1st day of July (both days inclusive) in each year.

"The use of seines for manure is prohibited.

"The use of seines for the purpose of catching smelts is prohibited.

"Smelts shall not be fished for, caught, or killed by means of any kind of bag nets having meshes of a less size than one inch and a quarter extension measure.

"The use of bag nets for the purpose of catching smelts is prohibited except under special license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and then only between the 1st December and the 15th February in each year.

These are the regulations which are now in force.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am much obliged to the hon. gentlemen for the concession which he made and the information he has given. I was anxious to know what change had been made in the regulations, but the licensing of nets for smelt fishing has been in force for many years, and I have heard a great many complaints as to the manner in which these licenses are given out and the restrictions which are placed upon them. The information which I have from the most experienced persons in smelt fishing, and the result of fifty years of my own experience, are that the smelt fisheries of this country are more plentiful to-day than they were fifty years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Minister of Marine is able to effect a saving of \$50,000 in his department, we will be delighted, I am sure, and so will the country; but I may observe that whenever increases are asked for by any Minister we are always regaled by the same story, that there has been either an enormous increase in the work of the department, or that an immense saving is going to be made. Now we have grown somewhat sceptical as to the saving; we find that the increase in the department always remains; once that occurs, it not only never is diminished, but it goes on increasing, and apparently will go on increasing, I may say, to the end of the chapter. But as for the mythical savings that are going to be made, why, Sir, we are obliged from experience to place them on the same footing with the promise of the 53 millions which the First Minister used to allege was inevitably to come from the sale of land in the North-West, or the 640 millions of bushels of wheat which long since the hon. gentleman's progenitor was in the habit of holding up for the delectation of gentlemen on the other side of the House as soon as their policy in Manitoba had reached a successful conclusion. Now, there is one question which was put by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) which I can answer, that was as to the relative cost of these departments in the past. I find that in 1878, the last year of the Administration of my friend, Sir Albert Smith, the whole cost of administering that department, less the Minister's salary, amounted to \$25,301, for the Department of Marine, plus the Department of Fisheries. I find to-day that these two departments cost about \$44,000 a year, that is to say, not very far from double the expenditure that they involved some years ago. Now, I do not myself believe that there has been any sort of increase in the work of the department to warrant that increase in the expenditure of nearly 100 per cent., nor can I admit that it ought to follow as a necessary consequence, admitting a considerable increase in the outdoor work, that there should be a proportional increase at headquarters here. It may be that it does cost more to supervise 500 lighthouses than 400, but the increase should not

be in proportion; it ought not to require 25 per cent. more to inspect the other 100. Once you have obtained the staff you require a very small additional clerical assistance to enable you to work 500 with very little more practical expense than 400; and so on in other ways. Surely it appears to me that we are allowing the expenses of the civil government to increase at a very reckless rate, and in no department is that more visible than the department which the hon. gentleman presides over. He is not responsible, of course, for the increases which have occurred up to this time, but he is most undoubtedly responsible for the increase, amounting, I see, to about \$4,000 in the two departments, which he now proposes to inflict upon the country. I beg to tell him that up to the present time, barring this hypothetical saving of \$50,000, which we have not yet realised—and which, in my experience, it is very doubtful if we ever will realise—he has not given a satisfactory explanation for making this large addition. I do not think that there is any such addition, within the last year or so, to the work of the department to cause him to require 10 per cent. more than the Minister of Finance required. Nor do I think that it is at all likely that he will gain any corresponding benefit from bringing over this gentleman, who had no special experience, as I understand, in connection with the fisheries, who is just put in there, apparently, for convenience, or, apparently, because he has been, I daresay, a useful public servant somewhere else. I submit, Sir, that this is not a sufficient reason for adding \$2,800 to the expenses of this department. I say the fact that I have just mentioned, that we have now verily increased the expenditure in these two Departments of Marine and Fisheries to something very nearly double what they were under the administration of my friend, Sir Albert Smith, is a sufficient justification of the line taken by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, that it is a mistake to have any division in these departments that can be avoided. The moment that you create a deputy head, that gentleman, almost of necessity, desires to magnify the importance of his office, he is sure to add to the expenditure of it, and so we get the result that within a few years, practically, the working expenses at headquarters have nearly doubled.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not want to prolong the discussion needlessly, nor to contradict those hon. gentlemen, or to take issue with them needlessly, but I think my hon. friend who has just taken his seat is hasty in his conclusion. It may be a fair matter of argument as to whether the action taken by Parliament some years ago in the division of the department, was wise or not; but I think the hon. gentleman, in his comparison of the work, taking the year of 1878 with the present year, in other departments, has forgotten to consider several important matters. In the first place, there has been an increase in the number of lighthouses, stations, and so on, under the charge of the Marine Department; while in the Fisheries Department the work is to a large extent different from that of a previous time. For instance, I may mention that there is entirely new work in connection with this subject that was discussed to-day, the distribution of the bounties under license; and there is, moreover, a very important addition to the work, that is, the protective service and its supervision, which is no light matter. A large addition to the fleet in charge of the Government was made in the year to which he alluded, and that has entailed a considerable amount of additional work, and work of a very important character. The hon. gentleman will find another feature in the Fisheries Department which has added tremendously to the work, as compared with that time—I refer to the great addition to the staff of fishery guardians, overseers and officers in every Province. The increase, too, was made necessary in consequence of additions to the

close seasons for various kinds of fish; and my hon. friend will recollect perfectly well, in his experience as Finance Minister, that where you attempt to enforce a longer close season, or apply it to different kinds of fish, you have of necessity to increase your staff. More than that, the old staff obtains, in proportion, a greater amount of money in the shape of disbursements. Your officers have to line the rivers and lakes as well as they can, they have to travel, and for all that extra supervision an additional amount of money is charged, and those additional amounts have to be investigated in that department. So, I think it was rather unfair to make so sweeping a charge in connection with the work of the department. The hon. gentleman also states that I am responsible for some \$4,000 of increase in both the Fisheries and the Marine Departments. On second thought, I am sure he will not say that; I am sure he will say that the only item for which I am to any extent responsible is the item now under discussion, because, as the Finance Minister explained, the other increases are all statutory, and in the sense in which he was arguing, I am sure he does not mean to make me responsible for that, beyond coming to Parliament and taking charge of these estimates. But this increase has nothing to do with that. For the present increase I do take the responsibility, and I have put, as well as I could, the reasons for that before the House. I am glad to be able to say that, while that officer is an additional officer in that department, we paid him before just the same amount of money that I am asking for now; we would have paid him the same amount of money had we left him in his former position, instead of bringing him into the department, I may again recall the hon. gentleman's attention to a system which I think has pretty generally prevailed, that when a member takes office as the head of a department, he, as a rule, does not take his private secretary from the officers of that department, and I could show several instances of this practice; at all events, I have one in my mind in which the secretary under the hon. gentleman's own administration was made an additional officer in the department, and, so far as I recollect, that was the usual course. The Minister chooses as his secretary very frequently one who is not in the department and not in any department, and I think I am about the first Minister who has had to make so long, and, perhaps, so labored an explanation to justify the selection made of a private secretary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is not proper to allow this matter to pass without tendering my acknowledgments to the Minister of Marine for his remarks on my having ventured to ask for any information on the subject-matter of a vote passing through Parliament, much more on my had the temerity to form an opinion on a departmental matter. An old-fashioned notion existed in this House, drawn from English practice, that members of Parliament had some rights in regard to watching public expenditure, and some duties too.

Mr. TUPPER. And some discretion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was an old notion that they had the right and that it was their duty to inform themselves in regard to the expenditure of public money, and that they failed to discharge their duty if they allowed sums to be voted year after year without questioning the Ministers as to why and where those funds were required. It was also thought that when departmental expenses were increased, members of Parliament had a right to inquire and inform themselves as to whether or not departmental alterations involved an increased public outlay. But it appears I am all wrong. It appears that the hon. gentleman and his friends, who have a monopoly of office, wish further a monopoly of criticism.

Mr. TUPPER. Not so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We must not express any opinion, and unless we have been a Minister we are debarred, forsooth, from expressing an opinion as to whether a large increase in a public department is justified or not. I remember well when the increase in question was proposed in this House. We questioned the Minister as to the grounds of the change, and failed altogether to obtain a satisfactory answer. From that day to this, no one has informed the House why the Department of Marine and Fisheries was divided. When I to-day asked the Minister, who has been in office six or eight months, as to whether he had formed an opinion, he coolly told me he was unable to form one yet and the matter was open to debate. If that is the case, why has he challenged my right to form an opinion? Have I not examined the reports of the department, have I not followed the expenditure, and have I not eyes and ears to see and hear what goes on in my Province and know something about the matter? I have never yet been able to satisfy my own mind that the change carried out was in the interest of the public service. I think the contrary. I had good grounds for predicting, as I did, that the very thing that has taken place to-day would come about, that as soon as the department was divided into two heads each would require for his particular department an expenditure equal in amount to the expenditure in any other department. They must be up to the times; their department must be a large spending department, and the object of many public servants—I will not say all, because I know the contrary in very many instances—is how much money they can spend. I tell the hon. gentleman he went a little too far when he challenged my right to ask for information and to form an opinion on this matter. I claim a perfect right to criticise, and I intend to exercise that right, not only in regard to the hon. gentleman's department but any other department of which I have information which justifies me in addressing this committee. Now, what do we find? We find in this department an increase of \$2,800. I suppose \$400 may be statutory increases; \$2,400 is for a new officer.

Mr. TUPPER. \$2,350.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) \$2,350, to be accurate. Has there been the ordinary promotion of those who have been in the service year after year? I should not enquire, I suppose, as I may be trespassing. It may be impertinent on my part to enquire whether the ordinary rule of promoting those who have been in the service for years has been carried out, whether merit has been rewarded in the department? It appears not to have been recognised. At all events, a gentleman has been brought in from abroad; I do not know his qualifications, he may be a competent man or not. I am merely asking for information, but the hon. gentleman has given me to understand that I should not do so as I have not been a Minister of the Crown. I may never attain that exalted position; I have not very much desire to acquire that exalted position, certainly I have no desire whatever to attain it in the present Government. It is, however, a very reasonable ambition for any member of Parliament to entertain. I want to know whether, in the meantime, I have to keep my mouth as close as an oyster. I think not. I have not yet heard any reason to justify the Minister in placing that officer over the heads of others in the department, and have not heard any justification of the increased expenditure. The hon. gentleman has stated that he hopes to save a certain amount of money in the department. I see no evidence of any fruition, so far.

Mr. TUPPER. You have not looked very carefully.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have looked very carefully. I see that under civil government the salaries are increased, that the amount for contingencies is increased, and very many other items are increased. We shall have, no doubt,  
Mr. DAVIES, (P.E.I.)

some further discussion on this promise of the hon. gentleman to curtail the expenditure by \$50,000 a year. I think he will be a public benefactor if he will do so. He will receive warm commendation from me, provided the reduction is not done at the sacrifice of the efficiency of the service. If the hon. gentleman saves any money I shall exercise my right to commend him as I claim my right to criticise his action when I think it is wrong.

Mr. WALDIE. The Minister has stated that there have been fishery inspectors employed in other Provinces besides the Provinces down on the sea coast. I have reason to be aware of that fact, because there has been recently appointed a fishery inspector in the county I represent. That fishery inspector was employed in securing evidence in an election trial against myself. That officer, appointed by the Minister of Fisheries, stood at the back of the prosecuting attorney at my election trial for two days, furnishing him with questions to put to witnesses. Is that the kind of fishery inspection you pay for?

Some hon. MEMBERS. They were fishing.

Mr. WALDIE. Yes, they were fishing. But I want to know if the Minister is aware that this is the employment at which his officer is working? It is an unjust and improper expenditure of public money, if the travelling expenses of that fishery inspector are charged against the public revenue when employed in hounding the representative of the people and trying to displace him from the position in which the people had placed him.

Mr. TUPPER. I must answer the hon. gentleman at once. I think, because the hon. gentleman is a member of Parliament, he has no right, it is not fair, at all events, to make a statement of that kind on the floor of Parliament with regard to a man because he is in the service of the Government. The hon. gentleman has used some very strong language, and he has not made enquiries and ascertained the facts from the proper course, or he certainly would not have dared to make the statement he has made. In the first place, let me tell that hon. gentleman that if he were more acquainted with the subject-matter with which he has dealt—

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentlemen will "hear, hear," but not interrupt. If the hon. gentleman had acquainted himself with the matter with which he is dealing, he would have found that no travelling expenses of any officer in the public service, as inspector or otherwise, are paid except upon the production of satisfactory vouchers, and those vouchers include a statutory declaration. He declares not merely that a certain amount was wanted, but he shows in that statement the miles that he travelled, the business on which he travelled, and the work he did. He has to sign that statutory declaration, and more than that, that account and that voucher is then sent for examination and approval to the department as to whether, in the opinion of the department, that service was necessary in the interest of the protection of the fisheries. In the case that he mentions, what does he suppose would be done?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Promote a man.

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman suppose, if his friends were in office that they would ascertain and anxiously enquire whether at the time a successor was to be appointed there was an election to take place, and that this would make the slightest difference. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Sergeant, to whom he refers, was appointed by me as an officer for a district including Halton, and that the appointment was made in the general way in which those officers are appointed. He was appointed at a very small salary, some two hundred dollars a year, and Mr. Sergeant has not yet, I think, received one single six-

pence for travelling expenses. However, of that I am not quite sure, but the hon. gentleman, I think, should have made enquiry before he entered into this discussion as to what Mr. Sergeant had obtained for travelling expenses. All those matters are open to him and to every hon. gentleman in the House, and he could have got the information at once. I have to repudiate the insinuation and the charge made against that officer, who, so far as I know, from the day that he was appointed performed his duty satisfactorily and was a fit and proper man to appoint to the position.

**Mr. WALDIE.** Just one word in reply. A vacancy occurred here and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done in that case what he has been charged with doing in another case—he has appointed two men for one man's duty. Mr. Kerr, the fishery inspector for Halton, died, and there were two inspectors appointed instead of one. The only duty that Mr. Sergeant has been employed in is fishing for evidence in the Halton election trial.

**Mr. TUPPER.** That last statement of the hon. gentleman is as correct as his former statement. The facts are these: One officer, a Mr. Kerr, had a district, large in extent and, in the general opinion, too large for one officer. Mr. Kerr having died, a redistribution of those districts took place; but it was not attended, as the hon. gentleman states, with additional expense, but with a saving on the whole. I am able to state to the hon. gentleman that the redistribution reduced the expense, and that we will obtain three officers for three divisions of what was once too much for one officer, at a less amount than we had to pay to the late Mr. Kerr.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I hope my duty to my friend behind me will not entitle me to be sat upon by the sage and experienced gentleman who, no doubt from his own merits, and not in the least on account of being his father's son, happens to fill the office of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries today. Now, Sir, the hon. member said nothing about what my hon. friend (Mr. Waldie) very justly objected to, and that was, that a paid servant of the Dominion Government was actively interfering in an election petition, or in the prosecution of an election petition against a member of this House. I do not hesitate to say that that conduct on the part of an officer was an indecent and an improper proceeding. I do not hesitate to say that a great number of the officials appointed by that hon. gentleman, and not a few other officials, are in the habit of interfering very improperly indeed, in election affairs, and in prosecutions against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Further, what I wanted to call attention to was this: The hon. gentleman said that he had a perfect right to bring in a private secretary from another department, and that it had often been done before. That may be true enough. No doubt there are reasons for bringing in private secretaries who do belong to other departments, but that is no reason whatever for appointing a new officer in the department. It may be desirable to bring private secretaries in, and that they should have, in addition to their salaries as private secretaries, a position in the department, but the usual rule is to arrange, as it can be easily done, for an exchange with the department from which the private secretary comes, and not to create a new and expensive office, not to create an office inflicting a charge on the public of \$2,200 or \$2,300 a year, as appears to have been done in this case. I submit that from first to last, no sort of adequate excuse or reason has been offered for the appointment of Mr. Chipman at his present salary, nor can I accept the statement that a saving was effected in the general expenses as an excuse. That saving could be effected just as well with the staff the hon. gentleman had, as with the staff that he now proposes to increase.

**Mr. FLYNN.** A little while ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the system of bounties was a great

boom to the fishermen. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing that point, but I rise to tell the Minister that whatever benefit or advantage bounties would be to the fishermen, that that benefit would be enhanced if the bounty cheques were distributed much earlier in the year than they have been in the past. The statements made, on the affidavits of the fishermen, that they have caught the required quantity by law are returned to the department on the 31st December. That being the case, I see no reason why those cheques should be delayed so late as the month of June or July, as has been the case in the past. It will be quite apparent and obvious to everybody that in the winter season, or perhaps in March or April, when the fishermen want it most, that this bounty, little as it is, would be of greater advantage to the fishermen. If he gets the cheque in June he is then in the middle of the fishing season and he has the means then to supply his wants, and is apt to spend the bounty perhaps in a useless way. At all events, whatever advantage the bounty may be—and I will not discuss that point now—it would be greatly enhanced if the Minister would see that those bounty cheques are distributed to the fishermen at least in the early part of April, and sooner than that if possible.

**Mr. TUPPER.** I think the committee will somewhat understand, after what the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated, that perhaps some of his criticism is due to the fact that I am, as he says, my father's son. I know the hon. gentleman is not altogether free from spite, and I know that he has cause enough to remember the hon. gentleman whose son he says I am. He is quite right in that statement, and I only wish he was as correct in his other statements. Perhaps he has cause to remember that hon. gentleman with not altogether the calmest feeling. I daresay that, though he has in his time not been able to repay him nor to have entire satisfaction in connection with their wordy warfare, he will do his very best to pay the debt back to the father's son, and I am prepared to receive it in any coin he chooses to pay it in. I never knew before that legitimacy was any disgrace, but perhaps the hon. gentleman's training and experience is different, and he may be delicate on that score. I am surprised, however, that he would allude to the matter in the way he has done. He has given me this satisfaction at the end of this debate, ostensibly upon Mr. Chipman, but really upon the father's son. He says it would be all right and proper if this was a mere exchange of officers and not, as he says it is, the creation of an office. If he had not been carried away by his feelings he would have found, from what I said, and from a general investigation of the facts, that this is the precise justification of the vote to-day. It is not the creation of a new officer, it is the exchange of an officer. Very often that occurs in the public service, and I think I have, towards the end of this little discussion, ample justification from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) for the vote now proposed.

**Mr. COOK.** It has been stated that the service has been considerably increased in reference to the appointment of extra officials. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat, the recently elected member for Halton (Mr. Waldie), has stated that a gentleman was appointed fishery inspector who performed his duty by hunting up evidence against him with the view of unseating him. Well, Sir, in the county I have the honor to represent there was a fishery inspector at the time Mr. Mackenzie's Government was in power; but since that time this Government have found it necessary to appoint another inspector to aid him to do the work which he had done quite intelligently and properly alone. But the new official was appointed somewhat on the same plan as the gentleman in Halton, as an electioneering agent. Mr. Fraser goes from one point to another, and if he finds votes

that are inland a considerable distance from the edge of the waters where his duties lie, he travels inland to get those votes for his party, and his travelling expenses in doing so are paid by the country at large. I can easily understand how the expenses have almost doubled in that department since this Government came into power. Not in one department alone, but in almost every department of the Government you will find electioneering agents, who are paid out of the public moneys by the hon. gentlemen now in office. I say it is a crying shame; it is a disgrace; and I am of the opinion, which was held by hon. gentlemen on the other side at one time, that those officials should not be allowed to electioneer for their party, but the franchise should be taken from them, particularly men who are so unscrupulous as many of these men are who have been appointed by the present Government. I will not travel beyond this department now under consideration; it is not necessary for me to do so, because there is ample justification for the statements I am making, and similar statements can be made by many gentlemen on this side of the House.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I notice, by the return laid on the Table of the House a few days ago, that there have been seven superannuations in connection with the Marine Department during the year. It is generally understood that when superannuations are made they are made in such a way as to reduce, as far as possible, the expenditure. I notice, however, that these seven superannuations have caused an increase in the superannuation expenditure of \$2,282.90. The salaries paid to those who were superannuated amounted to \$4,880, and the salaries paid to those installed in their places amount to \$4,530, a difference of only \$350, while there is an addition to the superannuation allowances of \$2,282.90; so that the amount we are paying out in superannuations is about equal to the amount we are now asked to pass as increases in salaries. In this connection I might say that Capt. Scott, who drew a salary of \$2,000, has been superannuated, and is now getting a retiring allowance of \$1,080. I notice also that ten years have been added to his time, he having served 27 years. I would like to know how it is that this has been done. It is well known that under the superannuation system we are paying out over \$165,000 more than we receive. If we received a sum equal, or nearly equal, to the amount we are paying out, there might be some excuse for increasing the allowance for faithful service to a man who had served the Government for many years; but, under the circumstances, I cannot see why ten years should have been added to the time of this man's service, in order to increase the allowance. But that is not the worst. It is generally admitted, that when a man is superannuated at an advanced age, the man who is appointed in his place should receive a much less salary; but I notice that in this case the man appointed in place of Capt. Scott draws a salary of \$1,850; so that there is only a reduction of \$250 in the salary paid, while \$1,080 is added to the superannuation expenditure. Then I notice that a Mr. Argyle, who received \$600 a year, has been superannuated, and a man has been appointed in his place at \$1,200. He has been, apparently, appointed to fill two positions. I wish to know if he is drawing the \$1,200 to do the duties performed by Mr. Argyle, as well as those of the assistant, or is he to hire an assistant, a party to suit himself, and pay him the \$600? I think it is an unfortunate arrangement that any civil servant should be placed in a position to draw \$1,200, and should pay \$600 to whatever assistant he likes to get. Those are the points on which I would like to get an explanation from the Minister of Marine.

**Mr. TUPPER.** I think it is scarcely usual that under one item all the branches of the service should be discussed; but I am willing, as far as I can, to give reasonable explanation.

**Mr. Cook.**

Since I came into office there have been several superannuations. The hon. gentleman has mentioned two. Capt. Scott was chairman of the board of examiners of masters and mates, and was commissioner of wrecks, &c. He came into the service a long time ago, at the inception of the system of cruisers for the protection of our inshore fisheries; and if the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was in his place, he could bear testimony to the value of the services that gentleman—who was a captain in the Royal Navy before he came to this country specially to take this position—rendered to the country in connection with the office he held. It was under that hon. gentleman's administration that Capt. Scott inaugurated the marine police for the protection of the inshore fisheries. But a far greater service he rendered to Canada was this: Before that officer came into the service we had no authority in Canada to grant certificates to masters and mates which would be recognised in England by the English Board of Trade. Under the administration of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that hon. gentleman entered into correspondence with the Home Government, and finally, the only objection appearing to be that we had no officer whose standing was such that the Imperial Government would recognise the papers issued on an examination held by him, that objection was surmounted by arranging that this officer of high standing in the Imperial service should come out and take that office. Capt. Scott came out in 1870 or 1871; he served continuously in the Maritime Provinces, and organised a system under which, ever since, certificates to masters and certificates granted here have been recognised at home. Under these circumstances, in view of the provisions of the Act, and considering the services rendered by Capt. Scott, and the fact that he was broken down absolutely by a serious and permanent illness, I recommended that ten years should be added to the time of his service, and that recommendation was adopted. Now, in the case of Mr. Argyle, I do not think the hon. gentleman has exact information. It was an appointment in British Columbia to which the hon. gentleman alluded, but it has just occurred to me that the necessity there for a large salary to the incoming officer was the fact that a steam-whistle has been added to the light, and you could not possibly obtain the services of a successor to Mr. Argyle for less than the salary given. That is my recollection of the matter; and in connection with his superannuation, I do not think there was anything exceptional at all. Of course, if the hon. gentleman wants a full explanation, I will have to look up the matter again, and I think I will be able to show him there is nothing to which objection can be taken. As to the salary of the successor to Capt. Scott, we were fortunate in being able, as all gentlemen familiar with this kind of work will understand, to get a man of sufficient standing to succeed Capt. Scott and be acceptable to the English Board of Trade, at a salary of \$1,800. That is the salary now given to Mr. Smith, who was one of the captains employed in the Allan line, and a member of the Royal Navy Reserve. I think hon. gentlemen who are familiar with shipping matters and the importance of that office, and who know Mr. Smith, will be quite surprised that we should have been able to obtain his services at a salary of \$1,800.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** In connection with the first item, in the case of Mr. Argyle, my attention was at once drawn to the fact that he only received a salary of \$600, while I noticed that his successor is given a salary of \$1,200. I thought, therefore, it was a fair question to put to the hon. Minister for explanation. I also noticed his successor being allowed \$600 for an assistant, and thought we should have some explanation as to whether the appointment of an assistant was in his hands or that of the Marine Department.

Mr. TUPPER. That explanation is due to the hon. gentleman, and, of course, an assistant was rendered necessary by the fact that there was a steam whistle.

Mr. LOVITT. I rise to bear my testimony to the valuable services which Capt. Scott has rendered this country. It is to him we are indebted for the system under which we can grant licenses to masters and mates that are recognised by the English Board of Trade. I may add that, apart from that important service rendered by him, Capt. Scott is entitled to recognition, from the fact that the illness which resulted in the breaking down of his system was caused by his incessant and arduous labor in the service of the Government.

Mr. WELSH. I heartily corroborate the remarks of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt), and quite approve of the pension granted Capt. Scott.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With regard to the statements made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Waldie) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), I would ask the hon. the Minister of Marine if he is prepared to follow in Ontario the example pursued by his predecessor in the case of the fishery overseer in New Brunswick, who was dismissed, I believe, because he took some part in politics. The hon. gentleman should apply the same rule in Ontario which his predecessor applied in New Brunswick.

Mr. TUPPER. We did not dismiss the fishery overseer in Ontario. He died.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). You dismissed him in New Brunswick.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask whether Mr. Moodie is still in the employ of the Government as overseer in West Lambton?

Mr. TUPPER. There are some 1,200 officers, and I cannot keep track of their names.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are a number of matters in connection with the department which might be better discussed when we come to the votes on the department generally, but it will be impossible to discuss the Estimates properly before we get the Fishery Report. When may we expect it? It is, somehow or other, always the last report presented.

Mr. TUPPER. The reason that the report cannot be presented earlier is that, unlike the reports of the other departments, which deal with matters up to the end of the fiscal year, this deals with matters to the end of December. The Fishery Report is held over until the reports of the different overseers and inspectors in all the Provinces are received. I think I will be able to lay that report on the Table before we reach the regular estimates in that branch.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It would be better to bring the report only to the 1st of October?

Mr. TUPPER. The custom has been, for many years past, to comprise the whole year's work in the report, because we must take note of the different seasons so as to have a full review. It would be awkward to change that system now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would draw attention to one point with regard to the superannuation of Capt. Scott. I notice that he served twenty-seven years and that ten years has been added to his time. If I understand the Superannuation Act rightly, a superannuated officer is only permitted to draw  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the salary he received for the last three years. How is it that in this case  $\frac{3}{4}$  has been allowed him? I am very glad to find expressions on both sides of the House complimentary to Capt. Scott for his efficiency. At the same time I felt it my duty to ask this question.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course, I am unable to answer that at the present moment. I do not remember now the amount which Capt. Scott is allowed, but I can give the hon. gentleman the information. It is impossible to carry in my memory the exact proportion in which the superannuation allowance was calculated. That is done at the Treasury Board.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me the information at a subsequent stage?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister another question as to the appointment of Mr. Chipman in his office. He says he is a very efficient officer, and was taken from another department where he was not needed.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood him to say that there is no additional expense in the department from which he was taken, that the public are paying nothing more now than before, and that Mr. Chipman was transferred from a department where his services were not required, where they could do without him, and without substituting anyone else in his place.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say so. I said the very contrary. I said there was an exchange of officers, that Mr. Chipman was taken from one office and another officer put in his place. I stated that about a dozen times to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister is mistaken. He has said that now for the first time.

Mr. TUPPER. Well, look up the *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not improved his position by the statement he has made at this moment.

Mr. TUPPER. Those are the facts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does not matter whether they are the facts or not. If Mr. Chipman had been replaced by an officer taken from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, then the hon. gentleman's explanation would serve as an argument, but he does not say that anyone has been taken from his department and transferred to the London office when Mr. Chipman was taken from the London office and brought here. His statement is that there is no addition to the public cost, that there is no additional officer employed in consequence of this change. There must, therefore, be a vacancy somewhere. If there is plus one in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it is clear that there is minus one in some other department, and whether that is the London office or some other office, it is taking an officer from a place where he was not required. Of course, the hon. gentleman says there was not a sufficient number of officers in his department, and it was necessary to appoint an additional officer. That of itself is a justification, no matter where Mr. Chipman came from, if that fact is made good. But I did not rise to discuss the propriety of the appointment of Mr. Chipman to the office, but to ask the hon. gentleman whether he contemplates uniting the Department of Marine and the Department of Fisheries again under the charge of one officer, and whether that officer is to be Mr. Chipman? Is Mr. Smith to be retired, or is Mr. Tilton to be retired? Is there any deputy Minister who has passed the time of life when he can be no longer useful to the department, and is his place to be filled by a more efficient officer in the person of Mr. Chipman? That would be an interesting piece of information to the House, and I am sure the hon. gentleman is able to give it.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no intention of recommending the retirement of Mr. Smith from the service; I have no intention of recommending the retirement of Mr. Tilton,

and have no intention of promoting Mr. Chipman from the position he occupies at the present time.

Department of Fisheries..... \$16,187 50

Mr. FOSTER. There has been a net increase in this department of \$762.50. There are eight statutory increases at \$50, \$400; two at \$62.50, \$125; one increase for an optional subject, \$50; the difference between the salary of Mr. Stanton, transferred from the Finance Department to the Fisheries Department, and Mr. Jenkins from the Fisheries Department to the Finance Department, \$87.50; making the total increase, as I said, \$762.50.

Department of Public Works..... \$45,190

Mr. FOSTER. The increase in this department has been \$1,680. There are 17 statutory increases at \$50, \$850; one at \$30, and there is an addition of \$800 to the salary of the chief engineer, making the total of \$1,680. The chief engineer is Mr. Perley, a very valuable officer, whose services, I think, would not be overpaid by the addition which has been made to his salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We should have some explanation as to the increase which has been given to the chief engineer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Perley is the chief engineer of the department, and, as hon. gentlemen know, the work of that branch of the department has been increasing very largely. We have had lately, besides the ordinary work of the department, the work of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec thrown on the department. We have now the graving docks, and the new graving dock at Kingston, which entail a large amount of work on the chief engineer, and a very grave responsibility. I may add that I know personally that Mr. Perley, whose valuable services to my department are appreciated, not only by me, but by all those who have had the opportunity of meeting him, had an offer, some two months ago, of a position in England which would give him over \$5,000 a year. I asked him not to leave the department or the service, but to wait, and I would ask my colleagues, and most likely they would assent and would ask Parliament to increase his salary to this amount, which will not be the amount he was offered in England, but, which I thought would compensate him for his services, inasmuch as if he becomes disabled or unfit for work, he may rely upon having his superannuation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What salary does he get now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$3,200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the increase?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, the increase will give him \$4,000, instead of the \$5,000 he was offered.

Mr. WELSH. I am glad to hear that we have the services of such valuable men. I should like to ask the Minister who is the valuable man who has been appointed to look after the piers in Prince Edward Island? There are some 23 or 24 of them, and they are falling away and breaking up. I have brought this to the notice of the Minister for three years, and I have had the promise that the Government would send an engineer—a valuable engineer I suppose, because they are all valuable—to look after those piers. At present they are falling into the water, and people cannot ship from them. I would like to know from the Minister who is this valuable man who is charged with the piers of Prince Edward Island? I understand that there is an engineer from New Brunswick, that he has applied to attend to them, but we do not know where he is, nor when he comes; in fact, we have no responsible person at all to whom we can apply about these piers. I would like the

Mr. TUPPER,

Minister to answer me. What is the name of this engineer, and where is he to be found, and what is his address?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows that the officer to whom he should apply is Mr. Perley, at headquarters here; and besides that, we have in the Lower Provinces an officer, Mr. Grey, I think is his name, who receives his instructions from the chief engineer in Ottawa, and acts on those instructions. I am pretty sure that the hon. gentleman is right in saying that certain piers on the Island are not in a condition in which he would wish them to be, and in which I wish them to be. I applied the money I obtained from Parliament for that purpose; that amount was increased last year, and the same amount is asked for in these Estimates. I hope that with these amounts I will be able to do a great deal in the line that the hon. gentleman has suggested, that is to say, to repair these piers, or as many of them as can be repaired, with the money at my disposal. The hon. gentleman knows that we are unable to do everything in the same year, we have to do it by degrees. The repairs of the piers on the Island have been going on in the same way as those in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and elsewhere. Of course, we know that the coasts of the Atlantic and the Gulf are more exposed to storms than are the piers on the coasts of the St. Lawrence or the lakes. Whenever severe storms occur they sometimes damage a pier, an examination has to be made, a report is obtained, with an estimate, and if the work is pressing, I obtain from my colleagues a vote of money, and if a case of that kind is unforeseen, I obtain the warrant of the Governor General and ask Parliament to give us the money afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are few more disgraceful chapters in the history of the Department of Public Works than that which relates to the repairs of the piers in the Island. A few years ago the Government up here, as I thought for political considerations, took from the Government of Prince Edward Island a large number of piers, on the report of the chief engineer whom they sent there, on the ground that these piers were of Dominion importance and that it rested with them as a matter of legal right to take charge of them and keep them in repair. They agreed with the Local Government upon those piers they were to take over, and those they were to leave, and those they took over became immediately afterwards Dominion property. I do not think that my colleague has stated the case as strongly as the facts justify. There has been no such thing as a repair of the piers. They have been allowed to fall to pieces, to rot, in some cases almost to float away. Now, Prince Edward Island, the hon. gentleman knows, perhaps, is the most thickly populated portion in the whole Dominion for its size, the people are a farming community almost entirely, and they have to ship their produce in a very short time in the autumn of the year before the rivers freeze up, and they require a large number of piers, because they have not got the railway communications that are open to the farmers in other parts of the Dominion, and they require a large number of wharves and piers where they can ship away their produce. These wharves are absolutely essential—the people cannot live without them. Now, when this Government and the hon. gentleman's department took them over, it became their bounden duty to keep them in such a reasonable condition, at any rate, as would enable a ship to lie alongside of them, so that the farmers could ship off their products. They have not done so. The management has been absolutely disgraceful. I have been applied to, and so have numerous other public men in the Island, for personal subscriptions to pay for laying the planks on some of those piers, and we have contributed the money out of our own pockets in a number of instances, and the farmers have gone to work themselves to put on the copings and the top work on the piers, to enable them to

ship off their produce. I cannot conceive, from my experience in this House, and knowing what the hon. gentleman is, I cannot conceive that these things have been brought home to his knowledge; but somebody in the department, or some of his subordinates, have blundered most shamefully; there has been gross mismanagement, unpardonable mismanagement. In consequence of their negligence the people have suffered very much, so much so that there is not a representative from the Island in this House who is not burdened with letters from people in all parts of the Island complaining of the Government because it does not recognise the duty which rests upon it of keeping the piers that it assumed as its property, in reasonable repair. The whole thing is disgraceful. I say nothing against Mr. Perley, I have always heard him highly spoken of as an officer; but I will say that if he is responsible for the state of the Island piers, the grant of an addition to his salary is something that I would oppose very strongly. I do not know if he is responsible; I have never been able to find out who is responsible. The Government, I know, are responsible as a whole, but I want to get at the officer whose duty it is to inspect the piers and report to the Government. I want to know why that is not done. If Mr. Perley is at the head of the department it is his duty to see that it is done. The hon. gentleman wonders sometimes why it is that six men are sent here from the Island to oppose the Government? Why, what can the people do except to express their sense of dissatisfaction in that way at the disgraceful mismanagement of the public piers on the Island? If the hon. gentleman lived in a part of the Island where there were 75 or 80 farmers who had to haul their produce to market, like potatoes and oats, and on coming to the pier where they were to put them in ships, found that the wharf was rotten, and they had no way of shipping their produce, do you tell me that they would not go away dissatisfied with the administration of the Government? Sir, there is dissatisfaction from one end of the Island to the other among the farming community. The Island has been treated most shamefully, most disgracefully, and in the hon. gentleman's department more than in any other. I here raise my voice in solemn protest against any officer who has had such an amount of public works under his control as Mr. Perley has had—if he is responsible; I leave it to the Minister to say if he is—if so, I here raise my voice in protest against his receiving an increase of salary. If I knew who the officer was I should have made it my duty to correspond with him, and asked him to see to these wharves. I have been taken to some of these wharves by my constituents. All that I could say was, that in coming to Parliament I will bring this to the notice of the Minister. But what can I do? I cannot force his hand, I can only bring it to his notice. The hon. gentleman knows that there are a number of piers that have not been taken over by this Government, and it has been an open question between himself and the Local Government whether to take them over or not. What is the consequence of this being left an open question? The Local Government will not lay out a dollar upon these piers. The Local Government say, the Dominion are going to take these over. The Dominion say: Well we have not decided yet. What is the consequence? The people are suffering between the two, because the piers which the Government have not taken over are in a worse condition than those which they have. The hon. gentleman knows that in most parts of the Island the inhabitants are all engaged in agriculture; he knows that they must have wharves within 8, 10 or 15 miles of where their crops are; and if these wharves are allowed to rot down it is an absolute necessity that they should be rebuilt, and the people have to do it. If such a state of things happened in any other part of the Dominion as happens in Prince Edward Island, you would see the whole time of this House taken up with it. Why, Sir, representatives

from the North-West and British Columbia are never slow to complain of any grievance, but when we take up a little time in complaining of the shameful way that we are treated hon. members say, Prince Edward Island is taking up the whole of the time. I make allowance for the fact that we are some distance from the department; but I cannot make allowance, I will not make allowance, for the gross negligence that has characterised the conduct of the Government in the management of our piers for the past year or two.

Mr. WELSH. I observe that \$6,000 is down in the Estimates for the repairs of wharves and piers in Prince Edward Island. I think it is very wrong that the sum should be so small; there should be a sum inserted sufficient to put all those piers in good order. I have now been in this House three Sessions. I did not complain much before, but I applied to the Minister privately telling him the condition of the wharves and piers, whereupon he promised they would be attended to and put in good order. It was not done last year. I applied to him again. He said he would place a larger sum in the Estimates and see that the work was done. There were \$3,000 in the Supplementary Estimates last year to put them in proper repair. The money has been spent, I am informed, but the piers are in a worse state than ever, and not a hand was put to some of them. I suggested to the Minister that in the Estimates a sufficient sum should be voted to put them in a respectable condition, and for the credit of the Government and the Department over which the Minister presides, I would insist if possible that this should be done. He asserts that the wharves in Prince Edward Island are more exposed than those on the St. Lawrence, but it is not so. There are no piers and wharves under the control of his department so little exposed as the wharves and piers of the Island, and if common attention were paid to them they could have been put in repair for a much less sum than will have to be expended on them now. I intend as the Estimates proceed, to bring some other matters connected with the harbors and piers to the notice of the Government, and I will defer any further remarks until those items are reached.

Mr. PERRY. As this question of the piers has come up it is the proper time to have the matter discussed all round the board. No doubt the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said very much to the purpose, and he administered the proper castigation to the Department of Public Works for their gross negligence to carry out their solemn promises. At the time of Confederation the Province was given the promise that the wharves and piers would be kept in proper repair. I have failed to find a single report, or a single line of a report, from any officer of the Government with respect to these piers; I have hunted through the library, but have found nothing. I do not know whether the Minister is aware that the Government own a wharf, which was taken four years ago from the Local Government, at the west point of the Island, and that has gone to grief. Do they mean not to rebuild it? They can build the Chignecto Ship Railway, which they are not bound to carry out under the terms of Confederation, but they cannot build a wharf at West Point. I suppose it will be kept over to be agitated about on the eve of another election when it comes around. The Government should know that they have a breakwater at Tignish, which cost \$12,000 or \$14,000. They ought to know, if they do not know, that it is in a very dangerous state and is liable to be carried away by the ice. They have another breaker at Miminegash which cost about \$5,000. If they have an officer in charge of those public works he should have informed the Government that that breakwater also was on the eve of sliding away. They ought to know that their breakwater at Malpeque, in Prince County, requires a large amount to place it in



proper repair. In spite of these facts, the hon. gentleman comes here and satisfies himself and thinks he has satisfied the House and the people of Canada, and more particularly the people of the Island, by telling them that he is going to repair all the piers and breakwaters with the big sum of \$6,000. Let me tell the hon. gentleman and this House that the best evidence that the people feel the wrong perpetrated upon them, more particularly by the Public Works Department than by any other, is plainly proved and shown by the results of the last election; and no wonder the people should have no kindly feeling for the Government of Canada when they are used in that manner. The idea of voting \$6,000 to repair about 30 wharves and breakwaters is absurd, especially when it is remembered that the Souris breakwater cost about \$70,000. I observe there is a small amount specified for that; but there is no special amount for Tignish, for Miminegash and others. We have a right to expect a report from a Government officer with respect to the condition of these piers and wharves. If we apply for sums for public works, such as post offices, we are told that we have no influence, that we do not support the Government. I find there is behind the curtain some person, who is not able to secure a seat in this House, but who, nevertheless, possesses more influence than the whole six members from the Island. Is that a fair way to treat the people of the Island? It is the same in regard to the piers. If this person, not connected with Parliament, but who has shown himself to be a friend of the Government, says this pier must be repaired, I suppose it will be repaired, provided it is in the interest of some Tory who expects boodle out of the money to be expended. There were \$6,000 voted last year, and the Minister said he would place in the Estimates a large sum. I defy anyone to show that one cent was expended on the Island by public tender or public contract. It was all handled by, and it all found its way into the pockets of Conservatives, friends of the Conservative party. I hope and trust an end will be put to this injustice, and that they will have some responsible officer who will make a yearly report with respect to the state of these public works, so that the representatives of the Island will be able to obtain all the information they require, in order to present in a proper way the requirements of their constituents before this House.

Mr. LOVITT. Before all the money goes to Prince Edward Island, I desire to call the Minister's attention to the condition of Port Maitland breakwater at Green Cove, respecting which I have had correspondence with the Minister for two years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have not got any money yet.

Mr. LOVITT. I have asked the Minister to place a sum in the Estimates for Port Maitland breakwater, and so far have not succeeded. It is the most important harbor on the coast, but on account of its bad condition the people of the village around it have almost all gone away. Vessels have to go ten miles down the coast to make a harbor. I have sent telegrams and letters, and have gone to the department myself on the matter, but without success. If Mr. Perley is responsible for the condition of these works, then the sooner he is removed the better. The department sent an engineer down there who spent \$200 or \$300 in visiting different parts of the coast, but nothing has been done. Port Maitland is really a harbor of refuge, and is deserving of the immediate attention of the department. The Minister has been very kind in regard to a good many matters, but I do not know how he is advised in regard to this breakwater. I do not desire to say that this is a political matter, but the breakwater is in a bad condition and should be immediately repaired.

Mr. COOK. We have the authority of the Minister of Public Works for the statement as to the manner in which Mr. PERRY.

the increase of salary to Chief Engineer Perley has been obtained. He may be a very valuable man and a good engineer. I have never heard otherwise. His salary last year was \$3,200, and it is now proposed to raise it to \$4,000. Now, Sir, I do not object so much to the increase as I do to the manner in which it was obtained. The Minister stated that this gentleman brought pressure upon the Government, that is that he said unless the Government would give him the \$800 increase, he had an opportunity of obtaining a position in England at a salary of \$5,000. If this is to be the rule of the Civil Service, and if the officers discover that the Government is so weak as to yield to their solicitations they will bring pressure of this kind, and the result will be disastrous. We already pay our civil servants a very large sum of money and I believe they should be paid liberally and fairly, but I wish to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that this system of increasing salaries on such grounds is a dangerous one. It is very unfortunate that the Minister should have made that statement on the floor of the House, because the civil servants of this country are a pretty intelligent lot of people. They read, and when they read the acknowledgment of the Minister that pressure was brought to bear upon him in a matter of this kind many of them will avail themselves of the opportunity, and we may have a repetition of this in every department of the service. I see that the salaries of several officers have been increased, but I hope that they did not bring the same pressure to bear upon the Minister. I suppose they did not, because the increase in each case is so small that out of his good heart he may have given it to them without pressure. It is very unfortunate that the statement of the Minister should go abroad that pressure was brought to bear upon him, by the fear that if he did not increase the salary of this particular officer he would leave the service of the Government and obtain a situation in Great Britain at a much larger salary. We have plenty gentlemen in this country who are able to fill the position as well as Mr. Perley, and probably the Minister would not have to wait very long to fill the office if it were vacant. I do not think he would have to go to the expense of even putting an advertisement in the newspaper. Probably he might get as good a man for the \$3,000 or even less than that. I hope the Minister will put himself right on this question, because I think it would be unfortunate if the statement went to the country that he has been forced to increase this gentleman's salary to the extent of \$800 a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no pressure brought to bear upon me by Mr. Perley. As I have said before, he is a very good officer, he has rendered very valuable services to the country, and is a most efficient chief of that branch of the department. I would certainly have asked Parliament last year to increase Mr. Perley's salary, but we could not do it at that period, and it was postponed to this Session. It was only incidentally that the reference was made to the position he could obtain in England. It was not until I said that I would try and have his salary increased to \$4,000 that Mr. Perley showed me the letter in question, but there was no pressure or anything of the kind. I am sure he would never have showed me the letter had I not told him I would ask Parliament to increase his salary. Therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cook) need not be alarmed that any pressure of that kind has been brought, or will be brought to bear on me. The other increases of salary in the department are purely and simply the \$50 annual increases according to the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There has been some discussion on the expenditure of this department, in reference to the proposed increase in the salaries of the officers who are specially in charge to assist the Minister in determining upon what public work it is necessary expenditure should take place. I might remind the Minister that two years

ago I called his attention, by letter and petition, to the necessity of improving the turning ground at the town of Dresden. The hon. gentleman said that he would send an officer there to report upon the condition of the place, and I believe such an officer was there and that such a report has been made. The representations made to the hon. gentleman were that the banks were sliding into the river, and that the winding ground had seriously affected the banks, so that, if they were not protected, serious damage would be done to property on either side, and that in fact the owners of the property would be entitled to compensation at the hands of the Government. I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject last year in this House, as well as by letter, and the hon. gentleman promised that attention would be given to the matter immediately. I have been written to by the owners of the property at that point and they tell me that nothing has yet been done towards the improvement, and that serious injury has been caused to their property by the neglect of the Government to properly protect the river. The hon. gentleman is aware that the river was dredged and widened there so as to furnish a place for steamboats to turn about, and that this dredging, without any piling to protect the banks, has made it probable that unless something is done the property on each side of the river will be seriously affected, and that the cost to the Government will be very much greater because of this damage than it possibly could cost to take precautions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there is a report about that, but those reports are not to be taken up until we consider the Supplementary Estimates, which will be submitted to my colleagues and to Parliament afterwards.

Mr. LOVITT. Is it necessary that Mr. Perley should report in favor of a work before any action will be taken by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I must have a report from the chief engineer, and he furnishes that on the data which he receives from his sub-engineer. He cannot go everywhere himself and he must entrust the examination to another who makes a report to him. After that, the chief engineer takes into consideration the data furnished him, and makes an estimate and lays it before the head of the department. All those matters are laid before Council and the result of the deliberations of Council is what we see in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LOVITT. Well, for the last two years, since 1887, about 90 feet have been broken away from the middle of the wharf, and the waves of the Atlantic are driving through it. No business man would attempt to do anything like that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has a local engineer there, I believe?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. One for the three Provinces, Mr. Grey. I think his headquarters are at St. John.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the deputy head receive any additional allowance for any other service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, that is the total amount.

Department of Railways and Canals..... .. \$47,700

Mr. FOSTER. In this vote there are twelve statutory increases at \$50 and one at \$20, making \$620. The decreases consist of the difference in the accountant's salary, \$600, and a difference in the salary of a second class clerk, \$300, making \$900, showing a total decrease of \$280.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Chief Engineer continue to receive \$2,000 for services in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What service does he render for it as matters now stand? As I understand, the Government have ceased to have any connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain odds and ends which I think are not yet fully completed. There is an arbitration going on at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But surely the Government do not propose to pay a gentleman in their employ a salary because he may be required to give evidence before an arbitration? That would hardly be ground for getting a salary.

Mr. FOSTER. When the item itself comes to be voted I will give the explanation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the Department of Railways as a separate department in the future as in the past? I remember a few years ago, when this department was separated from the Department of Public Works, it was done on the ground that the Government were engaged in the construction of a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this ground seemed to be satisfactory to the House. Now we have done constructing Government railways, I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. The Cape Breton Railway is being constructed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is partly constructed, and I think the Pictou Branch is finished, or nearly so. I have not heard that the Government contemplate any extension of Government roads. I would like to know whether the matter has been considered by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no present intention to alter the law in that regard.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No present intention or no intention at present?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no present intention and no intention at present.

Expenditure required in connection with the High Commissioner's office..... ..\$14,253 37

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with this, I think we must have some explanation. We were told a little while ago that the services of Mr. Chipman were not going to involve any additional charge. As appears by the Public Accounts, Mr. Chipman was employed in the office of the High Commissioner. Last year I see that the estimated charges for salaries in that office were \$7,554, and this year they are estimated at \$7,753, and I desire to know where the saving comes in, which we were told would be effected by placing Mr. Chipman in the Fisheries Department at a salary of \$2,350, while in the office which he left the expenditure remains just the same. I would like the Minister of Finance to explain where the saving comes in.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry I have not the explanation here among my papers. I will have it this evening if possible.

North-West Mounted Police ..... .. \$8,980 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When this item was up before, I alluded to the fact that in the public prints there appeared some rather serious charges about the establishment of a canteen at Regina, and its effects, and the item was allowed to stand until the First Minister came. I thought perhaps it would be in the public interest if some explanation were given of the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry I was absent at the time. I do not happen to have the papers at this moment. At eight o'clock I will have them here.

Customs Department.....\$38,750

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to throw out a suggestion with reference to the Trade and Navigation Returns. The Trade and Navigation Returns, unlike other departmental reports, which, though very valuable, are of special interest only to certain portions of the people, are of interest in all parts of the Dominion, and it has occurred to me that perhaps a more concise compilation might be made, apart from these returns, which might be more largely circulated among our people than the present issue of the Trade and Navigation Returns can be. There is a statistician, I think, who has compiled figures which are very valuable, outside the department, but whether it should be left to him or to some one in the department, I think it would be well that a compilation should be made of the imports and exports of the country, containing comparative tables—a compilation which would not give all the detailed information contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but would give sufficient to afford business men an idea of what the imports and exports are and the general run of trade. I am not prepared to say what it should contain or not, but merely throw out the suggestion, as the demand for the present returns is more than the supply can meet.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the suggestion. It is one that has already occurred to me. In fact I have been discussing with those whose duty it is to prepare the tables as to whether a volume of about half the size of the one now printed could not be compiled—a volume which would give general information and not contain so many details. For instance, if the statements were confined exclusively to the Dominion and not embrace each Province separately, that would reduce the work by at least one-third and perhaps one half. But the question suggested itself to me, how far those who import, and particularly those who export, would be satisfied with returns containing information of that kind. We know that when a company desires to establish any particular industry, one of the first questions they ask is how much of that particular article is imported into the country; and then the next question is, into what portions of the country is it imported; having obtained this information they decide where they can best locate their particular industry. I would be glad indeed to carry out the hon. gentleman's suggestion if at all practical. However, it shall receive my most earnest consideration. I may say, however, for the information of the hon. gentleman that the same number of copies are printed now as have always been printed. I have found it difficult, however, to supply the great demand made from all parts of the country for copies of the report, and I have been obliged at times to refuse applications made by hon. gentlemen who desire a larger number than is usually given; but I have endeavored to supply all demands as far as possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am afraid from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that he thinks I suggested this as a substitute for the Trade and Navigation Returns. I did not mean that; I think it is absolutely necessary for the use of hon. members and the public that we should have Trade and Navigation Returns. What I proposed was, that a compilation might be made for general use, which would not entail a great expense, and would answer the purposes of many who just seek general information. In addition I might say that while the Trade and Navigation Returns are voluminous and bulky at present, improvements might still be made in that respect. In the matter of the iron and cottons, though there is a good deal of detail

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

given, yet there are times when you cannot get just the information you want in reference to a particular item. It is absolutely necessary to retain the Trade and Navigation Returns, and to include in them even a little more detailed information. I did not want to imply that the hon. gentleman wanted to cut down the number, but there seems to have been an insufficient supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very glad to hear that the hon. the Minister is willing to consider the matter. Like my hon. friend, I have been very frequently applied to for copies of the Trade and Navigation Returns. It is utterly impossible to supply the whole public who desire it with those very bulky and voluminous returns, except at great expense, but I think that for all practical purposes a very much condensed abstract—an abstract, very little more than such details as are given monthly, or it may be quarterly or half-yearly to the department, would answer the great majority of enquiries; and that I presume the Minister could supply in considerably increased quantities at a very moderate cost. If that was not found sufficient, it might be enlarged from time to time. But there is a great and growing interest shown to get the general returns of our trade, and I think those which the Minister receives himself for his own use would afford to the great bulk of the applicants all the information they desire, although, of course, for the details of that information, they must necessarily refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot agree with my hon. friend that this would be in the interest of economy, because in any case the Trade and Navigation Returns must be continued. I would suggest that, with the addition of a few pages to that blue-book, the object of my hon. friend might be attained. There are some very valuable abstracts given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and if we had this comparative abstract made with previous years, say between 1888 and 1878, that would serve the purpose, and one or two pages would be sufficient. We have excellent comparative tables in that return on every other subject; but, when you want to refer to the comparative value of the products whether of the mine or the fisheries or other industries, that appears to be the only thing missing, as the return goes back only, I think, about three years in each volume.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON. Might I ask the Minister what is the cost per copy of the Trade and Navigation Returns?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot state that, because there is a staff of clerks employed in each branch, besides the cost of paper, printing, and so on.

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

### After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

North-West Mounted Police ..... \$8,860

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have read the remarks made by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other night. I think the question to which he referred was the canteen. The canteen system is known to exist in all the military corps in the British service, and it is a great convenience for the soldier. The same system has been adopted at Regina. I think the regulations are guarded enough to prevent any abuse. The barracks of the police are about two miles and a half, I think, from the trading part

of the town, and it is a great comfort to the soldier to be able to get his supplies at home.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that in this canteen groceries and other matters of that kind are sold and other supplies, that it is not for the sale of liquor alone?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a general store for the convenience of the police.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly. The hon. gentleman having been the inhabitant of a garrison town for many years, knows that canteens are a great convenience to the soldiers. I will read the general regulations submitted to me and approved by myself on the 14th December last:

"1. The canteen at head quarters is for the exclusive use and convenience of members of the force, and for the ready supply to them of articles at reasonable prices, but it is to be clearly understood that no one will be in any way prevented from resorting to shops in the neighborhood.

"2. No one other than an officer, non-commissioned officer, constable or special constable of the force, will, under any circumstances whatever, be allowed to make a purchase of any sort in the canteen, or from the canteen stock.

"3. To aid the commissioner in the general management of the canteen, as well as to maintain a supervision of all matters appertaining thereto, a committee of officers and non-commissioned officers will be nominated by the commissioner, the senior officer of such committee acting in the capacity of president.

"4. The practice of placing the immediate management of the canteen under a non-commissioned officer of the force having proved unsatisfactory, a fit and proper person to act in the capacity of sutler may be selected by the commissioner.

"5. The amount to be paid by the sutler for the privileges awarded him will be a stated *pro rata* sum monthly for each member of the force, including commissioned officers and special constables, stationed at Regina. This amount so paid will be expended on the recreation room by the canteen committee, with the approval of the commissioner."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I suppose that, as in the British service, the profits go to the regiment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The profits go to the regiment. This is expended in the recreation room, in the purchase of newspapers and things of that kind. The regulations continue as follows:—

"6. The books and invoices of the sutler are to be subject to inspection by the committee at any time.

"7. The sutler will be required to bind himself to stock the canteen with such articles as the committee may at any time direct. Such directions will be based upon carefully prepared estimates of the probable requirements.

"8. Lists of all articles and their prices will be prepared by the committee and posted in the canteen.

"9. Defaulters are not to be permitted to enter the canteen.

"10. Detailed instructions for the non-commissioned officers on canteen duty will be posted in the canteen.

These instructions are to be rigidly carried out, and are at all times to receive the supervision of the adjutant, of the orderly officer and of the regimental sergeant-major.

"11. The sutler is strictly to obey all orders and regulations which may be issued from time to time for the government of the canteen. In the event of its being proved to the satisfaction of the commissioner that he has been guilty of any irregularity, he will be liable to immediate dismissal.

"12. Should the sutler become incapacitated, or fail to supply the canteen in a satisfactory manner, or should it be considered advisable at any time to close the canteen, thirty days notice will be given him by the commissioner, and within six days after the expiration of such notice the sutler will remove his stock of goods from the canteen and will have no claim to compensation of any sort."

These are the regulations which are made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What descriptions of liquor, if any, are sold in the canteen?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nothing but beer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We do not suppose that the hon. gentleman knows anything about 4 per cent. beer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not think it would suit me at all. At all events, beer, as I understand, is the only liquor sold. I may say that there is a petition

from the trades in Regina, making complaint of the establishment of the sutler, who is a gentleman from Winnipeg. They complain that it is unjust to them. I will read their memorandum, which is most respectfully signed, addressed to myself:

"We your humble petitioners, being merchants in the town of Regina, beg leave to bring to your notice the great injustice we are subject to through having a large and complete stock of groceries and other goods opened out within the barracks square at the North-West Mounted Police post of this place. We consider that the opening of such an establishment is not necessary where the town is so adjacent, and our merchants carry full stocks, and competition is keen enough to keep goods at a fair price. We also labor under great disadvantages when it is considered that we have to pay taxes, rent, fuel, light, wages and other incidents as compared with the establishment of the barracks, which we are assured is furnished a building for its accommodation, apartments for the manager and assistant, fuel, light, free drayage by police teams to and from railway stations, of his goods, police teams at his service at all times, use of prisoners' labor when required, and best of all, accounts with the men all guaranteed."

That is quite a mistake, there is no guarantee. I positively refused to allow that provision to be made in the arrangement:

"All for the small sum of 40 cents per man per month. The right of the monopoly of the police trade at the post is bartered away to an individual who has no interest whatever in Regina or the Territories. We hereby proclaim our protest against this movement of your Government fostering a trade movement against individuals who are striving to build up this country, paying their full quota to sustain the Government. We cannot allow this opportunity to pass without calling your attention to a further grievance. We are also subject to having, in addition, opposition to our legitimate business callings, we are called upon to sustain our municipal government, while the Government own one-half of our town sites, the Canadian Pacific Railway one-quarter, and the North-West Land Company one-quarter, therefore, leaving the whole burden of the taxation upon the resident ratepayers, and we trust you will devise a speedy settlement of the Government interest in the town sites."

That is quite a different subject. I do not think it would answer any good purpose to read the reports, which dispute decidedly, in some respects, the accuracy of the paper that was read by the hon. gentleman opposite, because I have made up my mind on the whole that the game is not worth the candle. We shall close that arrangement with the present sutler, giving him the notice which we are allowed to give under those regulations, and allow the men to manage their own affairs by a committee of sergeants, and buy their own supplies, so as to avoid any appearance of unfairness towards the traders who are pushing their way in the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to that question I have no opinion to offer. This may be strictly within the business of the department, and no doubt they consider it very proper. But the only thing that does occur to me is this: whether, after all, this particular office of the comptroller of the North-West Mounted Police had not better be stationed at Winnipeg instead of Ottawa. I presume that Mr. White must spend a very large portion of his time, if not two-thirds of it, in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He makes two visits certainly in a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under any circumstances it appears to me that for the purpose of closely inspecting and controlling these affairs, the public service would really be better managed if we were closer to the scene of operations. This force, as I understand, is scattered mainly west of Regina. There is a small detachment here and there in the present Province of Manitoba, but a great proportion of this force is very far away indeed. Looking at the enormous distance that intervenes, it would almost seem as if it were a waste of the capacity of the comptroller to keep him here, unless there are very strong reasons indeed to the contrary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman mentioned that before, and I made some enquiry about it. In consequence of the great extent of that country, the distances are

so great, that the comptroller would be practically as far away, as far absent from the scene, as he would be here in Ottawa. I believe after discussing the matter with those who ought to know, including the financial officers here, that it is better that the comptroller should be here. If the comptroller was stationed at Winnipeg, or Regina, or another place, there must still be a responsible officer here to deal with the innumerable accounts coming in from every station. He is always here in communication with the Department of Finance, and especially with the Auditor General. I fear if the comptroller went up there he would still have to have a deputy comptroller down here at Ottawa—I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expense of that force per head is very great. It has been somewhat reduced since the old time in consequence of the comparative facility of obtaining forage; but it still ranges, if I am not misinformed, close on \$500 per man. Now making all allowances possible for the expenses of keeping the men in proper condition, it does appear to me a very heavy expense. It is vastly in excess of the expense of the English cavalry soldier. I think that the English cavalry soldier costs about \$450 per head,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, we spend on this force—I see there is an attempt to cut it down—but judging from the actual accounts I see that we spend on this force of, say, 1,000 men, about \$360,000, amounting to \$360 per head on the average. I cannot but think that close inspection might enable the average expenditure to be considerably reduced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Between the expenditure of a cavalry regiment stationed in England at any of their headquarters and our mounted police in the North-West there is no comparison. The cavalry regiment is in barracks; it does not move away except to go to the drill ground and to have perhaps some little excursions through the country to keep the horses and men in good health. This force has very hard work. Let hon. members only think for a moment that this whole extent of country, which is almost the size of Europe, has only 1,000 men. Besides their employment in watching the Indians on the reserves, and preserving peace between the red and white men, they are employed on a continuous system of patrol from one end of the country to the other, from the Rocky Mountains to the head of Lake Superior. Although the Dominion is not obliged to furnish a force of that kind for the Province of Manitoba, yet practically they are obliged to do so, because the Province has no force of its own and has not sufficient means to keep up a mounted police along the frontier. At the request of the Government of Manitoba there is a patrol along southern Manitoba to prevent smuggling, in the first instance, and, in the second place, to prevent horse and cattle stealing and raids of all kinds. That is not obligatory on the police according to law, but I think the committee will understand it is in the cause of good order and law observance that a portion of the force is used in Manitoba. Then they have to watch the whole line from the western boundary of Manitoba to the eastern boundary of British Columbia. They have stations along the whole line. Day and night the patrols are moving from station to station. They seize smuggled goods, as the reports will show, and as hon. gentlemen if they pay any attention to the subject will ascertain, and stop smuggling of all kinds. They seize any intoxicants that may be brought in. They are very successful in preventing the stealing of horses. They keep up a friendly relation with a similar force on the south side of the line, and there is an interchange not only of courtesies but of services; they help each other. On information coming from the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

American side that a lot of horses have been stolen and brought into the Dominion by our Indians or by our horse traders, our police immediately use every exertion to find the animals and return them, and to punish the thieves. The American force on the south side of the line reciprocate in the same way. This system keeps the country in order and keeps up pleasant relations along the line between the populations on each side of it. Besides all that, the force has smaller or larger detachments, according to the size of the Indian reserves scattered all through that country, not only along the border and the foot of the Rocky Mountains, but also along the Saskatchewan, and in addition we were obliged last year to send a force and keep a force for a year in British Columbia. According to the Mounted Police Act, the Government of the Dominion, may, on the request of the Government of a Province, aid them with a body of police. Last year there were apprehensions of an Indian insurrection in the Kootenay District, and there was a representation from the Government of British Columbia, stating there was imminent danger of an Indian war. Those apprehensions proved to be, in a great degree, unfounded and the reports exaggerated; but still the statement was so positive that life and property were in danger, and they had no force in British Columbia to meet any Indian rising, that the responsibility of sending a force devolved upon us. That cost a great deal of money. It was successful, in the first place, in putting down any apprehensions, and, in the second place, in giving the people of British Columbia a very exalted opinion of the value of this force. I refer to these matters to show that the expense of a cavalry soldier in barracks at Canterbury, in England, cannot be compared in any way with the expense of a mounted policeman obliged to carry food for himself, and his animal, with him. These parties are frequently, if no railway is near, accompanied by waggons or carts or other means of transport for food for the force. This costs a great deal of money. I believe the expenditure, so far as I can learn, has been very carefully supervised by the comptroller, who, in my opinion, is a very good officer and a very economical officer. He sees there is no undue expenditure. I have given this explanation to show the difference between the expense of a cavalry regiment in England and this force, which is constantly moving through the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not at all disposed to underestimate the value of the force. I have always considered the force to be necessary; whether it is necessary to have so large a force is a question I am not going to raise. It may come up possibly in connection with the detailed Estimates further on. Nor would I have felt it my duty to have called attention to the matter, even to a very considerable increase, but the figure named is a large one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is perhaps as well that the House and the country should obtain the detailed explanation which the hon. gentleman has given the committee. My point was simply this, whether—looking at the nature of the expenditure and the innumerable details, and the great importance it was for the comptroller to be in a position to keep an eye on those expenses—it would not be better to have his headquarters in the North-West?

Mr. WATSON. The First Minister has remarked that a considerable number of the police were maintained in Manitoba to maintain law and order there. The Province of Manitoba has a provincial police force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so; I said they were there to watch the frontier.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, and not to preserve order there. It is true there is a mounted police force along the frontier,

but I understand their duties there are to assist the Customs authorities to prevent timber being stolen from Government lands, and not to maintain law and order in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I understood the hon. Minister rightly, I think he said the petition of the memorialists was granted, and that a change would take place with respect to the complaint they had addressed to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That there would be a change.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has that been communicated to them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has not been communicated to them. It was a memorial or petition very recently received.

Department of Customs..... \$35,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the item of Customs I understood that that item was allowed to stand over.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct and I intended, if there was no objection to the passage of this item, to suggest that the discussion which commenced the other night might more properly be continued under the item for that special service to which they objected. I do not object to take up the matter at any time, as I desire to refer to the remarks made by some of the gentlemen, more particularly to those which reflected on myself. It is more convenient to confine the discussion to the particular item which it is necessary to discuss.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would, no doubt, expedite the criticism if we would confine ourselves more closely to the particular item. In looking over the details of the Customs Department inside service the Minister will observe that item 194 under the head of Customs is included in the salary of the Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board. Would not that come under this discussion?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I do not think so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it not so much expense added to the department?

Mr. BOWELL. It is adding so much to the salary of the deputy head which has been paid him for a number of years out of the appropriation for the Board of Customs, and has always been voted in the same way as now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am aware of that, but I thought that it might be discussed under this item.

Departmental Contingencies..... \$192,250

Mr. McMULLEN. There are several items in connection with departmental contingencies which ought to receive the serious consideration of this committee. I notice that a considerable sum of money has been paid out in connection with the Post Office Department, for paying a number of clerks extra sums for computing interest. I do not understand why a clerk who is engaged in an office, and who is supposed to discharge the duties devolving upon him in that office, should be allowed an extra sum for the purpose of computing interest from year to year. I notice that this expenditure is increasing, and of course those clerks when once they get an opening for making extras and find that the House and Government are prepared to pass it, will try to increase their salaries by this means. I think that this is a very bad principle. I find that the average salary paid to the civil servant is \$1,190 a year or nearly \$100 a month. Their hours of work are not long; they are supposed to go to work at half past nine in the morning and leave at four in the afternoon, but if they devote half an hour, or an hour, in computing interest on deposits they make an extra charge for it. I do not

think this is right. If a farmer hires a man for farm work and tells him to go into the potato patch or to weed his onions he will not pay him an extra sum for an hour's work of that kind, and I do not see why we should be called upon to sanction items of this kind every Session. When one civil servant gets an extra pay others will be inclined to claim it also, and the result is that the money voted for extra services has been something enormous. Last year, including some other items, it was in the neighborhood of \$129,000. It is time that we should put a stop to this. We employ a man for a special department, and he is supposed to discharge the duties devolving upon him in connection with that department. He has no right to say what kind of work he shall do or what kind of work he shall not do, and it is for the head or the deputy head of the department to say that he shall perform all work that comes within the jurisdiction of that department without extra charge. I think that the initiating of this system was pernicious and that the perpetuation of it on our part is undoubtedly wrong. I desire to express plainly and frankly my opinions on this matter and to say that I believe the system should be stopped at once. Those men are well paid, as I said before, and there is no line of business in this country in which officials are so well paid as in the Civil Service. Take school teachers, or clerks or bookkeepers engaged in wholesale or retail houses, and you will find that, in the general salaries paid, there is no other class paid so well as civil servants. In the face of that fact, I cannot for my life understand how it is that they are permitted to initiate a system of getting extra allowances, which has been practised in every department for years, and the system is growing from year to year. I consider it the duty of the House, apart from political feelings altogether, a duty devolving upon one side as well as the other, to strongly protest against the continuation of a system that is undoubtedly leading us into financial recklessness, and into a system of expenditure that has already become burdensome and is going to be worse. I earnestly look forward to a change in the system altogether. My impression is that we shall have to put our civil servants upon a basis entirely beyond the control of the head of the department or the deputy head with regard to removal or otherwise. I think it would be an advantage if we had a Civil Service Board of inspection whose duty it would be to inspect the services performed by every civil servant in the Dominion, and if they found that he was not performing sufficient duty to warrant his continuation in office or sufficient work for the money he received, they should have power to dismiss him. I would leave in the hands of the Government of the day the power to appoint, but I contend that as long as we have the system we now have, it will continue to grow worse, and through political influence men will be installed in office who are unfitted for the duties and will be in the way of others. As a general rule, you find that when men are once installed in the Civil Service, they are never dismissed. That is a peculiarity of the service. You will find no business man in the country who always gets the man who suits him, whether it is a bookkeeper or a salesman or anything else; but you never hear of a dismissal from the Civil Service. After a man is appointed, he goes on from year to year, his salary is increased, and ultimately he is superannuated. I think the Government should put their foot down, and decide that when a man is in a department, he must perform all the labor devolving upon him, and receive no extra pay for extra work. As one man comes to know that some fellow servant has been allowed a charge of this kind, the evil grows until it becomes general. I hope this system will be so criticised and its evils pointed out, that the Government will take an immediate step to put a stop to it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that there is a reduction this year, and I agree with the hon. gentleman who

has spoken that some further savings might be effected. It would be almost impossible to go through the Auditor General's Report and point the items, consecutively, which to those who have not the incurring of the expenditure seem unreasonable; but the Ministers themselves, in looking through them, will see, as they have been able to effect considerable savings this year, amounting to some \$7,000, in what directions they will be able to go on with the good work. There are some suggestive items here. There is one about which I would like to enquire of the Minister of Justice, not so much because of the money value in it, as from a little curiosity. I see that in that department a statuette of Sir John has been bought, and I wondered whether it was of the great original—but not the only Sir John—or of some other Sir John. Then I wondered why it was there, and the thought crossed my mind that as our esteemed Premier is charged with the duty of supervising closely the expenses in all the departments, finding himself, with the many duties that crowd upon him, unable to discharge them all, he hit upon the expedient of having a little statuette of himself put up in every department, which would serve to call to the remembrance of the officers that he was charged with that particular duty. Then, again, I thought it might perhaps have been placed there as an emblem of that principle of justice which is so dear to British hearts; but unfortunately that thought is marred in my mind. While I would like to give full credit to Sir John in my mind as being an emblem of justice, the gerrymander and one or two other acts crept into my mind, and I felt that that would hardly be an appropriate emblem in all respects. There are such things as human frailties, and I thought perhaps it would be better to stick to the even-handed scale as an emblem of justice. I thought, however, that I would just like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice whether the statuette was of the Sir John, or of a Sir John that has perhaps been called into existence at a later date.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend if he would not allow the statuette of Sir John to be voted without remark on condition that the original should disappear.

Mr. PATERSON. (Brant.) No, I would not; I do not think the hon. gentleman thinks I do. I would like ample time to be given for repentance of the gerrymander, and reparation for a great many other things. Oh, no; I would not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You want me to carry out the gerrymander of 1892, as I promised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the material of the statuette is brass or marble?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is *ære perennius*.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I may state that those extra amounts were allowed to clerks at certain periods, because in two of the departments, the Finance Department and the Post Office Department, quarterly and half-yearly there are special accounts and special large calculations of interest to be made up. This requires the clerks to be engaged sometimes to twelve or one o'clock at night. The question arose whether it would not be better to employ extra clerks for the purpose of doing that work, and adhere to the principle that clerks should not receive anything more than their salaries. That question has been thoroughly considered both in this country and in Great Britain. In England precisely the same system prevails, for the difficulty presented itself of getting clerks who would be equal to the technical requirements at those times. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is objectionable that a clerk who is employed at a fixed salary should receive any other remuneration; but in those two depart-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

ments particularly, it has been found impossible to do otherwise.

Mr. McMULLEN. Apply that principle to other lines of business. Take, for instance, bank clerks. It is well known that they have to make up a monthly statement at the end of every month. We know that they have to work from nine to ten o'clock, and sometimes midnight, in making up the monthly statements, and I would like to ask hon. gentlemen if the banking institutions pay their clerks extra money for that extra service. I say they do not. I would again refer hon. gentlemen to the wholesale trade of the country, of which we have representatives in this House. I would like to ask any wholesale man, if, when he takes stock and has to keep his men at work until midnight, he pays those men extra. I do not think so; he may give them a lunch or something of that kind, but it is not the rule to give extra pay for this extra time. I would refer hon. gentlemen to the retail trade, in which I have been 27 years, and I know that it is not the custom to allow clerks extra pay in that trade for extra work taking stock. That is not the custom in banking, in the retail trade, or in any other line of business, and I would like to know why we should make an exception in favor of the Civil Service. The heads of the different departments in that service should follow the same rule as is followed in every other line in this country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Before we leave this item I would like to have more detailed information with regard to certain expenses which really seem to be far larger than they ought to be. In the first place, I think it is to be regretted exceedingly that contingencies are as large as they are. If we look over the various departments, we see that the contingencies amount to the enormous sum of \$192,250. Although the amount appears to be less than it was last year, we cannot help regretting that it is not much less than what it is. We find that, although ample allowance was made for the departments generally, yet, they expended as regards the last item in contingencies the sum of about \$20,000. Now, while I do not wish to be regarded as finding fault with contingencies expended which are absolutely necessary, yet I do feel that we should guard public expenditure just as closely as we would our own, as we would, if we were employes, our employer's expenditure. That being the case, we ought to have explanations given to us as to why certain items are larger than what we consider they should be. The other day I drew attention to the item of travelling expenses of one of the Ministers, which appears to me to be very large, too large to vote without our being given details. I refer to the travelling expenses of the Minister of Militia. You will find in the Auditor's Report that these amounted to \$1,400 last year. While I raise no objection at all to the Minister's expenses being paid while travelling on Government work, yet to be asked to vote this money, without being given any vouchers, or explanations, or reasons to show that the money was expended in the service of the country, is, I think, going too far. While the Minister of Militia may have to travel a great deal, we find that the travelling expenses of other departments, in which one would naturally suppose there were as many duties to perform upon the road as the Minister of Militia has to perform, are much smaller than his. I find also that the Postmaster General has a very large item, over \$1,000 for travelling expenses. I refer to the former Postmaster General, who was appointed Lieutenant Governor. What the items may be composed of we have no knowledge.

An hon. MEMBER. He may have gone south.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend behind me says he has gone south. I am afraid too many of the Ministers occasionally go south in the winter or to the seaside in the

summer season, and very conveniently, perhaps, they may find that it is necessary to attend to some public duty during that time. If that be the case, they should explain it. They should be honest enough to say that on account of the arduous duties they are compelled to perform here during the winter they go to watering places during the summer. Whether that be so or not, we are entitled to an explanation as to the nature of these charges. The Government may say that this is a trifling matter, but the principle is equally as great in a small item as it is in a larger one, and if they by any means expend one cent of public money without justification they should be held as strictly responsible, and be called upon to give as full explanation to the House as if it were a large sum. During last Session when a discussion came up in reference to cab hire, a promise was made before the item finally passed that we should have full explanations and vouchers. Has any explanations been given to us? This year we find one department expending in cab hire, outside of travelling expenses, the sum of over \$1,600. We find that another department, which, perhaps, has as much to do as this one where an expenditure of \$1,600 is required for cab hire, expends only 50 cents for cab hire. Either the Minister of the Department of Customs must use his own money to pay his cab hire or travels on foot a great deal more than many other members of the Government do, or other members of the Government charge a great deal more than they ought. We should have some reason given for this expense. It is certainly too large an item to allow to pass unchallenged. It may be said that urgency often causes a Minister to order a cab hurriedly in order to transact public business. I should not find any fault with the cab hire being paid in that case, when it is in the interest of the country; but no Minister has any more right to employ a cab for running about the city of Ottawa, or any other place, at the public expense than any private individual. The money is not his, it belongs to the country, and we are here to protect the interests of the country against any encroachment on the part of the Government or any member of this House. That being the correct principle, I cannot for the life of me see how any member of the Government—I do not say they do so, but the items look very suspicious—can feel himself justified in using the public funds for his individual ease and comfort. He has no right to do so, and such a case is contrary to everything which is upright and honest. I hope that the Minister of Militia will be able to explain the large item of \$1,600 for travelling expenses. I know he is a warlike individual, and that he may have many duties in connection with the position he occupies, and may have to travel from one end of the country to the other. I know that his labors are arduous, because persons who are engaged in military pursuits have a great deal to do which exhausts them. They have, for instance, to go to the seaside. I do not suppose that the Minister of Militia would charge to the public his expenses when he went to the seaside to regain his health, but I do expect that he and other Ministers will explain to the committee the great disparities which exist as to travelling expenses, cab hire and sundries in connection with their departments. It is the duty of the Government to explain these matters and not to allow it to go abroad that any wrong is being done. Individually, I have very little confidence in the Government. I believe they need watching, and with all the watching which we can give I do not think we will be able to do more than protect the interests of the country. I believe that not only is there a large amount of money expended in the various departments here which should not be expended, but there is an enormous amount of money squandered in the Government offices throughout the country. We ought to bring home these charges against the Government of the

day, and it is our duty to challenge these items and ask for a full explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I regret to say that, for the last two years, in consequence of my engagements in Ottawa, I have been unable to go to the seaside, but I hope next summer I shall be able to get away and enjoy the rest which I am perfectly satisfied my friends will consider I am entitled to. The question which the hon. gentleman has just brought before the House is one strictly within the limits of the Opposition. It is perfectly right that every item of expenditure should be challenged by the loyal Opposition of Her Majesty. The charges for travelling expenses this year are larger than they have been before, and I am asked to give an explanation, which I am perfectly prepared to give in the frankest possible manner to the House. I considered that it was my duty upon departmental business to go to British Columbia, and more than one-half of the expenditure which the hon. gentleman has challenged was incurred for the purpose of going to British Columbia, where I was detained for a fortnight, and where it was my duty as head of the Department of Militia to investigate important questions which called for the attention of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You did not want to go to the seaside after going to British Columbia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I went to British Columbia in December, and the hon. gentleman who has the benefit of living on that lovely Island of Prince Edward knows that that is not the month which one usually selects for visiting the seaside. However, I went to British Columbia at a time when it was absolutely necessary for me to go as head of my department, and I think the duties I was called upon to fulfil were such as required the attention of the head of the department. Every account of my expenditure was submitted to the Auditor General, and not one was challenged. The hon. gentleman a couple of days ago congratulated me on saving \$100 in the civil branch of my department. I am sorry that they did not consider that I am really deserving of the same congratulation now. I think the expenditure is as small as possible. It covers travelling expenses from Quebec to Montreal, and to several camps, and every item of the expenditure was made as small as it was possible to make it. However, next summer, when I go to the seaside, I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will see that when I do go for my own benefit, I pay my own expenses and do not charge them to the public.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am sure that the members of this House must feel very thankful to the Minister of Militia and Defence for the very lucid explanation he has given of this item of expenditure. I see by the Auditor General's Report that the hon. gentleman expended \$1,498.17 in travelling expenses. He has given us the voluntary explanation that more than half of that was expended in his trip to British Columbia. He says he was there two weeks. I do not know whether he travelled in the celebrated car "Jamaica," which is familiar to members of this House, and which has been occupied by men of more prominence than the Minister of Militia, but I cannot understand how in two weeks he could spend \$750 in travelling to British Columbia. It certainly is not a very ordinary expenditure. I think that the expense, even if he paid his fare, would not be more than about \$150 going there and coming back, leaving \$600 to live on for two weeks. I do not know how sumptuous the fare of a Minister of the Crown may be, especially when he is on the Pacific coast in the winter time; but to any ordinary individual who is not accustomed to occupy such high and dignified positions of trust in the interest of the public at large, it does seem to me an enormous expense. He could not surely eat this amount while he was



in British Columbia. He does not look as if he could have eaten \$600 worth of food. He certainly took his own clothes with him, and he could not have invested very much in that line in British Columbia. What became of this \$600 which he managed to squander while he was there, besides the amount to pay his fare, I do not understand. I do not think any gentleman in this House can accept the explanation he gives as satisfactory. He may consider it satisfactory himself, but I do not think he can get even one gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches with him to accept it as satisfactory. Now, in my opinion, the expense, according to the Minister's own showing, has been of the most extravagant kind. If the Minister of Militia requires to spend \$750 to make a two weeks' trip to the Pacific coast, I fancy if he goes down to the seaboard on the Atlantic, and stays a few weeks to recuperate his health that he injures by attending to his arduous duties here, he would require to expend over a \$1,000.

Mr. GILLMOR. He pays that himself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, I am glad to hear it. At all events, I think it was an enormous expense for the Minister of Militia to make in two weeks. While I am on my feet I may mention that I find in the Auditor General's Report that no less than \$33,858.26 were expended by the Ministers in travelling allowances, for the travelling of employes, cab hire in Ottawa, street car fares, &c., during the fiscal year. Now, as has been said by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), this does seem to be a very large amount of money to expend. I will particularise another item, that is the travelling expenses of Sir Charles Tupper. I see last year that it cost this country \$3,018.45 to pay Sir Charles Tupper's travelling expenses. Now, if he had travelled every week day in the year, he would, at that rate, have \$10 per day to spend. Everybody knows that an ordinary man can travel for less money than \$10 a day; but allowing him \$10 a day he had to travel 302 days in order to spend that sum of money. Probably some of this money he expended while he was at Washington.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No, \$5,000 extra.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, that is worse than I thought it was. I would like to have some explanation in regard to this expenditure. He spent \$3,018 in travelling expenses, and \$5,000 besides when he was in Washington negotiating a treaty which has fallen through. Then there is another matter. I do not consider the Ministers are the only transgressors in this line, for I see that one gentleman who is in the service of the Government, and has been for some years, travelled no less than 261 days during last year. He is a great traveller; he received \$1,773.70 as expenses for travelling. Well, that seems to be an extraordinary sum. That gentleman is Mr. J. G. Moylan, and he is Inspector of Penitentiaries. No doubt it was necessary for him to do a good deal of travelling, but there are only five penitentiaries in the Dominion of Canada, and he certainly did not require to spend \$1,773.70 and to travel 261 days in order to inspect five penitentiaries in the Dominion of Canada. I cannot understand how he could have done it. I do not know for a certainty, but I believe that a very large sum of money is expended, not only by Ministers of the Crown, but by—I may just as well speak plainly—other public servants, by those in the departments, and not alone in the interest of the public service. I believe a large proportion of the traveling expenses are incurred by these gentlemen enjoying themselves at some summer resort, or in some way for their pleasure. I am satisfied that it is utterly impossible for this money which is expended by some of the deputy heads and some other gentlemen, amongst them Mr. Moylan, to be spent in a legitimate way. He could not possibly require to travel 261 days, or to be

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

absent from the seat of Government 261 days, and to spend this large sum of money to inspect five penitentiaries in the Dominion of Canada. I think it is due to the people's representatives here, I think it is due not only to those who sit on this side of the House but to hon. gentlemen who support the Government, that some explanation should be made in regard to this enormous expenditure. Of course, we have been told in times past that it is a small matter for a member of Parliament to be cavilling about cab hire, and the travelling expenses of the Ministers of the Crown and others in connection with the Government. We are here not only to look after large sums but after small sums, and if extravagance is found in small matters we may expect it in large. Therefore I hope that some of the Ministers will rise and explain in some way more satisfactory that the Minister of Militia has done, how this money has been expended, and if there is an actual necessity for so large an expenditure every year for travelling expenses, not only of Ministers of the Crown, but of their deputy heads, and others in the service. I may say, however, that there is one man in the public service who deserves credit, and whom I want to except; there is one man, and that is the Minister of Customs. We never can find any fault with the Minister of Customs' account for travelling expenses. I believe he keeps strictly within the letter of the law at all times; I believe he manages his department in that regard just as economically as he would manage his own private affairs, and, therefore, I have great pleasure in complimenting my old friend the Minister of Customs, for the frugality he exhibits in this respect.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to hear the Postmaster General explain the item of over \$1,000 for travelling expenses of the late Postmaster General during last year. No doubt he will have several vouchers, and that he will be in a position to show us that every cent of it was legitimately spent in travelling. I do not know where he travelled. I know that he was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia and he left Ottawa. Very likely he had to travel down to the Province where he was going to assume his office. Certainly it is a very large item. I was not aware that the Postmaster General had to travel so much. Perhaps we shall see the present Postmaster General have an item of \$1,000 for the same purpose, because I believe he will not travel unless it is necessary in the interests of the department. If, another year, we find that he has expended \$1,000 for travelling we will think that the item is an honest and correct one. Perhaps the present Minister of Agriculture, the old Postmaster General, will be in a position to know how much ought to be expended during the year by a Postmaster General travelling around the country. Certainly we require some explanation from the Government with regard to these items. If they say, which it appears they will be compelled to say, that they cannot explain them, therefore they will keep as close as an oyster's mouth, I suppose we will be obliged to accept that as an explanation. My brave and gallant friend the Minister of War did himself an injustice in his explanation. If he expended in travelling \$600 or \$700 in two weeks, I hope he will not travel as many days as some of the officers do or the expense will amount to an enormous sum.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will try not to do so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He says he hopes he will find time from the services of the Government to visit the sea shore. Perhaps he went there last summer and enjoyed a recreation from his arduous duties. Perhaps you might as well call Rye Beach the seaside. That is a comfortable resort, a pleasant place, and you can pass a week there and be rather invigorated and made more comfortable for your duties after your return. Perhaps the hon. gentleman

will be able to explain whether he was performing some of his duties down there, and if a part of the items were incurred on that account. However, that may be we are entitled to some explanation at the hands of the Government. The First Minister should also explain the item under the head of Privy Council, the contingencies of which are very largely increased, unjustifiably so. It is only proper that he should, this Session, fulfil the promise he made last Session, but which he deferred until to-morrow, to give us details with regard to these expenditures. He might do so now. There is plenty of time and opportunity, and the explanations would come very conveniently. He appears to be good-natured and would give us a good-natured explanation. I hope the Minister will feel it to be due to himself and his colleagues that the explanation should be given. I guarantee that if we were able to show the same condition of things in the Department of Customs as we are able to do in other departments, that Minister would be only too ready to give ample explanations. Members cannot find a single item in the way of expenditure that that Minister is not able to justify, and that without any hesitation. That ought to be the case with every department of the Government, and we have an upright man in regard to departmental contingencies who is an example to the rest. Perhaps, however, hon. gentlemen will offer explanations, and I will wait for them, and I certainly hope the Postmaster General will be able to explain an item of a thousand dollars and over.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to my hon. friend for West Elgin (Mr. Wilson), I may say that this expenditure of which he complains was made by my predecessor. I am informed that he went out to British Columbia, to the North-West, to Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and travelled all round for the purpose of enquiring into the efficiency of the post-offices in those different parts. Particulars as to the time he was absent and the distance he travelled were sent in to the Auditor General, and I am sure that that gentleman has seen that the charges were not at all excessive. As to the other large charge of \$1,000 that was made by the late comptroller in the post office: He was sent to England for the purpose of studying the money order system and the system generally carried on there and in France. He spent a long time abroad, and I am sure his charge is very moderate for the time he served the department there.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did I understand the Minister of Militia to say that his accounts after his trip to British Columbia were submitted in detail to the Auditor General?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, all accounts were sent in, of course.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the custom that all accounts incurred by the Ministers are submitted in detail to the Auditor General?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mine are.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then we will be able to arrive at the items in the Public Accounts Committee, if the accounts are in possession of the Auditor General in detail, and we shall only have to ask for the accounts to be brought down in order to have an opportunity of inspecting the items. It would be a good rule if all the members of the Government would follow the rule which the Minister of Militia says he practices. If I have done an injustice in the remarks I have made I shall be glad to take them back after I have scanned the items of the accounts, but not before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the First Minister, who I suppose is responsible for the Privy Council Department, to the very heavy expense that appears to have been incurred under that head. I find from the Auditor General's Report that no less than

\$15,380 were required to be expended in that department. I remember very well the expenditure in that office in 1877 and 1878, and it is worthy of the attention of the committee to compare the two expenditures. In 1877, the total expenditure for contingencies for the Queen's Privy Council in Canada amounted to \$2,996 as against \$15,880. A difference between \$3,000 and \$15,000 is hardly capable of being explained by any increase of work in that department that could have occurred. I could understand that there might be some increase on account of the fact of the First Minister being now President of the Council, and to a reasonable increase on that account I would not object. But the difference between \$3,000 and \$15,000 is altogether out of the question, unless there has been some very remarkable change, which has not yet come to our notice, as to the manner of doing business there. A brief explanation, I think, would be desirable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, but I am unable to explain the difference now.

Mr. PERRY. I should like to obtain some further information in regard to the items of expenditure for the Lobster and Oyster Commission. I observe the following items: Edward Hackett, Chairman, July 4th to November 9th, 1887, 80 days, \$800; A. Ogden, July 4th to November 9th, 1887, 114 days, \$1,140; J. H. Duvar, Secretary, July 4th to November 9th, 1887, 129 days, \$645; W. B. Deacon, July 4th to November 9th, 1887, 105 days, \$504; J. H. Duvar, travel of Commissioners, \$738.14; J. H. Duvar, telegrams, \$75.48. I see again on the next page of the Auditor General's report an expenditure of \$3,998. J. H. Duvar received \$2,034; W. B. Deacon, \$250; Edward Hackett, \$450. I see here that there appear to have been no vouchers. It is almost surprising that a gentleman will get \$10 a day for eighty days, and be paid a very large amount for expenses besides, and have no vouchers. I cannot understand that, and I am sure it is due to the House and due to the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that a proper explanation should be given. I saw those gentlemen when they were down on the Lobster Commission. I cannot say that I saw them at work, but I suppose they did a little work for we had a small blue-book last year containing a report of the work they had done. They got the ideas of some gentlemen engaged in the lobster fisheries and put them in print. I remember the book right well; you could easily shove it in your pocket and the weight of it would not necessitate your having to take a cab. We had to pay them very well, however, for what they did, and I contend that it is not right to vote this money when no vouchers were forthcoming. It is not right that we should be in the dark on this matter and not know whether the country got value for its money or not.

Mr. COOK. Comparisons sometime are invidious and I am afraid my friend in alluding to the Minister of Customs has done an injustice to the Minister of Militia. Probably my friend the Minister of Customs travels on a railway pass and the Minister of Militia does not. I know that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) declared last year, that he was not one of those who travelled on a pass, and that statement was heralded from one newspaper in the County of Simcoe to another in his praise. Perhaps an explanation could be made in this way. It may be that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia was not treated so generously as the Minister of Customs by the railway authorities, and the consequence is my hon. friend is getting credit for something he does not deserve. He may be travelling on a pass whilst my friend the Minister of Militia has to pay his railway fares. I would like to have him make an explanation of this matter, because after all a man, whether he lives at home or abroad, has to eat. I do not believe the expenses of living would be so very much

larger in his absence than if he were at home, and I do not suppose he would eat much more away than he would at home. I have no doubt that if my hon. friend would make an explanation he would put himself right with the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask an explanation about the subscription to newspapers in the different departments. It amounts to over \$10,000 and I suppose that merely means subscription to the papers for the different departments, and that it does not include advertisements.

Sir RICHARD CARWRIGHT. There is a separate heading for advertisements.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, there is a separate heading for that. It looks almost as if it would be impossible to make use of \$10,000 worth of papers. One department has \$884 for Canadian newspapers, besides some English and American. We will suppose they are daily papers and cost \$7 or \$8 a year, that would make over 100 papers there. It certainly gives one an idea of the task there is on a Minister's hands if he has to go through all those newspapers. I would like to know if any Minister could give the list of papers that he takes, and whether there is a general rule which guides them in subscribing to papers; whether they are taken altogether from one side of politics, or whether the organs of the Opposition party find entrance into the offices? I would like to ask if there is a rule that all leading papers, of whatever shade of politics, should be subscribed for in fair proportions. The Minister of Customs, who has been so complimented to-night, may explain that. In his department I see there are \$537 worth of Canadian newspapers subscribed for; it is less than in other departments, but it seems impossible that so many papers could be hung around the rooms.

Mr. FOSTER. The papers are subscribed for by the different departments on the basis of their usefulness and necessity, and as a rule the best papers are selected. Naturally, I suppose, the best papers are found to be more largely on the side of politics—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That pays best.

Mr. FOSTER,—that supports the Government. Although it may seem useless upon first view, to have such a large number of papers in the departments, I may say that every department has to take a certain number of papers for its guidance and information. Take, for instance, the Department of Marine and Fisheries; a large number of papers are taken there and they are found valuable in discovering the number of wrecks, in keeping track of the shipping and the like of that. I found, when I was in that department, that a great deal of use was made of those papers and we were obliged to take them. In the Department of Finance there are a very large number of financial papers that have to be taken and are found useful, and so on through the other departments. I have no doubt myself that probably a less number of papers could be taken by each department and yet the work of the department would not materially suffer, and I think I may say that next year's account will show a very decided improvement in that respect. The accounts will show that papers on both sides of politics have been subscribed for. The leading papers on both sides of politics are taken by the different departments.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I can quite understand that it is necessary to have newspapers in the public interest. I was not disposed to complain of that, but I wanted to know what rule guided in their selection, and whether the different prints on both sides of the question were to be found in the ante-rooms for the convenience of parties who went there. There is one item on which I would like to have

Mr. Cook.

some information. I see that in the Department of Agriculture a sum of \$20 was paid to the Holland Bros. for reporting lectures at Almonte. That seems to be an unusual item, and I would like to know what those lectures were.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine those are lectures delivered by Prof. Saunders, who has made a practice of attending a number of agricultural meetings. Those lectures were published in the press, and afterwards in pamphlet form.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think we have yet had that answer from the head of the Privy Council that we are entitled to. I do not wish to press this matter unduly, but when we take up the Auditor General's Report we find that in that department no less than \$15,380.38 has been expended in that department during the year on contingencies. It is said that these accounts are sent to the Auditor General, who examines them and must be satisfied that they are correct, or he would not report upon them. Then there is an item here which, perhaps, the hon. First Minister will be able to explain, as the Auditor General's report does not explain it satisfactorily. We find charged here, travelling expenses of Sir John A. Macdonald, \$364.59; John Dowdall, living expenses, \$86.75; B. Chilton, ditto, \$82; Joseph Pope, \$371.90; John J. McGee, \$162.30; James Foley, \$11.75. Then comes cab hire at Ottawa—Sir John A. Macdonald, \$734.50; Sir John A. Macdonald, from May to June, \$214, a pretty good rate; lots of drives; he has been in a cab nearly all the time in May and June. Then we have cab hire of Ministers, \$11.50, and persons not named in vouchers, \$728.15. I would like to have an explanation of that; I think the First Minister might explain it. There are several other items which bring up these expenses for travelling expenses and cab hire to over \$2,000. Now, we ought to have some explanation of these expenses. We shall be able, perhaps, to get some of the vouchers in the Public Accounts Committee, but we shall not be able to get the vouchers for these accounts for which no vouchers were presented. Perhaps the First Minister will present vouchers now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I am not able to do. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to wait until the Committee on Public Accounts sends for the vouchers, or gets an explanation why there are no vouchers. I certainly do not come here charged with explanations or vouchers for the employment of every cabman. All I can say about that is that I cannot afford to keep a horse, I am too old to walk, and as long as I hold my position, I think the hon. gentleman will have to submit to my paying cab fare.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is a very strange doctrine that the First Minister offers to this House as an excuse, and to which the gentlemen behind him cry out "hear, hear." If we are not paying the First Minister the amount that he is entitled to and that his services to the country are worth, I think the only right and proper thing for him and his supporters to do is to come down here and say so, and not allow items to be charged to the country that he ought to pay out of his own pocket. I say the doctrine is a vicious one, and I am surprised to hear his supporters cheer it. I hope the doctrine offered by the First Minister is not endorsed by his colleagues in the Cabinet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think any member on this side of the House will find fault with any legitimate expense incurred by the First Minister or any other Minister of the Crown in the way of necessary travelling expenses. No hon. gentleman would complain that the Prime Minister, who is now advanced in years, should have a cab whenever he requires it. We do not find fault with that at all. So far as I am concerned, I do not find any fault. I think he is entitled, from the position he occupies, and from his age

and services to the country, to have a cab when he requires it. But what we find fault with is that concealment has been attempted by some one, I do not know whom, to cover up these cab hire expenditures. Here we have a charge of \$728.15 paid for cab hire by persons not named in vouchers, and last year we had similar charges. Now, just to give the House an idea of the difficulty we have in the Public Accounts Committee in getting at the details of such accounts, I may say that this matter was up in the committee last year. We got the vouchers down, and one voucher was certified as correct by Mr. Joseph Pope, who I believe is the private secretary of the First Minister, and it was paid. This voucher was for cab hire in Ottawa in December, 1886. That was about the time both parties were getting ready for the general elections. We find by this voucher that the sum of \$28.51 was charged for cab hire by Mr. Riopel in the city of Ottawa, from the 11th to the 22nd of December. Well, I do not know how it was possible for the leader of the Government to be travelling in cabs in Ottawa and at the same time attending political gatherings all over the Province of Ontario making speeches for the benefit of his followers. The bill was made out for cab hire from the 11th to the 22nd of December. Now, the right hon. the First Minister was not in Ottawa at all during those days. He left Ottawa on the 11th of December; he was in Welland on the 12th and 13th, in St. Thomas on the 14th, at Alymer on the 15th, in Simcoe on the 16th, in Wingham on the 17th, in Chatham on the 18th, in Port Hope on the 19th, and in Toronto on the 20th, 21st and 22nd. It does appear to me that a man cannot be in two places at once.

Mr. CASBY. Unless he is the Premier.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is true that the First Minister is capable of doing many things that ordinary men cannot. The people in the United States say they only have one Barnum in that country. Well, we have only one Sir John in this country.

Mr. DENISON. We are ready to pay for him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Judging from the way this account is made out, I should say this country, on a small scale at all events, is being humbugged by our Barnum Minister as much as the United States people are being humbugged by their Barnum. If the hon. the First Minister can be in two places at once, the people ought to know it. That this year there has been expended \$728.15 for cab hire for persons not named in the vouchers is a matter that requires as much explanation as this account. Therefore I cordially agree with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that this requires some explanation, and I can see from the happy mood in which the First Minister appears to be that he is just in the vein to explain it. I would be glad, for my own satisfaction and that of the people, if he would be kind enough to rise in his place and tell us how it is that he can by any possibility be riding in a cab at Ottawa while travelling in the car "Jamaica" and making political speeches in Toronto, Welland and other places.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My memory cannot pretend now to inform the hon. gentleman how it happened that there was an account for cab hire in Ottawa when I was travelling in the west. I really cannot stretch my memory back so far. No doubt the hon. gentleman was on the Committee of Public Accounts then, and I dare say he informed himself about it, but what I would point out is this: that I think the country has made a very good bargain, because they only pay for the Ottawa cab hire when I might have charged all my travelling expenses in the car "Jamaica."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are anxious to know if they were charged also. If the hon. gentleman is so communicative he might perhaps tell us that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They were not charged.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot say I agree with the hon. gentleman that there should be no objection to cab hire for the First Minister simply because he is the First Minister. That is wholly a new doctrine. I always supposed there was a sessional allowance granted to every member of this House, granted to the Prime Minister as well as to others, and he may use a portion of that sessional allowance to pay for his cab hire precisely as he may use it for any other matter. If the House is of opinion that a different rule should be applied to the First Minister, the House ought to proceed regularly. There is no authority for the Premier, any more than for any other member of this House, to come to the House in a cab and charge the cab hire in the public accounts. He has no special position in that respect. My friend the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), is a member of this House and was at one time the Prime Minister. He had devolving upon him the important duties now devolving upon the First Minister. In consequence of his assiduous application to those duties, he is scarcely able to get to his seat in this House, yet I do not find that the right hon. gentleman has made any provision to bring my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) here in a cab. I do not think this matter should be treated as a jest. If the First Minister thinks he is entitled to charge his cab hire or any other portion of his expenses to the public, he should assume the responsibility of making a proposition of that sort. Now that has not been done, but what the right hon. gentleman has done is that which the law does not authorise. If he can point out in what way he is authorised to employ a cab of Mr. Buckley to bring him here at 3 o'clock and to take him away at 6 o'clock, and to return at 8 o'clock and to leave the House when it adjourns, and to charge the expense in public accounts, the hon. gentleman is just as well able to do so now as he would be before the Public Accounts Committee; but so far as I know, there is not any authority for that, and I supposed that the object of a sessional allowance was to enable the hon. gentleman to use it in that way if he thought proper. The hon. gentleman has no more right to charge his cab hire than any other hon. member, and if the House thinks differently it should provide by vote or increase the salary of the First Minister.

Mr. DENISON. He ought to be paid \$25,000 a year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. gentleman may ask the Government to bring down a proposition of that sort. The hon. gentleman's Government is a courageous one, ready to do anything in the public interest. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, would not state what he stated here to night if he did not think it was in the public interest; but I suggest to the hon. gentleman the propriety of putting it in a formal resolution, so that he may do in a parliamentary way what he is now doing in an unparliamentary and illegal way. The hon. gentleman, as Prime Minister, is entitled to \$1,000 a year more than any of his colleagues. I do not say that that is an improper provision. A Prime Minister may not be very liberally provided for when that is done, but, if my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was Prime Minister, had come down to the House and said: I am entitled to a thousand dollars more than any of my colleagues, there are duties devolving on me and there are expenses which I have to incur which are more than those of the ordinary Minister, and that a further charge for cab hire, to attend in my place in Parliament is not an unreasonable charge, would the hon. gentleman opposite have submitted to that? He would have said that the member for East York must formally propose that, and must come down to Parliament and ask for the appropriation, or must propose it by Bill, or at all events must propose it in some constitutional way. Now, the hon. gentleman says he is getting too old and is entitled to ride, and



money was properly paid or not. It will be interesting to find out these things in the Public Accounts Committee. Although I am not a member of it myself, I have no doubt that somebody else will find out on whose account this \$748 for persons not named in the vouchers, was spent. The cab hire in the other departments comes under the same heading. It is not proper that the head of the department should be able to run up bills against the Dominion at his own pleasure. My right hon. friend said we got off cheaply because we did not have to pay for his "Jamaica" trip. But we did have to pay for his cab hire while he was not here, and we paid \$364 for himself, \$371 for his secretary, and \$462 for Mr. McGee, a total of \$1,197 for travelling expenses paid to the three individuals, the other two being immediately under his management in that department. That is a very considerable sum, a sum that should not have been paid without vouchers, showing that these travelling expenses were incurred on journeys taken on public business. The Premier has no more right to take trips for his own pleasure at the expense of the country than I have. It should not be allowed any longer; this money should not be paid without positive proof that these trips were taken on public business, and that no more than the cost of the journeys is paid. When the hon. member for York, the late Premier, was in England on the occasion spoken of, after the public business was transacted he took a trip for his own pleasure up to Scotland, to the neighborhood where he was born, and after he had finished transacting public business not one cent more was charged to the public Treasury. I would like to know, if the same rule has been followed in regard to the travelling expenses found in the accounts of last year. We paid on account of the Minister of Militia, for travelling expenses for last year, the sum of \$1,498, in round numbers \$1,500, at the rate of \$5 a day, for every working day in the year. Now I know, that he has been very active in getting about the country, but I do not suppose he has spent \$5 a day in travelling every working day on public business alone. I do not suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Grand Trunk Railway either, charge him the highest rates for passing over their lines. It is understood that Ministers get passes, and yet in face of that we have this bill, without any vouchers, without any statement whether he was at the seaside, at a watering place in the State of Maine, or on a fishing trip, or in the North-West inspecting the local volunteers, or where he had been; we have simply the lump sum of \$1,498 for travelling expenses. Vouchers for this will be called for also, and the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of saying where he paid this large amount for travelling expenses on public business. The travelling expenses of the Marine Department amounted to \$2,150. I shall not go any further with these departments. It will be better to take them up item by item in the Public Accounts Committee. But the point to be emphasised is that none of these expenses are regular, and they should not be paid out of the contingencies at all, which are really voted for carrying on the actual public business of the department and not for paying the personal expenses of the Ministers. If it is thought necessary, let a definite allowance be given to the Ministers for travelling expenses on public business, and let them keep within that sum, or pay the balance out of their own pockets.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to be informed in regard to the expenditure incurred by the late Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper, during the year. I find on page 113 E, in the Auditor General's Report, that for travelling and for living expenses at Washington he was allowed \$5,378.85. In another place on page 55 C we find he was allowed \$3,018.45, and on page 56 C he was allowed for cab hire in Ottawa, \$228, making a total of \$8,625.30 that was allowed, outside of his salary, of course, to Sir

Charles Tupper for travelling expenses during the last fiscal year. Now, that must strike any gentleman, I do not care whether he sits on that side of the House or this, as something enormous, and requiring explanation. I think the country ought to know how this was incurred. I think the present Minister of Finance might give us some information with regard to that. I think he is in possession of information which he ought to give to the House. Besides, I find in the Auditor's Report that Sir J. S. D. Thompson was paid for travelling and living expenses at the same time the amount of \$1,691.53. Then coming to the present Minister of Finance, I find that the Hon. George E. Foster only cost the country at Washington \$800.

Mr. FOSTER. More economical.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, he is a cold water man—at least he used to be, and I hope he is still. But certainly there is too big a difference between the charges of the present Finance Minister of \$800 for living at Washington, and those of Sir Charles Tupper for \$5,378.85. I would like the present Minister of Finance to give us some information. Did he not live in the same first-class style that Sir Charles Tupper did when he was in Washington? Or did he board at some second or third rate corner grocery, and allow Sir Charles Tupper to board at a first class hotel, where they charged him three or four hundred dollars a day. I do not think he kept up the dignity of his position as Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he allowed Sir Charles Tupper to live in such extravagance while he was living in such a quiet way. The hon. gentleman should explain how the expenditure was incurred and for what it was made.

Mr. FOSTER. I can explain with respect to the item which is charged against myself. It was for legitimate travelling expenses and living expenses. The difference between my own expenses and those of Sir John Thompson can be explained by the fact that Sir John Thompson was longer in Washington than I was. The difference between the expenses of Sir Charles Tupper and myself can easily be apprehended by hon. gentlemen, for Sir Charles Tupper was one of the Commissioners and occupied a position far different from any of the rest of us who were with him, and his expenses were necessarily greater than either Sir John Thompson or myself.

Mr. CASEY. He put on more style.

Mr. FOSTER. As he properly should do, as the representative of Canada, and an ambassador as it were from this country, who could not be expected to exercise the same prudence and economy as ourselves and others who did not occupy that position. Anyone can easily apprehend the difference, and that his position called for greater expenses.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The explanation is partially satisfactory, but I should like the Finance Minister to explain why, as seen on page 55 C, of the Auditor's General's Report, Sir Charles Tupper expended \$3,118 on travelling expenses in addition to the Washington outlay. I should like some particulars in regard to that item.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the particulars at hand, but I know that Sir Charles Tupper during the year of his incumbency went to England and back, and you cannot travel there and back without expending considerable money. Besides that he did a great deal of travelling in Canada, but the largeness of the item is chiefly due to the causes I have mentioned. He was not in this country all the time. Besides, we must recollect that while Sir Charles Tupper's expenditure for travelling expenses seems large it is partly due to the fact of his having to go to England, and while there discharging the duties of High Commissioner for quite a time, during which period he was not drawing the salary of High Commissioner.

Mr. CASEY. It was made up in travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. It was quite proper that his travelling expenses should be paid.

Mr. LISTER. During the time I have been in Ottawa I have observed that the Ministers are in the habit of walking to their departments and home again, and it seems extraordinary to find these enormous charges for cab hire. The amount charged to the First Minister is \$734, or upwards of \$2 a day for cab hire, and in addition for May and June there is \$214, and for persons not named in vouchers \$728. The amount altogether reaches about \$1,700, or \$5 a day for cab hire in Ottawa. The right hon. gentleman must remember that this money does not belong to him, but to the people; it belongs to me, and to every other inhabitant who pays taxes. It is not his to spend with such prodigality as it appears to have been spent in the past. It is time the country should understand how the money of the people has been expended. No one can possibly object to members of the Government expending all the money that is reasonably necessary for the carrying out of the administration of the affairs of the country, but when we find Ministers expending thousands of dollars every year for cab hire in Ottawa, many of whom are living within a stone's throw of the buildings, the matter requires some explanation. One cannot avoid the suspicion, which thrusts upon one, that the charges for cab hire are charges made for the purpose of covering up some other expenditure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh. Shame.

Mr. LISTER. Who are the men for whom the c. b. hire has been paid? No one can complain that the First Minister, in view of his age, should engage cabs. I would not raise any objection about that, but the amount is so unreasonably large that one must feel that these cabs are not hired for the purposes of the First Minister, not for his own use only, but there must be others using liberally the cabs of Ottawa at the expense of the people. As regards the other Ministers, I see them walking from day to day to their departments and it is extraordinary under these circumstances that such large accounts should be sent in for cab hire. The committee are entitled to some explanation of these items. The travelling expenses are enormous. We all know that every member of the Government holds a pass over every railway in this country. How, therefore, do they spend the money? Is it for luxuries? They do not expend it for railway fare. The Minister of Militia expended \$300 for travelling expenses. Did it cost him anything to go to British Columbia? Why, no; he would travel on a pass. He went, I believe, to the sea coast; and are these charges made for his summer trip? Do we not know that he has brigade majors and other officers all over the country to do inspection work, and these little excursions on the part of the Minister are really unnecessary in the interest of the people. If they were made they did not cost the amount charged by him, and the conviction is thrust upon us that these charges are made, not for actual travelling expenses of Ministers, but to cover up other charges. I feel justified in making this statement, because I feel that the expenditure cannot be explained in any other way. This matter must be brought before the country, and the people be led to understand how their money is being squandered by the Government. When Ministers are receiving enormous salaries and occupying positions to which any one can properly aspire, living in luxury while the majority of the people are struggling to obtain a bare living, the people have a right to know that their money is not being wasted in extravagance by Ministers who have their confidence. The Ministers owe it to themselves and to the country to show that every dollar they expend for travelling expenses has

Mr. FOSTER.

been properly expended. I think the Minister of Marine—I see nothing of that kind so far as he is concerned.

Mr. TUPPER. Next year.

Mr. LISTER. I hope not. The Minister is too young to want a cab; in the case of his father it was all right. The hon. gentleman stated to-day that, so far as the officers of his department were concerned, the utmost strictness was observed with regard to their accounts: that when one went travelling he was obliged to file a detailed statement showing every dollar expended. If that rule is a good one for the officers of the department, it is a good one to be observed by Ministers. They owe it to themselves and the people that no suspicions should be aroused. I repeat that when we find \$1,500 or \$1,700 entered in one year to a Minister for travelling expenses, it is a matter into which we should enquire, and satisfy ourselves beyond all question that it was honestly and properly expended.

Mr. CASEY. The charging of this \$728 in a lump sum for cab hire for persons not named cannot be due to the smallness of the sum, for I find immediately following, a smaller sum of 75 cents given in detail as cab hire for Mr. St. Onge Chapleau, and also another charge of \$1.25. It is remarkable how very minute the Public Accounts are in some respects and how very vague they are in others. Here is a charge of \$728 in a lump sum for driving unknown persons around Ottawa, and a charge of 75 cents for driving Mr. Chapleau in a cab. There must be some reason other than the smallness of the amount for not mentioning the name of the persons. In regard to the expenses of the Minister of Militia, to which attention has been called, it would be very interesting for that hon. Minister, and the other Ministers as well, to state to the House distinctly and definitely whether they had travelled on passes or not. There is enough money voted here to pay their railway fares. Do they travel on passes while receiving this money for their railway fares, or do they not? It is asserted here that they do have passes and that they do travel on them, and it is generally believed they do, so that it would be both interesting and necessary for them to deny it if it is not the case. As my friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, it would save Ministers from a great deal of suspicion, and save the time of the House also if the statement of expenses were put in detail, in such shape that the Auditor General could vouch, from the papers laid before him, how the money was spent. If that was done, all this discussion would be at an end, and if there was any fault to be found it would be found with the Ministers for travelling too much, but there would be no suspicion that such money was not paid for legitimate travelling expenses. Such suspicions are inevitable under the present system. We know that Ministers do take pleasure trips, that they go down to the seaside, and that they stop at the Banff Hotel when they are not on business at all, and we naturally suspect that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, or some of the others, have spent some of this money in pleasure trips. There is no way for them to get out of the suspicion unless they show what they pay for their railway fares and hotel bills. It may seem to them degrading to have to do what ordinary mortals do, but if they did it they would at all events save their reputation. I forgot to refer, when I spoke previously, to the large amount of \$5,400 for extra clerks in the Privy Council. If there is enough work to require the services of those clerks, it would be much cheaper and much more seemly in every respect, to somewhat increase the permanent staff to do this work and not to leave the option to the Minister at the head of the department to employ as many extra clerks as he likes, without any of the safeguards which surround the clerks of the permanent service, and to pay them what he wishes without applying to Parliament for a vote. If the Minister had to ask for a

vote for extra clerks, the number employed would be limited and kept within bounds.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Apart from the extreme unpleasantness of discussing personal matters of this kind, I say it is not creditable that this House should be compelled by the Government, on account of the manner in which they bring down the Estimates, to enter upon such considerations. We have Ministers of the Crown charged with having passes over railways, and of having, without a previous vote of Parliament, taken money from the public Treasury for fares they did not pay. It is a discreditable state of affairs that such a charge should be made on the floor of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly my gallant friend from Toronto (Mr. Denison), who is such an Imperial Federationist, and who has such a desire to follow Imperial practices, and who wants to give a present of \$25,000 to the First Minister right off—

Mr. DENISON. Not at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.),—that hon. gentleman is very anxious to follow the English system. In many cases I think he and others who think with him are right, but does the hon. gentleman imagine it would be possible in the English Parliament to have a discussion of this kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does he think it would be possible to have a Minister of the Crown charged with spending money for travelling expenses which Parliament had not voted? Why, Sir, a Minister of the Crown in England so charged, unless he were able to disprove it, would have to give up his seat at once. I hold that the proper plan in this matter is to challenge the opinion of Parliament. Some hon. members think that there should be some kind of graduated scale of allowance, and that if a gentleman is old he is to be allowed cab hire, and if he is young he ought not to be allowed cab hire. That is perfect nonsense. We do not allow indemnities to Ministers on such grounds as these. If the Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet think they are not paid sufficient for the duties they discharge, let them come before the House properly, as they do in other instances, and propose an increase of their allowance, but do not let us have money surreptitiously taken without any vote by the House. We have been discussing this matter long enough. Let us take the opinion of the House whether it should be allowed or not. If Parliament says it should, we will not discuss it and then let the Ministers say how much should be voted, but they have no right to take money from the public Treasury unless they have it sanctioned previously by the vote of Parliament. We do not altogether agree on this side of the House as to how much should be voted. I heard one or two gentlemen say that because the Prime Minister is aged and infirm and not so active as he used to be, that something should be allowed him. Let them come down and propose it and if Parliament chooses to approve of it our voices will be hushed and there is an end to this discussion. But, if this is not done you will have this unseemly discussion forced on the Opposition, and I say forced, because they would not discharge their duty unless they accepted the challenge, given them in the manner by which the Government bring down their Estimates here. I say that the proper course of the Government in this matter is to follow the course always adopted in England, and if they want money for the expenses of the Ministers let them propose it to Parliament, and if the money is not sufficient then they can come to Parliament again. I am entirely opposed to the principle of allowing any Minister in any department to put his hand in the public Treasury to any extent he likes. I see that the Minister of Customs—a gentleman who cannot be accused of being a young man, he is not an aged man certainly, but he is not young—has the enormous sum of

50 cents charged in his department for cab hire, while other Ministers have a thousand dollars, and eight hundred dollars, and fifteen hundred dollars, charged for the same purpose. They have no right to take that money, for it was not voted by Parliament for them, and now they refuse to rise up and justify it, or to give the House, which is now endorsing the payment, an account of how that expenditure was incurred. If a Minister of the Crown uses a thousand dollars in his expenses, a sense of duty ought to impel him to send a full and accurate account to the Auditor General and have it laid before Parliament. I am sure that no Minister would take money that he is unable to give an account of. This has been styled a trivial matter, and those gentlemen who propose \$25,000 to be given to this man and that man, no doubt consider it trivial, but go to some parts of the Provinces—the sentiment was uttered before and sneered at—where a man finds it all he can do, by getting up early and late, taking rest and eating the bread of carefulness to put food in the mouths of his children and tell him that a matter of \$8,840 for the travelling of Ministers, \$15,347 for the travelling expenses of their staff and \$4,799 for cab hire is a trivial matter, and I think the electors will open their eyes in astonishment. I am not standing here to contend that some of this cab hire and travelling expenses is not a necessary and justifiable expenditure. I dare say some of it is; but I want Parliament taken into the confidence of the Ministry in this matter of the expenditure of money the same as in other matters. Let them come down and say what they want to spend, what it is for, and take a vote; then those opposed to the vote can put themselves on record, and the Government can spend what is voted and no more. But the system adopted is discreditable in the extreme. We have unseemly discussions here, which are unworthy of this Parliament, and they will be continued as long as this abominable and unconstitutional system of withdrawing public moneys without a vote is continued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said the Ministry sat silent when there was a charge made that they charged against the country travelling expenses when they had passes. I do not understand that any hon. gentleman made that charge. It was left to the hon. gentleman out of his own imagination to coin it, and I say to him it is utterly false, utterly untrue; he had no right, no warrant to say so, and I am quite surprised that a gentleman holding his position in Parliament should state or suppose such a thing unless he had evidence of it. Then, as to the other statement that it is unconstitutional, what are we doing at this moment, Mr. Chairman? We are asking Parliament to vote for contingencies for each department for 1889-90, as last year we asked Parliament to vote for contingencies for 1888-89. We got those votes, and the hon. gentleman knows that under previous Governments, as well as under this Government, such expenditures made in the different departments were charged to the contingent account. The previous vote is taken by Parliament. It may be quite open to say that improper items have been charged against those contingencies; that may be a matter of fair discussion. But this Government and all Governments take an annual vote for contingencies, and against the sums of money so voted and appropriated these charges are made. It is quite open to the hon. gentleman to state that they are unreasonable or ought not fairly to be considered as contingencies, but it is wrong to say that the expenditures are unconstitutional.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I will not permit the hon. gentleman to make such a charge against me unanswered. I made no such statement as that which he has put in my mouth, and the hon. gentleman's ears must have been stuffed if he did not hear the charge that was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who made it?



Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It was stated by an hon. member in this debate that he understood that Ministers had passes on the railways.

Mr. FOSTER. But you stated more than that.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) And that they had charged travelling expenses, and he asked whether that was the fact. I stated that no Minister had risen to contradict that charge, and that it was discreditable that such a charge should be made and received in silence. I do not know whether it is true or not; that never entered my mind. I made no charge; I said it was made, and it was made in the last ten minutes. But the hon. gentleman is not going to escape from the point we make by drawing a red herring of that kind across the track. The question is whether these expenses should be submitted to Parliament, or whether they should be taken out of a general vote for contingencies. I argued that the unseemly discussions we have here from year to year is the most convincing evidence, indeed, that when Ministers want to expend money in cab hire and travelling expenses they ought to come and ask Parliament for a distinct vote for that purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to escape in that way. The hon. gentleman is ashamed of the charge, and he says he did not make it. But he did make the charge, and no other made the charge before him. An hon. gentleman said that he was surprised that the amount for travelling expenses was so large, as it was understood that Ministers had passes on railways, but no one dared to say that a man who had a pass on a railway took a journey and then charged for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did I say so?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, you did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a most injurious charge.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite natural that the right hon. Premier should become a little wrathful under the circumstances, and that he should, as he always does when he gets angry, stand up and scold, and he is scolding now, according to his general practice; and it is natural under the circumstances that the hon. Minister of Finance should sympathise with him in his anger and in his scolding assertion that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island made certain statements. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island did not make those statements, and *Hansard* to-morrow will show that he did not make the statements which the right hon. Premier said he did. I do not suppose that if the right hon. Premier was in his ordinary temper he would make such assertions as to what my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said; but under the influence of his imperfect hearing and bad temper for the moment, he made a distinct misstatement of the remarks of my hon. friend. What my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said was that it was scandalous that it should be charged across the floor of this House that Ministers having passes on the railways should charge for their travelling expenses as if they had paid their fare. He did not say that such was the case, but that it was scandalous that such a charge should be made without denial. Now, the making of the charge was what I said before my hon. friend got up. What I said was this, that it was generally understood that Ministers had passes, and that we found sums charged here for travelling expenses, and I wanted to find out whether a portion of these sums was for travelling expenses on railways over which Ministers had passes. I thought it was in order for Ministers to get up and deny that they had travelled on passes; but not one did so, and I do not think any of them will deny that they do travel on passes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

An hon. MEMBER. And most of their followers.

Mr. CASEY. Well, their followers do not charge the country for travelling expenses. Here the hon. Minister of Militia has charged nearly \$1,500 for travelling expenses, and if he travels on a pass, I do not think he charges anything for his railway fare. I do not suppose he would, and this makes it more difficult to explain where this \$1,500 has gone. The hon. First Minister makes a great point about this money having been voted by the House previously. When he says that all these sums were voted in contingencies last year he states the fact, the vicious fact, that an enormous sum is voted for contingencies and left to the heads of the different departments to be used by them as they see fit. That is just the thing we complain of, that this money is left to them to use as if it was pocket money, and not public money at all—to use it for cab hire, for their trips to Portland, their trips to Banff Hotel, their trips to British Columbia, to use for going fishing, so far as I know, to use for going to Montreal or Quebec where they have a little business. That is what is said to be the custom of Ministers in the summer; and if they do not explain these expenses, we must conclude that a great deal of this money has gone for those little trips. Now, let us come to the point, that this large sum should not be voted in this way. If the Government want a certain sum for cab hire, let them ask for a certain sum for cab hire; if they want a certain sum for towels, or for charwomen, let them ask for it; if they want a certain sum for subscriptions to newspapers, surely they can predict that beforehand, and it need not be a matter of contingencies. Let them treat each considerable item in this way, and they will reduce the amount, which is left to the irresponsible control of the Ministers, to one-third of the present sum. One must admit that there must be a certain amount of loose money left at the disposal of each department to provide for contingencies that may occur during the year, but the amount that need necessarily be left in that shape within the limits of these departmental blocks here, and in connection with the business transacted in these blocks—the amount necessary to be left for justifiable contingencies for that service need not be large at all. There are separate contingencies for the outside service of every department, but the amount of contingencies left at the disposal of the Minister in connection with Civil Government alone, for business transacted in these departmental blocks, need not amount to more than \$50,000 a year, were it not for the fact that the Ministers like to have a little loose cash for disposal in this way. No one pretends that they put it in their pockets, but we would like to know what they do with it. There are many dark corners. It may be used sometimes as an electioneering fund, sometimes for personal amusement, sometimes for other purposes only hinted at vaguely in the accounts. The fact that Parliament has voted these sums does not do away with the vicious character of the whole system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) had perfect right to say that there is a good deal in this matter which requires explanation. If any gentleman chooses to turn to the Auditor General's Report, under the heading B, page 12, he will see that the sum which was asked for contingencies in the Privy Council was \$8,000, while the sum that was spent was \$15,339, being an excess of \$7,339 over the amount which Parliament had allowed to the service of that department. Now, I say that the simple fact of itself that over \$7,000 were taken for the service of the Privy Council in the year 1888 more than Parliament had voted for it, disposes entirely of the pretension which the right hon. the First Minister advanced that he had acted within the limits of Parliamentary appropriation. Instead of keeping within those limits he doubled the amount,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I said we had a vote for contingencies in each year, and this vote before Parliament now for next year is for contingencies, and that cab hire referred to has been charged against this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Exactly; but my hon. friend was complaining that the public money was improperly used. I have just pointed out that the fact that on a vote of \$8,000 for the right hon. the First Minister's own department, \$15,339 was spent, does not look as if the First Minister was setting to his colleagues that example of rigid economy which I understood was to be enforced by his presence, if not in the flesh at any rate in brass or marble or other material, in the Department of Justice. A great deal of looseness has evidently occurred in the administration of these contingencies, and no doubt this department of Civil Government, taken all in all, is one of the most extravagant in the whole compass of all these expenditures coming under the head of Public Accounts. We are now spending \$13,000, and a very large sum for superannuation allowance ought, in all conscience, to be added to that if we want to ascertain the larger amount of expenditure here in Ottawa. I say nothing whatever which has occurred in the past few years warrants the enormous increase in the number of officers and the total amount of expenditure, and I am bound to say that any hon. gentleman who chooses to compare our expenditure under these heads with the expenditure in England or the United States, on similar heads, will see that, in proportion to our population, we are drifting into the most improvident and extravagant habits. There is no doubt whatever that if, particularly in the early years of the American republic, the Americans had permitted anything like the same unbounded extravagance in the administration of their public funds to prevail—which is being permitted and encouraged, I am sorry to say, by many members of this House—instead of having, as they now have, succeeded in reducing their enormous war debt to an extremely small amount in proportion to the wealth and resources of their country, they would have found it impossible to make any saving whatever. I regret to have to say that, year after year, month after month, week after week, day after day, in spite of all the professions of economy made from time to time, this expense is creeping on, and not only is it creeping on in departments which may be controlled, but every year the fixed expenses are becoming much larger. That is going to be a source of difficulty in dealing with many of the problems which wait us, and this expenditure particularly being subject more than others to the control of this House, my hon. friends will be derelict to their duty if they did not call attention to the way it is carried on from year to year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The right hon. the First Minister informs us that all those charges complained of are proper charges for contingencies. Some of these charges no doubt are properly placed under that head, and were intended to be covered by that appropriation. Of course, the question of what ought to be contingent account and what ought to be specifically stated is a question to be determined by the experience of the Government. When the Government finds that a charge is annually recurring, where a series of years shows that that charge is made every year, it ought no longer to be included within contingencies but ought to be presented to the House by a specific vote, and it is an abuse of the contingency appropriation to propose a vote for contingencies in any matter that you know is going to recur every succeeding year, and the amount of which may be very fairly estimated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot do that with travelling expenses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That may be; but take, for instance, the subject of cab hire. The hon. gentleman

knows right well that the charges made in this account are charges for administration. If a Minister of the Crown comes down here and asks for an appropriation for his department, that appropriation has nothing to do with his legislative functions. It is not to do his work as an administrator that he sits here. He comes to this House as a legislator, not as an administrator. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he knows that the appropriation that is now under discussion is not properly chargeable against contingencies. Under any form, no matter how indefinite, while a Minister may charge his expenses in performing the duties of administration against his department, he cannot charge against the department any contingency or any expense which he incurs as a legislator coming to this House. If it is necessary that that should be paid, the hon. gentleman ought to ask for it as a specific appropriation. He says he is an aged member of this House, and cannot come here as a pedestrian, like some of the rest of us, or with the same facility as he once could. That may be perfectly true, and, if the hon. gentleman thinks that is not covered by the sessional allowance, he should come here and ask for a specific appropriation, and should not charge the expense of his coming here to legislate and to lead the House against one of the departments.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not care to have a wrong impression go to the country. He intimated that the expense of Civil Government is growing from year to year, and shows no sign of reduction. If you take the amount to be voted this year and compare it with last year, you will find there is only an increase of \$2,107. If you take the statutory increases in the salary of a number of clerks, amounting, I suppose, to 600 or 700, you will find that there has been a very considerable diminution in the amount to be voted for the other expenses. So the outlook is not quite so bad as we might judge from the general remark made in regard to it by my hon. friend from South Oxford. With reference to what the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said, the difficulty is apparent to anyone in regard to some of these expenses. If there is an expense which is well known and occurs from year to year, it can easily be voted. But in regard to ministerial expenses what can we here in February tell as to what may be necessary in the way of visiting in connection with one's departmental work during the ensuing year? We may think now that there is no necessity for making a visit to any portion of the Dominion, but it may be found in the course of the year that it is necessary for a Minister to go from one place to another, and visit what is under his department and give it his personal supervision, and it is impossible to know that beforehand. I do not see how that could be reduced to a fixed sum within which one could always keep. As to cab hire, the same remark applies. Some Ministers, being fallible mortals like the rest, get ill, and a cab is necessary, and it is impossible to fix any stated sum to be voted for that particular purpose. This has always been the course adopted. I think for the whole life of this Parliament these sums have been charged to contingencies and paid in exactly the same way, and, although my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) made a good *ad captandum* speech, to be used hereafter on the stump, I believe that the farmers, that the honest people, the hard working people of this country, are of quite a different opinion. I believe that they do not ask any Minister who does their work and does hard work—and we are not always living in luxury, and when the hon. gentleman occupies the position of a Minister to which he aspires, and rightly, he will find that it is not a life of luxury and idleness—the people do not ask men who devote their time to the public service to do their work and travel in their interest at their own expense. They are quite willing—and

I should not fear to meet the people of the country in any section on that point—that all the legitimate, fair expenses should be paid out of the revenues of the country. Speaking for myself and for my colleagues as well, I do not think there are unnecessary expenses undertaken in this matter. Our country is one of large extent. When a man travels, he may have a pass, but everyone who travels knows that the mere railway or steamboat fare is the smallest item in the expense. We have to eat, there are other necessary expenses which, unless a man takes a biscuit in his pocket and a bottle of water, may have to be incurred.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am very much surprised at the explanation offered by the Finance Minister in reference to the expenditure in cab hire. He stated that we were all frail mortals, and liable to get sick, and it was therefore impossible to say how much ought to be appropriated for that purpose. Do I understand him to say that Ministers who are doing their duty here are sick so often that in some of the departments they require \$300, \$400, \$600, \$800 or even \$1,600 for cab hire, that they are sick all the time? If it is right and proper to charge these enormous amounts for cab hire when the Ministers are sick, have they not just as good a right to charge the attendance of the physician? That is a very unreasonable explanation. It shows that hon. gentlemen cannot defend the item under discussion, on reasonable grounds, but have to offer an argument of that kind and expect the people of the country to pay respect and weight to such a statement. This is an unreasonable charge, and they have no means of defending it, and they offer these excuses in order to cover up a transaction that will not bear the light of day. I think some other system should be adopted.

Mr. CASEY. If the Finance Minister will pardon me, I think his remarks were somewhat *ad captandum*, too, as he charged upon the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. He said that the country does not expect Ministers here to do work for nothing. Certainly not. We pay them well for doing our work, and what we expect of them is that at least they shall keep an account of their expenses, as any other servant of the people, or as any servant of a private employer would do; that they shall tell us just what for those expenses are incurred. If the Finance Minister was at the head of a firm, and sent an emissary to British Columbia to do some business for him, he would expect to have a very detailed account of that man's expenses. Well, Sir, Ministers of the Crown are, as the very name indicates, servants of the Crown, which means in Canada, as it does in England, practically the servants of the people. They are our servants. We give them good salaries for the work they perform, and we expect an exact account of their expenses. We expect, in the first place, a reasonable estimate of what their contingent expenses are going to be, and an exact account of it afterwards, and we do not think they should be allowed to increase their expenses at their own will. It is impossible to calculate what contingencies will be required under each head, of course, but we could come much nearer to it than we do now. I would suggest to the Minister to take the amounts paid last year for telegrams, for instance, for extra clerks, for the Stationery Office, and the Queen's Printer's account, let him take such items as these, and ask a definite amount. For instance, the Queen's Printer's account was \$50,000 odd, the Stationery Office account was \$37,500. Surely some estimate of the amount of stationery required in the departments could be made? There is no reason why that should be put in the contingencies. A very near estimate can be given of the amount of stationery required. If it is too large, the balance can be kept till next year. You will have the advantage of knowing beforehand what you are paying the money for, instead of leaving it in a lump sum and letting the Government spend as much

Mr. FOSTER,

for stationery, as much for washer-women, as much for towels as they see fit. Coming down to the newspapers, the hon. gentleman says that he intends to reduce that item. That is a very reasonable thing to do. He could estimate now how much he intends to reduce it. Going over a list of the papers he could strike out those that he will not patronise. He could get this ready by day after to-morrow. As to cab hire, I will only say that, although an exact estimate cannot be made, the whole amount of cab hire would be comparatively a small sum to be left in contingencies. If the Minister will take this advice and make definite and separate estimates for such items as are now included under contingencies, as far as a reasonable estimate could be made, I think he will see that the total amount left to contingencies need be but small, and it would be even less than I said a little while ago—I believe it could be reduced to \$25,000 or \$30,000. Estimate as nearly as you can, and then leave a small margin for unforeseen occurrences, and you have contingencies under control. The Finance Minister will say that things have been managed in this way by Reform Governments. No doubt contingencies have been left in this loose way, although the amount was not so great. But the principle was bad then, and it is bad now, and it is time for this Government, who believe, no doubt, that they have the statesmanship of the country in their ranks, should execute a real reform by putting this large amount of money in a more definite shape. If they insist, after attention has been fully called to the matter, in using this amount as pocket money to be disbursed at their own pleasure, the country will become more and more suspicious of the way they are using it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I wish to get some information from the Minister of Finance as to the mode in which the overplus of the specific amount voted by Parliament for each department is audited by the Auditor General. Is it through special warrant, or is it taken from the general vote *en bloc* by Parliament? For instance, I see on page 12 that the amount of the Privy Council Office is exceeded by \$7,000, Secretary of State by \$4,000, Militia, \$4,500, Department of Agriculture, \$7,000. Is that paid by specific warrant, or how is the Auditor General authorised to pay that amount out of appropriations?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a specific amount voted for contingencies for each department; there is also a general sum for general contingencies, and if one department exceeds that special amount voted to it for contingencies the excess is made up out of the vote for general contingencies. If that is exceeded, of course there is no other way to pay it except by special warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did a special warrant issue in these cases?

Mr. FOSTER. If it was not used it would be put in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy it will be brought down in the Unprovided Items, and that my hon. friend is right, that, up to the present moment, there has been scarcely a proper justification of the expenditure, and no doubt it would have been more correct if a special warrant had issued. I did not observe any special warrant for this, though I will not take upon myself to say that none issued.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### ADJOURNMENT—COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What course does the First Minister propose to adopt with respect to the debate that is to take place on Monday, supposing it is not closed on that evening? It is not a matter of particular convenience

to us, but it will be for the general convenience to understand whether the First Minister intends to go on with the debate *de die in diem*, or to take up ordinary business on Tuesday, and after Tuesday what course he proposes to pursue?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be more convenient for the Government to take Tuesday as a Government day. The debate can proceed on Monday, and, if not concluded on Monday night, it can stand over till Wednesday. Wednesday and Thursday are not Government days but are at the disposal of the House, and the Government will assist to have these two days, if required, for the hon. gentleman's motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will have to be made a special order?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be so understood. The hon. gentleman has given notice to that effect now.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report on Penitentiaries for the year ending 30th June 1888.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Report of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police Force, 1888.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

### SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. LAURIER. I would move that Mr. Colter's name be added to the Committee on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines, and also to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. At the time the committees were struck Mr. Colter had been elected but he had not taken his seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly; that was arranged for. I would ask that the name of Mr. Davin be put on the Railways and Canals Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Motion agreed to.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Maritime Court Law of the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Charlton.)

### REPRESENTATION OF KING'S COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to rise to a question of privilege, and I beg permission to make the following statement: I am credibly informed and verily believe that James Edwin Robertson, one of the members of this House for the electoral division of King's County, P.E.I., has within the past twelve months performed certain services for the Government of Canada, namely, that he has acted on several occasions as medical attendant on certain sick mariners at the outport of Montague, in the said county of Kings, in the said Province of Prince Edward Island, for which services I am informed the said James Edwin Robertson has been paid out of the

public moneys of Canada. I beg, therefore, to move the following resolution:—

That George Taylor, a member of this House, having stated in his place that he is informed and verily believes that James Edwin Robertson, one of the members of this House, member for the electoral division of King's County, P.E.I., has within the past twelve months performed certain services for the Government of Canada, namely, that he has acted on several occasions as medical practitioner attending upon certain sick mariners at the outport of Montague, in the said county of King's, in the said Province of Prince Edward Island, for which services he is informed that the said James Edwin Robertson has been paid out of the public moneys of Canada; be it therefore ordered that the matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the said committee be directed to enquire into the facts, search for precedences, and report the result of their enquiry to this House; and whether the said James Edwin Robertson has vacated his seat.

Mr. LAURIER. In a question of this kind it is a matter of courtesy and of justice, and of parliamentary practice also, that the member whose seat is impugned should have an opportunity to give to the House whatever explanation he may have to give. I beg to move, therefore, that the debate may be now adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend, but perhaps that is not the best way of doing it. I think the best plan would be that it should stand as a notice on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let it be understood that this is to be a matter of privilege, and when it is put on the Notice Paper it can be taken up at any time; of course giving due notice to the hon. gentleman whose seat is affected by it.

### OTTAWA AND MONTREAL BOOM CO.

Mr. TISDALE (for Mr. GIROUARD) moved second reading of Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before that motion is carried, I think we ought to have the mover of the Bill present to give some explanations. As I stated the other day, when the Bill was read the first time, I believe it is a Bill embodying the same principle as that of the Bill which was before the House last year, but is much more likely to affect the navigation of the Ottawa River. I do not know that I am specially interested in the matter except as a public man, but I think the Bill is one of such an important character that the House should have the fullest explanations before adopting it. As it is contended when a Bill goes to a committee, that the principle of the Bill is sustained by the House, I do not think we ought to pass a Bill like this, about the principle of which there is any doubt, without the fullest explanation and discussion; and this is a Bill of such importance, giving this company, as I understand it, control of the navigation of the Ottawa River, and the right to expropriate property for the purpose of constructing booms, that we should have the fullest explanations before we recognise its principle.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The promoter of the Bill the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), had a conversation with me about this Bill. I told him I thought the Bill exactly of such a nature as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said, and I told him that so far as I was concerned, it could not have my assent. But he assured me that the Bill was quite different, that its object was purely and simply for allowing the construction of one boom somewhere on the river. I said that, under those circumstances, I would not object to the Bill going on, because we could take it up in the Railway Committee, and look into it there as thoroughly as we do into other measures; but I warned him, that, if the Bill was intended to give away all

the rights to the navigation of the river, from the Chaudière Falls down to Montreal, I could not support it.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what I understand to be the meaning of the Bill.

Mr. BRYSON. I had intended to say a word or two on the principle of this Bill, but the promoter of the Bill not being here, I decided to wait until it should come before the Committee on Railways and Canals, when it would be fully discussed on its merits. To my mind it is a very serious Bill, and one which this House should hesitate about adopting. This company are asking for incorporation to control one of the most important stretches of the Ottawa River, and before the House adopts the principle of the Bill, there ought to be some discussion on it. I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is not in the House, for I understand that there is one clause particularly that asks for control of both sides of the river. If the company propose to boom both sides of the river, and also to construct a boom across the river, it will certainly impede the navigation of the river, and almost entirely obstruct it. I, therefore, reserve any further comments until the Bill comes before the committee.

Mr. TISDALE. My object in moving the second reading was this: Any Bill of which no hon. member is prepared to move the six months hoist should, it seems to me, go to the committee. I do not understand that the House assents to the principle of the Bill in carrying the second reading, but only decides to send the Bill to the Railway Committee, to let that committee adopt it or not as they see fit; and since no hon. gentleman is ready to move the six months hoist, any discussion on the Bill would be much more convenient in the Railway Committee than in the House. I think the action of the Railway Committee is always such as to justify me in saying that any Bill which is not in the public interest does not get through that committee. There is no work before the Railway Committee and I thought we should get some of these Bills before it. I think the Bill had better go and be disposed of there instead of hanging up here.

Mr. SPOULE. I would like to say one word in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said, as his remarks might be misleading. As I understand, the effect of the second reading is to either adopt or reject the principle of a Bill, and that is the proper stage to discuss the principle of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that in adopting the second reading of a Bill, as regards public measures, we adopt the principle. It has always been the practice *quo ad* private Bills, which are to be looked after by committees specially appointed to examine them, that the discussion on the principle comes up after all the details are reported by the committee, and then, on the report of the Railway Committee, the principle is discussed in the House and finally settled. Of course, if a measure is obviously, on its face, so objectionable that it ought not to go to any committee, the general principle of the Bill should be discussed on the second reading; but unless there is some very obvious objection, it is greatly to the advancement of public business that private Bills should be sent to the various committees to be dealt with, and then, on the reports of the committees, comes up the great question, whether the Bill should become law or not.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me this is the very objection taken by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), namely: That the Bill should not be considered now unless there be a very full explanation from the mover, because it is objectionable in principle.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. the First Minister has very properly drawn the distinction between the course to be pursued with regard to ordinary private Bills and those which appear to contain a vicious principle. If my hon. friend has read this Bill, he would no doubt draw the conclusion that if it is not a public Bill in the sense to which he refers, it is *quasi* public. It is a Bill which asks for the control of the River Ottawa from the Chaudière Falls to the Island of Montreal, and I contend that a Bill of so much importance, giving control over the most important tributary of the St. Lawrence, ought not to be dealt with in this summary manner. If it goes to the country that a Bill of this kind is before the House, and no explanation is given of its character, people will remain in ignorance concerning it; but if the mover will give the House those explanations which are necessary, then the people will understand its nature, and be enabled to see the force of objections which may be made by hon. members of this House, who see difficulties, from a public standpoint, in the way of at all passing this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After that statement, I must ask my hon. friend to allow the Bill to stand over.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection.

Motion for second reading allowed to stand.

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate "The Hawkesbury Lumber Company."—(Mr. Labrosse.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company."—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate "The Dominion Life Assurance Company."—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 25) An Act to amend the Act incorporating "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 31) An Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 35) An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

#### JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF JOLIETTE.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have appointed a Judge for the District of Joliette, in the place of the late Hon. Mr. Justice Globensky; and if not, whether they intend to make the said appointment soon?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A judge has not been appointed yet, but it is the intention to appoint one soon.

#### POPULATION OF THE PROVINCES.

Sir RICHARD CARTRIGHT asked, in estimating the population of the Dominion at 4,946,497, what number is assigned to each Province respectively?

Mr. CARLING. The number assigned to the Province of Ontario is 2,154,786; that to Quebec, 1,479,036; Nova Scotia, 483,217; New Brunswick, 345,292; Manitoba, 132,624; British Columbia, 131,366; Prince Edward Island, 120,176; the Territories, 100,000, making the total 4,946,497.

## MR. CHARLES LEDUC.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is Charles Leduc, of Hull, in the employ of the Government in any capacity? If so, in what capacity; in what department; when was he employed, and what salary does he receive?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Leduc is in the employment of the Government, in my department. He is paymaster and translator on the Ottawa Works, and he receives \$100 a month.

## MILITIA EXPENDITURE.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, What amount has been expended in paying for repairs and other works at the Quebec Citadel since the first day of June, 1887? What amount was voted by Parliament for such works since the date mentioned? What amount has been expended upon barracks for "C" Battery, British Columbia? Is it true that the money appropriated by Parliament to provide barracks for "C" Battery has been expended upon the Quebec Citadel? If so, how much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The amount expended for repairs and for other works on the Quebec Citadel since the 1st June, 1887, up to the 30th June, 1888, was \$7,232.70. The vote for construction and repairs was \$75,000, and no particular amount was voted for the special work at the citadel of Quebec, the vote having been granted for the general requirements of the service. The estimates for the repairs at the citadel for that period amounted to \$13,080, and the amount expended, as already stated, was \$7,232.70. The amount voted for the barracks in British Columbia for 1887-8 was \$14,000; there was expended up to the 30th June, 1888, \$8,945.75, leaving a balance on the 30th June, 1888, of \$5,054.25. No part of the money voted for the barracks in British Columbia has been applied for any other purpose than that for which it was granted by Parliament.

## FISHING ON THE RIVER MATANE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Whether the Government has received any communication as to the right of the Federal Government to lease or license the River Matane for fishing purposes? Does the Government intend to renew the license this year?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government has received a communication as to the right of the Federal Government to lease or license the River Matane for fishing purposes. The river is now under lease for a period of nine years from January, 1887.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FISHERIES.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have the Government appointed an Assistant Fishery Commissioner for Prince Edward Island? If so, who is he? What is the date of the appointment, and the amount of his salary?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government has not appointed an Assistant Fishery Commissioner for Prince Edward Island, but during the past season, owing to the increased vigilance which was rendered necessary by the regulations in reference to the lobster fisheries, Mr. Edward Hackett was appointed a fishery officer for Prince Edward Island, for which the department have paid him \$200.

## MOUNT STEWART, P.E.I., WHARF.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked, Has the Government received any petition or application from the Government of Prince

Edward Island asking for the construction of a pier or wharf at or near Mount Stewart, P.E.I.? Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of such pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Two petitions have been received asking for the construction of a wharf at or near Mount Stewart, but the Government, as yet, have taken no action on those petitions.

## MR. JOHN A. GROSSE.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Is John A. Grosse still in the employ of the Customs Department? If not, when did he resign, and what were his position and duties while so employed?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. John A. Grosse is still in the employment of the Customs Department, but has signified his intention to resign. His duties, while in the Customs Department, have been upon the special agents' staff, whose duty it is to look after smugglers.

## BRIDGE ACROSS THE GRAND RIVER, HALDIMAND COUNTY.

Mr. COLTER asked, Is it the intention of the Government to proceed at once with the construction of a bridge across the Grand River, at the village of York, in the county of Haldimand, for which work an appropriation of \$10,000 was made in the Supplementary Estimates of last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is now receiving the attention of the Government.

## CRIMINAL LAWS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. BERNIER (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have furnished to justices of the peace appointed within the past two years by the Provincial Governments copies of the compilation of criminal laws, and if not, is it their intention so to do?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the information that reaches me from the Secretary of State's Department, all the justices of the peace duly qualified have been supplied with a copy of the compilation of criminal laws.

## REGULATIONS AND ORDERS OF THE MILITIA.

Mr. DESSAINT (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have the Regulations and Orders of the Militia, 1887, translated and supplied to the French Canadian officers of the several militia corps?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is the intention of the Government to have the Regulations of the Militia translated and supplied to the French members of the corps.

## MANUFACTURE OF CIGARS.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce from \$75 to \$6 the license fees for the manufacture of cigars?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The advisability of substituting for the present a fee proportionate to the capacity of each manufacturing establishment is under the consideration of the Government.

## PRINTING THE BUDGET SPEECH IN FRENCH.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have the "Budget Speech" printed in French this year?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention of the Government to have the Budget Speech printed in French this year, following the usual practice, and in the usual proportion.

#### COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved :

1. That it has become a matter of extreme importance to the well-being of the people of this Dominion that the Government and Parliament of Canada should acquire the power of negotiating commercial treaties with foreign States.

2. That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will empower Her Representative, the Governor General of Canada, acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, to enter, by an agent or representative of Canada, into direct communication with any foreign State for the purpose of negotiating commercial arrangements tending to the advantage of Canada, subject to the prior consent or subsequent approval of the Parliament of Canada, signified by Act.

He said: It is now nearly seven years since the proposition which forms the subject-matter of this motion was brought to the attention of the then Parliament of Canada by my hon. friend, the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). In that interval many things have occurred, all strongly tending, in my opinion, to justify the wisdom and foresight displayed by that hon. gentleman in calling the attention of Parliament in the strongest manner to the very great importance of obtaining those rights and privileges which this motion desires to secure for the people of Canada. Sir, in that interval many important events have occurred; much which, when my hon. friend moved his motion, was only conjecture, is now a certainty. Many things that might be considered at that time as hypotheses, are now in the region of demonstrable and ascertained fact; many of the excuses and objections which were then taken are now seen to be unfounded or, to say the least, very greatly exaggerated. It is not probable that more than a comparatively small number of the hon. gentlemen who were then present are still in this House, and I would strongly advise all those who do not recollect distinctly the discussion which then took place, to refresh their memories by examining the interesting debate which occurred on that occasion. If they will do so, if they will take the trouble to peruse the arguments on the one side and the assertions on the other, and if they will then examine a short summary of the historical events which have since occurred, they might almost imagine, recalling what occurred then and comparing it with the facts which we now know to have taken place, that they were perusing a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on some point in dispute between the right hon. Premier of this Dominion and the Attorney General of Ontario. I doubt whether there ever was an occasion in which the facts, as we now know them, could more completely justify and vindicate the course pursued by the then Opposition, than what occurred on that occasion. I admit that there is one very important difference between the circumstances to which I allude and the result of the refusal to obtain for us the rights and privileges we then demanded. In the disputes which have taken place between the Premier of this Dominion and the Premier of the Province of Ontario and the Premiers of some of the other Provinces, at any rate the injury done to the general interests of Canada was, comparatively speaking, trifling. But this is not a question of interference with ordinary provincial rights; this is not a question of locking up territories of more or less magnitude from profitable settlement; this is not a question of withdrawing from the control of a Province, a larger or a smaller sum to be distributed among the followers of the right hon. gentleman. On this occasion the course pursued by him, the course in which he was sustained by his followers, was one which I am of opinion was in a high degree calculated to stunt and paralyse the growth of this whole Dominion. Sir, we have seen in consequence, largely, of that refusal, the

Mr. BERGERON.

loss of a great opportunity, as I believe, of conferring a great benefit upon the people of this country, and through them, in all probability, of greatly improving the relations which subsist between the two great countries with which, though in diverse ways, they are closely allied. I say that opportunity has been lost. I say more, that the sentiments and the doctrines then avowed, then avowed in particular by the right hon. leader of the Government, were calculated in no small degree to discourage particularly those of the younger of our population who had just and high aspirations for the future of this country. Sir, when men are told officially by a person occupying the position of Premier, that in an attempt to obtain for us the rights which so clearly, I think, belong to us, rights which are necessary to a proper development of our resources, when they are told, as were told on that occasion, by the man in highest authority in Canada, supported by a majority in Parliament at that time, that this resolution which, I may say, embraced precisely what the present resolution does—that this resolution to obtain the power for Canada to negotiate commercial treaties was :

"A boastful assertion of our coming strength, discounting our future, containing an ill-concealed wish that this should be a stepping-stone to something further, that in some way our independence should increase and our dependence and support decrease, and that we should as soon as convenient be cast on our own resources. This, Sir, would be an injury, a ruin, a destruction to Canada."

Sir, I cannot but regret that such language should have been uttered under any circumstances by a man who occupied the position of Premier of this Dominion. It is probably needless for me to say that I differ *toto cælo* not only with the expressions used, but with all that is contained and implied in that passage which I have read from the speech of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion. I think that such sentiments are degrading and debilitating to the country, that they are calculated to lower us in our own eyes and in the eyes of other nations, and I hope that this will prove to have been the last occasion on which any man holding such a high position or holding any position of importance in Canada will commit himself to such sentiments as these; and I hope that all the more because I remember on that occasion that some members who in former times and up to that date had always been prominent supporters of the right hon. gentleman were found by voice and vote recording their entire disapprobation of the sentiments which he then expressed. It is desirable before I go further that I should allude to the objections which have been taken, and which perhaps may be taken again to the proposition contained in this motion. The objections at the time were chiefly two. One class, who hardly ventured to say that the demand in itself was an improper one, thought that although there was a good deal to be said in the abstract for the right of Canada to make her own bargains with foreign powers, to negotiate, at all events, her own commercial treaties, still that it was premature for us, for various reasons, to which I will allude hereafter, at that particular moment to prefer that demand. There were others, of whom the First Minister was the leader, who declared bluntly and boldly that it was not at all desirable to obtain such powers, that we were better off acting through other parties, acting under the protection and through the agency of the Imperial authorities, that it was not desirable that Canada should have agents of her own or that Canada should speak for herself or make bargains for herself. Now, as I have said, since that particular period circumstances have developed in a very remarkable way. We have had very ample proof, as I shall presently show the House, that Canada does need the power to negotiate her own commercial treaties, and, what is necessarily involved in that, that Canada does require in certain cases, at all events, the right to appoint and to maintain agents of her own, responsible to her Parliament and responsible to her people, who will know better than those of

any other country can do what are the real wants of the people of Canada, and who would keep our Government informed of the feelings of other nations, with which it is very important they should be well acquainted. The result of the refusal to acquiesce in my hon. friend's proposition were twofold: first, a great chance of vastly improving the position of the people of Canada was lost for the time being, and, in the next place, a great and needless peril was incurred, one of which might have been obtained and the other have been averted had that motion prevailed, had steps at that time been taken to obtain for the people of Canada what I, in common with my friends behind me, believe it is our clear right and our clear duty to obtain for her. But a very short time elapsed after the rejection of the motion to which I have alluded before we had the amplest possible proof in the conduct of the preliminary negotiations which preceded the very important question of the fisheries, that we were justified in making the demand we then made. I venture to say that the whole course of the negotiations from the first to the last, down to this present hour, rightly understood, is one long vindication of Mr. Blake's wisdom and foresight. In those negotiations nothing has been more clear than the lack of power to negotiate and the want of a resident Canadian agent representing us at Washington have been most painfully felt. Had we possessed that power, had we had the right to appoint our own agent, and had he done his duty, as no doubt he would have done, it is utterly impossible that the Government of Canada would have been ignorant to such an extent as they were as to what were the feelings aroused in the United States; had the Government been wisely advised on that question, had we had an agent in Washington to keep them acquainted with the state of affairs on the other side of the line, we would have been saved a very great deal of idle bluster and have been spared much subsequent humiliation. I take the ground at once that in North American affairs more particularly, in all that relates to the affairs of Canada on this continent, with all due respect I say that no English statesman will do. An English ambassador to the Government at Washington has a great deal else to attend to than the interests and rights of Canada alone. It is so of necessity, and I do not blame him therefor; they are controlled by other considerations when it is to the interest of Canada that our agent should have nothing else to do but attend to our affairs. More than that I say, what is known to every member here, what is known to every man of common sense in Canada, that it is utterly impossible that an English ambassador, notwithstanding the fact that he may have enjoyed many years of experience, can possibly know as well as one appointed by ourselves either the wants and necessities of the people of Canada, or the particular feelings and prejudices which actuate the people of the United States. Sir, I may have a little more to say on this subject, but I now simply point to it as a manifest fact known to everybody. I say it cannot be otherwise. It is quite impossible that an average English employé, coming perhaps from a very distant country, coming from an employment not in the slightest degree calculated to fit him for appreciating and understanding the exceedingly difficult position in which an English ambassador will find himself in Washington—it is morally impossible that our interests can safely be entrusted in such hands. Sir, it is no idle phrase, but it is the expression of a fundamental truth when we speak of the two worlds, when we declare this is the new world and the continent of Europe the old world. I say that everything that has occurred, notably certain incidents that have occurred very recently, goes to prove, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Canada is no longer safe in entrusting her interests to an English ambassador or any English embassy, no matter how well-intentioned they may be, no matter how earnest may be their desire to do all they

can do—and I do not in the slightest degree deny that they do desire to do all they can—to promote the interests of this Dominion. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of this House to the position in which we found ourselves placed in the early part of the spring of 1887; and I desire to do that the more, and I desire to emphasise that, because I am perfectly certain that but few of the members of this House, and still fewer of the people of this country, at all comprehend the very perilous position into which Canada had drifted in the early part of 1887. What was that position? We found ourselves face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, supported almost unanimously by the entire Congress of the United States, by the entire press of the United States, and by sixty millions of people in a state of irritation and exasperation. We found that no public man in the United States was willing to entertain a proposition for our benefit, until, at any rate, we had entirely ceased from the treatment of their fishermen of which they complained. We found, Sir, that this non-intercourse Bill was of such a character, that it menaced us with commercial war, a thing divided by a very narrow barrier from actual war, and I need not say war of that character would be almost a crime against humanity, and calculated in the highest degree to injure the interests of civilisation. Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask the Prime Minister, and I ask his colleagues, do they venture to dispute that this is a true statement of the state of affairs in the spring of 1887? Sir, I pause for a reply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I pause for a reply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will get a reply by-and-by.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can well understand the difficulty which the hon. gentleman labors under. Probably the hon. gentlemen's memory is better than I may have given him credit for; probably the First Minister is aware that the language which I have used, yes, the very words which I have used, is not the language used by me, is not the language used by my friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier), and is not the language used by my friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), but they are the exact, the identical words which were used by a man who of all others had best right to speak for hon. gentlemen opposite; it was the language used by their High Commissioner *in esse*, by their late plenipotentiary, by their colleague the then Finance Minister, when that hon. gentleman came down to us to plead that we should not oppose the sanctioning of the Fishery Bill. I wish, Sir, that not only the hon. gentleman opposite but that others outside this House should know, that in making those statements I have but copied literally and exactly the language used by that gentleman. I shall not hesitate to call the attention of the House, and as far as I can the attention of the country, to the manner in which Sir Charles Tupper described our position in April, 1887. Quoth that hon. gentleman when advocating the Fishery Bill:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with the non-intercourse Bill sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with a few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of sixty millions lying along our borders."

Sir, those are tolerably strong expressions, but the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"They said,"

referring to the arguments used by the Commissioners on the other side,

"that such was the hostility of public men in regard to Canada, and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen, that if to-morrow any relaxation of the tariff of the United States was made by an Act of Congress



it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operations, so' as to deny us its advantage."

And further on I find that our plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper goes on to tell us :

"We stood face to face with a Bill providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between the two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between the two countries from an actual war."

What such a war would be I quote the hon. gentleman again; he declares :

"That I consider that such would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the civilised world—a collision between the two great English-speaking nations."

The hon. gentleman goes on to point out—although he says this in cautious and diplomatic language as becomes a High Commissioner—that he felt bound to take a vastly broader view of the situation than his hon. colleagues the Minister of Marine or the Minister of Justice, whom he almost intimates, I am afraid, took a very narrow and pedantic view of the real relations between the two countries at that moment. This House cannot be ignorant of what occurred on that occasion, this House cannot be ignorant of how in April, 1887, Sir Charles Tupper in red-hot haste made his way down to Washington, and how he interviewed the American Government; nor can they be ignorant that he returned with a clear conviction on his mind, at any rate, of the very perilous character of the situation into which we had drifted, and that forthwith, upon that hon. gentleman's return, a complete and total change came over the whole policy of the Administration. Now, Sir, it is not my purpose at present to discuss how far the policy they adopted in 1886 was or was not a wise and prudent policy. But one thing is most manifest; that be that policy good, or be that policy bad, the moment that Sir Charles Tupper had come face to face with the American authorities, the moment that he had ascertained the perilous position in which we stood, that instant the policy of the Government was totally reversed. Did we hear of one solitary single seizure of American fishermen's boats during the whole year 1887? (I say nothing of 1888 because at that time the *modus vivendi*, I believe, was in full operation) but during the whole of 1887, according to President Cleveland, if I remember his message aright, the American Government had nothing to complain of, and the American fishermen had nothing to complain of. Why was that? Are we to suppose that the conduct of the American fishermen in 1887 differed materially from the conduct of the American fishermen in 1886? No. I have not the slightest doubt that the American fishermen deported themselves in 1887 precisely as they did in 1886, but the Government discreetly, if not valiantly, had seen occasion (and for that I am not disposed to blame them)—had seen occasion to alter their whole policy, and from the day that Sir Charles Tupper returned from Washington not one word of complaint is breathed against us by the American people, because the whole policy of the Canadian Government appeared to have undergone an alteration from that moment. Now, Mr. Speaker, the position that I take is this. It is quite clear that when Sir Charles Tupper went down to Washington he had but a very imperfect appreciation of the situation. It is quite clear the Government had but a very imperfect appreciation of the situation. No doubt it is impossible it should be otherwise. The British embassy had kept them advised to the best of their power; but it is perfectly clear, and it was admitted in substance by Sir Charles Tupper himself, that until the time he went down to Washington, he was quite unaware of the real position of things. Sir, I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, and I wish to ask this House, how was it, by what interposition was it, that Sir Charles Tupper and the Government were suddenly and unexpectedly awakened to a sense of the danger of the situation into which they had drifted? Sir, it was not through the British ambassador or the British embassy, but, as Sir Charles Tupper himself admitted, mainly through the interposition of a Canadian resident in the United States, who by good fortune happened to be better aware than the Government here or the British representative at Washington, of the state of feeling in the United States, and the real peril we were running. Sir, whatever may be said as to the schemes that gentleman recommends, no man who looks at the situation, no man who reads the statement of Sir Charles Tupper can deny, that Mr. Erastus Wiman, for it is to him I refer, rendered a great and important service to the people of Canada on that occasion.

Mr. DAVIES. That is, if we believe the High Commissioner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we take the High Commissioner's statement. And, Sir, if we do not take the High Commissioner's statement, if we are to suppose that those gentlemen had deliberately dragged us into such a position as the High Commissioner states, what are we to think; what are we to think, if, with full knowledge, obtained from the British embassy or anywhere else, they had brought us into such a position that we were separated by only a thin partition from actual war? Now, in connection with that, I may refer to the present position in which we find ourselves. Sir, I do not pretend to approve of the manner in which the late British ambassador was treated by the American Government. It is quite true that he displayed great indiscretion; it is quite true that he fell into a most patent and palpable trap; it is quite true that he did serious injury to President Cleveland in the late campaign; and I think I may add that it is quite true that President Cleveland did serious injury to himself in the minds of many people in the United States by the mode in which he retaliated. But, Sir, what position, again I ask, does Canada find herself in? At a critical period in our history, when it is a matter of grave importance to us that our Government should be kept well advised as to what is likely to be the intention of the incoming Administration at Washington, we find, by reason of a personal difference between Her Majesty's representative on the one hand and the American authorities on the other, that diplomatic relations have been for several months practically suspended between the two countries. Now, Sir, I say it is high time that this kind of thing should be amended. I say, we need, and those two facts I have stated show that we need, and that the time has come for supplying that need—we need to have agents or representatives of our own at such a point at any rate as Washington, not to speak of other places with which we have important relations. That is becoming a necessity to us in the most ordinary times. Such is the magnitude of the interests between Canada and the United States that if there be one point on the earth's surface where it is important to Canada to have an agent who shall keep our Government well advised, who shall be responsible to the Government and people of Canada, who shall take his orders from us, and who shall know that it is his business to look after the interests of Canada and nothing else, it is there; more particularly because at this present moment there is a very dangerous issue unsettled in the Fisheries question. Then there is a great question raised which is likely, very largely, indeed, to affect the relations between this country and the United States; and I say, Sir, that this double power, the power to negotiate without reference to a distant power, the power to appoint an agent of our own, is becoming hourly and daily, more and more essential to the good government and

development of Canada. Sir, in my opinion, we have lost a great deal by our inaction in this matter, and we stand to lose a great deal more. Looking at the correspondence which passed between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard, looking to the language President Cleveland used in December, 1886, even at the very moment when he was warning our Government of the risks they would run if they persisted in the policy they had adopted in the early part of that year, it is quite clear that a considerable number of American statesmen were not indisposed to treat with us, if we were disposed to treat with them on fair and reasonable terms. One of the consequences which I deplore from the refusal to satisfy what was then a felt want, one of the consequences that will follow if the present Parliament is ill-advised enough to take no steps in that direction, is this: that such a refusal undoubtedly tends to degrade and dispirit our people—that it is undoubtedly a thing which lowers us in our own eyes and in the eyes of our neighbors. When it is clear, as it is on every page of these voluminous fishery reports which have been brought down, that we can take no action on our own part at all, that we must go from post to pillar, that we must refer our communications to the Foreign Office or the Colonial Office, as the case may be, who must send them to the British ambassador at Washington, to be by him transmitted to the American Government, whose answer travels, by the same circumlocution back to Canada, after months have elapsed, I say the time has come when the position of things should be handled boldly. I say, though I do not in the least dispute the good intentions of the British ambassador, that very often he is perfectly useless to us, and under certain circumstances his advocacy may be downright injurious to our case. Our business is not his business, at any rate is not his sole business, or that to which he is bound or disposed to pay the most regard; and the circumstances are such that even if the British embassy desired most earnestly to consult the good of Canada and the good of Canada alone, they do not and cannot possess the requisite knowledge and information to put our case one-half as well as Ministers of our own Privy Council or agents appointed by ourselves. Now, Sir, let us see what would be the result of manfully pressing this claim of ours. Not the least valuable result would be that it would give us a clear understanding of the position we occupy. I, for my part, do not in the slightest degree believe that, if this proposal were properly placed before the British Government, the British Government would refuse to consider it in a favorable light. We have no ground for supposing such a thing. On the contrary, the whole course and current of their dealings with us goes to show that the British Government are perfectly willing to listen to any reasonable proposition on our part. If they should intimate to us that it is a power they could not grant, then it will be time, but not till then, to consider our position. For myself, I have to say this: I cannot at all agree with the First Minister or with his following in supposing that we are to consider our present position a finality. I say that, naturally and inevitably, this, which is, at the best, but a tadpole sort of existence, must come to a termination. I say that the question is in the minds of those who care for the future of Canada, is rather whether this form of existence has not lasted too long already. I say that the true end of Confederation, in the mind of every true Canadian, in the mind of every man who is honest in his convictions, is to pave the way for fuller rights and powers and for a fuller manhood than we now possess. What were the excuses to which we have been treated heretofore? These hon. gentlemen told us, when we made this proposition before—some of them, at any rate—that although in the abstract they did not object to this, yet that we were too hasty, that we had not succeeded at the time in incorporating British North America into one grand

whole, and, that, even when we had incorporated it, we had not perfected the material bond so as to enable us to look upon that incorporation as a reality. Well, these pleas, at any rate, are now at an end. We may have proceeded too hastily in our work, we may have been not altogether wise and discreet in the measures we have adopted, but, at any rate, the thing is done—it is done after one fashion or the other, and we are now responsible for the good government and management of the whole Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and, being so responsible, I say that the time has come for taking the next step, and that this step—the right to make our own treaties, the right in certain cases to appoint our own agents—is the proper, necessary, and inevitable one from which no man who desires to see Canada develop itself as much as she can with her resources develop herself, will ask to recede. Why, at this moment, and the right hon. the First Minister knows it well—and I presume his followers know it well—we are responsible for the good government of that immense area. We cannot look for help in defending that, at any rate, for any material or substantial help. If Canada is to be defended, she must be defended by Canadian arms and Canadian hearts, and she need not and ought not to look for any other assistance to do it. The right hon. gentleman has assented to that position, and the inevitable consequence is this, that if we are responsible, as I say we are, for the defence and good management of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we should have full power to make commercial treaties, to appoint agents, and to advise and instruct our Government when and how this best can be brought about. I can see no reason for supposing that the British Government, when this necessity is fairly put before them, would raise any objection to granting us those powers. What, after all, do we ask for? We ask that Her Majesty the Queen of Canada, acting by and through the Parliament and Privy Council of Canada, should use her prerogative to appoint agents, as she most undoubtedly has the power to do, to deal with foreign States on our behalf. Why, Sir, the right hon. the First Minister, if his followers do not, must know quite well that powers greater than those, that powers, not of making commercial treaties alone, but of peace and war, were ceded to an ordinary trading company, in the person of the Honorable the East India Company which, for years and years, and I believe the thing was acknowledged by English courts, used to make commercial treaties, aye, and used to make war and depose princes and annex territories, almost as large as North America, at their own sole will and pleasure; nor were they ever called upon by the British Government to account for their exercise of those powers. I do not think this is a case in which precedents will avail us much. I do not think, for my part, that any position at all analogous to ours is to be found in the known world, or has ever existed for the matter of that; but as I am aware that some of these hon. gentlemen are exceedingly anxious that every step we take should be fortified by precedent, I will just briefly read to them, as embodying to a considerable extent my view, at any rate, of the position of the people and Parliament of Canada, some remarks which I notice were made not long ago in another place by an eminent judge, now a senator, appointed by the First Minister himself. Speaking of the position of Canada that hon. gentleman used these words:

“We Canadians are part of the Empire in confederation, under a common sovereign, yet with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. We Canadians have the making, moulding and developing of the law, the recognition, or rejection of principles which shall prevail in our community, and to us it belongs exclusively to enact and declare, as a Parliament, in all concerns the welfare and good government of Canada.”

And such powers, as I assert in this motion, do most undoubtedly concern the welfare and good government of Canada. Now, I say this House, if it has any function, is here for the purpose of trying to build up a nation at the

earliest possible moment. That is what we are here for; and if we do not recognise that, I say that we are false to our principles and traitors to the people of Canada who sent us here. I will go further, and say if that is not the object of sending us here, if that was not the object of Confederation, we would have been better off as we were. I say we have been wasting time and energy to exceedingly little purpose. I know much of the difficulty which undoubtedly attends the good government of Canada is due to the uncertainty of our position in many ways. I know that has an influence in two ways to our detriment. I know that that uncertainty, that lack of such powers as we now desire to obtain, is one cause why many of the best immigrants who come to the New World pass us by; I know that is one of the causes why we are unable to retain a great many of the best of those who come to us; aye, Sir, and why a great many of the best of our young and enterprising men are found leaving us from day to day. Our present status as a dependency—say what you like of it—is but a low one. It is not a status of full manhood, of full freedom and capacity to deal with our own interests. This is felt, and felt strongly, by others than ourselves. This is a sentiment which is not in the slightest degree confined, I am happy to say, to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But the other day, although I cannot say that I agreed with that gentleman on all points, I had an opportunity of perusing a speech made by no less a person than the president of the Imperial Confederation League, a distinguished member of this House. And it may be interesting to hon. gentlemen opposite to know what such a gentleman, who, if my memory serves me right, has been declared to supply the missing brains of a large number of others in that league—it may be interesting to these gentlemen to know what that hon. gentleman stated as to our present position: "Do you know," quoth Mr. President, "that Canadians are not yet free. Wars may take place, and treaties dealing with Canadian interests may be made without the Canadian people having the right to utter a single word regarding them. I desire to have the full rights of a British subject, and for that reason think that Canadians should be admitted to the Imperial Parliament." I do not agree with that gentleman on all points, but he has stated the exact and literal truth in what he said as to the present incomplete status of the people of Canada, which he desired to amend in one way and which I desire to amend in another. But I am willing to believe that the objects of both of us are alike, to raise ourselves from the present low plane of political existence, to one higher and more worthy of the people to whom we belong, and, I will add, to the people from whom we sprung. The Government have made, I admit, an attempt—a feeble attempt—to meet this want. I refer to their action in the appointment of a High Commissioner who, in some mysterious way, was to fulfil all the functions, all the duties, all the responsibilities which we would rather devolve on persons appointed by us to deal directly with the Governments with whom we come in contact. I have nothing to say against the abilities of the gentleman who first filled, or the gentleman who at present fills that office. I dare say they did, on the whole, all that it was possible for them to do. My objection is different. My objection is that they are in the wrong place, after all said and done, and that they are obliged to act in the wrong way. It will not do, at any rate, it will not do any longer, for the people of Canada to speak through the mouths of persons who are not responsible to them and are not appointed by them. Our commissioner has, of necessity, in his dealings with foreign governments, in his dealings with foreign authorities, to act through and under the orders, to a very great extent, of the British Foreign Office and of the British ambassadors;

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

nor can it be otherwise so long as the present state of affairs lasts. I do not for one moment desire to disguise from the House that my main aim in bringing forward this motion is to aid and assist in carrying out the policy which I advocated a year ago on the floor of this House. I tell the hon. gentleman that I hold it of supreme importance that we should have a perfectly free hand in dealing with the people of the United States. I say that is of the vastest importance not merely to Canada, but to England and to the Empire at large. I am not going to inflict—it is not necessary to my present purpose—any long array of statistics on the House, and yet I cannot forbear calling attention for a few brief moments to certain most remarkable facts which are revealed to us in the volume of Trade and Navigation which was laid on the Table a few weeks ago. Sir, it is clear that, with the exception of England and her Colonies, our commerce with the United States is of incalculably more value to the people of Canada than our commerce with all the rest of the world—ten times over. How stands the case? We find that, last year, the total volume of our trade was \$193,000,000. Of that the United States alone took \$91,000,000 export and import. Our trade with nearly every other country in the world, not excepting Great Britain, declined considerably. Our trade with the United States alone showed an increase of \$9,000,000 on a trade of \$91,000,000. If we look to the exports of our own produce, the case becomes stronger still. We find that we exported of the produce of the people of Canada—our own articles of produce—\$78,297,000 worth. Deducting the amount exported to Great Britain and her Colonies, which was \$37,000,000, the balance remaining was \$41,297,000, and of that the United States alone took from us \$37,323,161; so that, excepting Great Britain and her Colonies, our trade with the United States is nine times as great as our total trade with all the rest of the world put together. And the increase in the amount of products which they took from us in that one year alone amounted to the total volume of our trade with all the rest of the world except Great Britain and her Colonies. Why, we find that in articles of the mine they took \$3,341,000; in fisheries, \$3,128,000; in the articles from the forest, \$10,622,000; in agricultural products, \$10,300,000; in manufactures, \$1,632,000; and in miscellaneous, \$701,000; so that, out of our five principal articles of export, the United States were beyond comparison our best customers for the articles of the mine, for the fisheries, for the produce of our forests and our agricultural products. They were the best customers we had, and the only customers we had in whose case there was a large and manifest increase. Now, in dealing with other countries, I am quite willing to admit that it is of less moment to us to be kept advised of the temper and possibly of the prejudices of the people with whom we have to deal; but I say that, in dealing with the United States, we have had the clearest possible evidence which any man can conceive that, in the first place, we run great risks unless we are kept well advised as to all that happens in that great country, and in the next place, that we cannot at all depend upon our present sources of information to give us any accurate advice as to what the Americans may be feeling or as to what they may be intending to do as far as we are concerned. Therefore I say it is indispensable that we should be well advised as to the progress of events, that it is indispensable that we should be able to seize the best moment for negotiating with them, that it has become clear that it will not do that we should be compelled, when the favorable moment occurs, to make a reference to a distant power 3,000 miles away, and above all that it is for the manifest interest of the two countries—for the manifest interest of Great Britain no less than ourselves—that there should be free and frequent intercourse between the men who are

charged with the government of Canada and the men who are charged with the government of the United States. I repeat that that is best for us and that it is best for England too. I think now hon. gentlemen opposite will understand, if they ever had any doubt about it, that there is no wavering in the policy adopted by this side of the House. We are prepared to carry out the propositions which we heretofore propounded to the House, and we are not disposed to shrink from the natural results of those propositions. We say that these are our clear right. We say that, though there might have been before a sort of lame excuse for regarding our proposal as a sort of abstract proposition, because, as was then alleged, forsooth, we were in the midst of a fiscal experiment, because we were cherishing some dreams, many of which have, as we know to our cost, proved utterly futile, yet now we have the absolute need of the power which we demand. More than that, I assert that the effect of perpetual pupilage to which hon. gentlemen would condemn us lowers us not only in our own eyes but in the eyes of our neighbors, and that it is partially responsible for the political debasement that very many of us have regretted to see creeping over this country for some years past. Now, I know that there are hon. gentlemen here who, whenever a question of this kind comes up, affect to think that it is necessary for them to consider how it will harmonise with the policy of the parent state. Sir, I have to say this, in the first place, England is very well able to take care of herself. English statesmen are in the habit of considering measures in the English Parliament according as they will or will not promote the interests of England, and I say that it is the duty of Canada's representatives, and of Canadian statesmen, first and mainly to consider what is for the interest of Canada. But I am quite willing to admit that although there is a good deal of hypocrisy about all this professed desire to do nothing which can clash with the interests of England, particularly when I see this desire expressed by men who have not scrupled to adopt a policy in utter contradiction to the avowed policy of Great Britain, a policy which is continually reducing the volume of our trade with Great Britain, a policy which is enlarging, in spite of all obstacles, our trade with the United States, although I know that much of the language used has no honest foundation at all, I am quite willing to admit that there are a considerable number among us who do honestly desire in promoting the welfare of Canada, to promote the welfare of England also; and to these men on both sides of the House, I say that I believe it will be found, I am pretty certain that it will be admitted by all the more advanced English statesmen, at any rate, that the true policy for England to adopt is, under existing circumstances, to devolve upon Canada the direct control of North American affairs. I say that this is really very much more dignified and very much safer, too. Under existing circumstances the fact of Canada having to approach the authorities of the United States, not speaking for herself, but speaking through the mouth of the British ambassador, is very little more than just a temptation to the baser sort of American politicians to hurt us for the sake of affronting England. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), were he free to speak, could give the House some valuable evidence on that point. I know that we could obtain redress for any grievance of which we would have to complain quite as readily through our own agent as if we spoke through the mouth of an English Minister at Washington. Now, Sir, it is no business of mine to criticise the conduct of the English Government, but I will say this: that the mere fact, that to day, under the circumstances with which we are familiar, knowing as the English Government do, knowing as we all do, the enormous importance, in every point of view, that Great Britain and the United States should be

in thorough accord, it is a tolerable evidence, although a secondary evidence, of the truth of many things that I have said here to-day, that, whereas, it is manifest that there is no post whatever in the English diplomatic service which calls for higher abilities, which needs a higher class of men, than the post of British Minister at Washington; yet to this day, I believe, according to the technical rules of English diplomacy, the British Minister at Washington fills but a third-rate, or, at best, but a second rate position in the English diplomatic corps. I think I am correct in saying that he is inferior, even to an official, comparatively, of such minor importance as the British ambassador at Madrid. I know that there may be considerations of petty technical etiquette which have brought this thing about; but I say that it is hardly satisfactory to us, nor do I believe that it ought to be quite satisfactory to the English Government that this should be the case. We have seen to our cost that it is imperatively necessary for England, if England wants to promote good will between herself and the United States, that she should be represented at Washington, not by men of inferior grade, or, it may be, of inferior capacity, but by the best and most distinguished men which England can produce. Now, Sir, I desire briefly to summarise the results at which we have arrived. In the first place, I lay down as a self-evident proposition, what I think hon. gentlemen on the other side are hardly in a position to contradict, that our position, to all intents and purposes, is without precedent or parallel. We here, the Parliament and the Government of Canada, are responsible in the highest sense for the good government of nearly half a continent. Although similar obligations and responsibilities may be, and in some circumstances have been, imposed on other communities situated like ourselves, there is this most material difference, that we alone are side by side, for more than 3,000 miles, with a frontier interlaced and interwoven in every conceivable way with one of the greatest powers now existing in the world, if not, potentially considered, the every greatest. Sir, under these circumstances where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves with power to do almost any amount of mischief, with power, as Sir Charles Tupper showed clearly enough, to embroil the two Governments, but practically helpless for any good or useful purpose. I say the time has come when that situation, which was long felt to be inexpedient, is fast becoming intolerable; I say that indirectly it is responsible, in no inconsiderable degree, for the exodus of a very considerable proportion of the best of our population, that it is responsible, also, to some extent, for the inferior quality and quantity, perhaps not so much of the immigrants who come here, as of the immigrants who, having come here, and understanding the position, elect to remain with us. I say that the knowledge that we occupy a comparatively low political position goes a long way to account for the lack of a wholesome public spirit, and for the failure to weld our Provinces into one compact whole. Now, for all this I say the natural and appropriate remedies are such as we point out. I do not say that this resolution, if it carries, will effect all that we desire, but I do say that power such as we ask, to manage our own affairs, power to act independently, particularly if we use it as we ought to use it, to come to a better understanding and better terms with the United States, particularly if we use it, as we ought to use it, to foster friendly relations between the United States and the mother country, would, to a very large extent, contribute to do away with the evils to which I have alluded. More than that—and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to contradict it—I say that Canadians are best able to deal with Canadian interests, and that more especially in all North American affairs, Canadians possess naturally and instinctively the knowledge which can only be obtained in the case of English officials by long and protracted

experience in American affairs. And I say, what is patent to all, that we have a thousandfold more interest in maintaining good and friendly relations with the United States in particular than it is possible for any English officials to possess. Now, Sir, to all this, what sort of reply are we likely to get? If I am to judge from some of the statements I have seen in the press which is subsidised by, and which supports hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sorry to say that many men appear to think that it is fitting for Canadians to crawl rather than to stand upright. Why, we are told by some of these men: Suppose the British Government do not like your proposal, suppose the British Government were to threaten to let you go, what would become of you, what would you do, where would you go, where would you be? All I have to say is this, that if this sort of cowardly utterance is to be the outcome of twenty-one years of Confederation, our time, as I said before, has been worse than wasted. I say for my part: out on such dastards! Is it true that Canada is inhabited by five millions of cowards? Sometimes, looking at the outrages to which our people have stooped to submit, I almost fear such is the case, although I cannot bring myself to believe that when the facts are known and the case is fairly presented to them they will be found for one moment to entertain the cowardly plea set out in their behalf. I ask, for what purpose does this House of Commons sit here? Is it to discuss and to promote measures calculated to advance the welfare of the people of Canada, or is the highest aspiration of the majority of this House to play the part of jackal to the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Manufacturers Association? We are told that this is a great step onward, and therefore we must be cautious; that great consequences may be involved, that we do not know what is likely to come out of taking any such position as this. Well, I admit it is a great step onward, and a great step in the right direction too. I admit that grave consequences are involved or may be involved in it, and I say it is high time these consequences should be considered and these issues, whatever they may be, should be faced. But, Mr. Speaker, I deny emphatically that these parties have the slightest right whatever to assume, as they do assume, that the British Government or the British people, provided always the case be fairly and honestly stated to them, will have any objection to the proposition which I now submit, just as I deny, and deny most emphatically, that any man here or elsewhere has the right to assume that if fairly and honorably treated the Government and people of the United States would be found unfriendly to the Government and people of Canada. If, as has been alleged, that be the case, if the Government and people of the United States are today actuated by unfriendly and hostile feelings to the people of Canada, then I say it is not the fault of the people of Canada, but it is very largely the fault of the policy of the present Government. Sir, we see it constantly alleged that the United States will not treat with us. This is false. We know perfectly well that the highest authorities in the United States held out the olive branch to these gentlemen nearly two years ago. We know how that proposition was received, that the door was shut in those men's faces. We know that after that, although they were cautious in word, our Government showed, and showed, I am sorry to say, only too clearly, they were not actuated by feelings of genuine and sincere friendship towards the people of the United States. Must I recall to the House the scene which took place here about a year ago, when hon. gentlemen opposite rose in their places to refuse to implement their own statutory offer to the people of the United States, and when they were taken by the throat by the High Commissioner, the then Finance Minister, and compelled ignominiously to recede from the position which they had declared that no man but a traitor could recede from? Have we not seen, to the disgrace of Canada be it said, that the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

privilege of sending free fruit from the United States, to this Dominion was attempted to be withdrawn by a petty tax on the packages in which that fruit came into this country? Have we not seen lately, only the other day, contrary to the advice of every man competent to speak on the subject, those hon. gentlemen deliberately challenging the United States by the needless and foolish imposition of an extra duty on exported logs? The fact is this: first, they do their best by small, petty indignities to disgust and irritate the Government of the United States, and then they plead that the United States will not make a bargain with them. I will tell the hon. gentlemen when they may with some degree of propriety say that the United States will not make a bargain with the people of Canada. When Canada possesses a capable and upright Ministry, when that Ministry has succeeded in proving to the people of the United States, and to the Government of the United States, that they are actuated by feelings of sincere friendship and a desire to be good neighbors, when Canada has obtained the right to make her own bargains with that country and other countries, when Canada has a right to appoint her own agents, when she has felt her way, as in a matter of such importance she should feel her way, and proceeded cautiously, and when under these circumstances the people of Canada have offered fair and reasonable terms to the people of the United States, then, if that offer were refused, we would be justified in saying to our people that a very good opportunity had been lost some time ago by the folly and obstinacy of the Government of Canada, and that we must wait for some favorable opportunity, until the mischievous impression produced by the foolish conduct of the Government has had time to subside. But, as the matter stands, we cannot say that the people of the United States are not disposed to make a bargain with us. Why, all these conditions I have mentioned are absent. Canada has not a capable and upright Ministry, Canada has not through its Ministers showed herself sincerely desirous of cultivating neighborly relations with the United States, Canada has not the power to make her own commercial treaties, Canada has not the power to appoint her own agents, Canada has not offered fair and reasonable terms, in trade matters at all events, to the United States.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Canada has not: and until these things are done it is utterly preposterous on our part to argue for one moment that the United States would refuse fair and reasonable terms offered at the proper moment in the proper spirit. I have deliberately omitted not a little bearing specially on our position as regards the United States which perhaps might have strengthened my argument in some respects, and I have omitted it, not because I am in the slightest degree afraid to speak what I believe to be the truth on these points, but because I am willing to deal with this subject generally in the broadest possible aspect. This House has now an opportunity to show of what metal it is composed; this House has the opportunity to show whether it desires to assist the just and righteous aspirations of Canadians for a large measure of power in their own affairs, or whether, so far as it can do, it is disposed to remain in a state of political childhood. No little depends, I admit, on the answer this House may give, and still more depends on the answer the people of Canada may choose to give to the proposition we now submit. I do not at all desire to conceal from you, Mr. Speaker, or this House, that there are many things of importance involved in this proposition. I have no doubt in my own mind there are questions of great gravity now engaging the attention of the public, and more particularly of the younger portion of the community. Men are beginning to ask themselves on all hands whether this Confederation

is to be a political *cul de sac*, or whether it is to be, what the hon. gentleman says that it never should be, a stepping-stone to a higher form of political existence. Sir, they are asking this, further: if we are to remain forever in a state of dependency, whether Confederation was worth all or half the sacrifices we made to obtain it? Sir; for our part we neither fear to state the problem, nor do we fear to work out the solution. I believe that if the people of Canada do possess the spirit which befits them, if they possess the spirit of freemen, if they are worthy of their ancestry, they will welcome such a task instead of shrinking from it. I repeat again that if they do not possess such a spirit, if we find that they shrink from such a task, then, in my judgment, the twenty-five years that have been spent in attempting to work out Confederation have been worse than wasted. We have gone back and not forward in that case in the matter of political education. I, for my part, hope for better things. I believe that all the people of Canada require is to have those facts fully and fairly presented to them. All they require is to be made aware of what is wanted, of the opportunities that have been lost, of the perils that have been incurred, and of the real character of the proposition which we submit. Sir, when that is done, when the people do know that all we ask and all we demand is simply permission to manage our own affairs, to appoint our own agents to deal with other nations as we see fit, to make the best terms we can with our neighbors across the line, and with any nation willing to enter into similar relations with us, then Sir, I believe that with scarce a dissentient voice on the part, at any rate, of all those who desire to see Canada become what Canada ought to be, they will agree with the motion which I have now the honor to move in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, whatever may be said of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House as to the rightness of their principles and the practicability of their methods, I think it will never be alleged against them that they lack variety or that they are wanting in versatility of movement. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) who has just taken his seat started out by saying that much had occurred since 1882, and in that sentiment I entirely agree with him. Much has occurred since 1882; but to the student of the political history of Canada in after days, there will be nothing more amusing, if not more interesting, than the strange variations which the party known as the Liberal party in Canada has undertaken since 1882 and carried out up to the present time. Sir, in 1882 we found that party solidly planted with both feet upon the solid basis of free trade. They would make no compromise with the enemy. Protection even to a limited extent was a crime and a blunder, vicious in its conception, and it could not help being terribly injurious in its result. If they had to fight the question in Canada for that year or more years, no matter how long, they would take their stand upon the eternal principles of right and justice, so far as it affected trade, and they would stick to the freest possible trade in this country, and the quickest possible taking-off of the trammels of protection. Time went on and something occurred. The elections of 1887 were near at hand, and just a little while, only a little while, before the time when the people should be called upon to poll their votes, that party, which planted itself on the bed-rock of the principles of free trade through their leader of that time (not their leader of to-day), who spoke for his party, and who spoke after consultation with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Sir Richard Cartwright), declared that so far as he and his party were concerned those who believed in and those who profited by protection in this country had nothing to fear if they should return his party to power; they had nothing to fear, because as the people had once, twice, yea, on many

occasions in bye-elections outside of the general elections, declared that they required a policy of protection, protection was therefore a fixed fact in this country that neither he nor his party would be found attempting to disturb it. Well, Sir, the elections of 1887 passed, and the people did not listen to the voice of the charmer though he charmed ever so wisely. The result of that election brought about a very sudden change. Then it was no longer free trade to be fought out to the end, then it was no longer protection to be upheld as they asserted it would be if they came into power; but, inside of a month or two, after the people had spoken at the polls many of the foremost men of the party, and of the foremost papers of the party, were found in full cry in this country in favor of commercial union, or a customs union, by which to hand over the tariff and fiscal regulations of this country, inevitably and certainly, into the hands of the people of a foreign country, to hand over the fiscal government of a population of five millions to the power of a people of sixty millions. It was not long before a cry arose, a voice as out of the wilderness, in the person of my hon. friend who sits for South Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who declared that it would not be right to take the Customs houses away. The party heard the cry, and the party leaders brought their followers into line, and the party papers followed suit, and inside of six or eight months commercial union was thrown to the dogs, and a brand new policy of unrestricted reciprocity was formulated before the people, and formulated last Session in this House. Upon that the leaders of the party, and the papers representing the party, declared that they would fight out this battle if it took, not one, but many, many summers, and they would never lay down their arms until they were successful. Well, Sir, we come to the present time, and something else has occurred. The policy of unrestricted reciprocity, in its own manly dress, in its own form, apparent and real to the people, has been laid aside,—

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER—and from a musty shelf has been taken down this skeleton which, for nineteen years, has slept upon that shelf with only an hour or two of vigorous shaking in 1882, administered in a vain attempt to arouse it to a vigorous life. They have now laid aside their policy of unrestricted reciprocity, or, if they have not done it, they have not the manliness to stand to their colors. My hon. friend thought we were surely not five millions of dastards and cowards. May be we are not five millions of dastards and cowards, but, as I live, I think there may be some of that class when a party which declares for a principle, and which declares that it shall fight for that principle to the bitter end, for some reason or other, lays it aside, or, if they do not lay it aside, cover it up with a mask and refuse to go to the country on a manly, open, plain, honest statement of their position. But one thing that occurs, occurs in only one way. Just so surely as the old worshipper in Palestine turned his face towards Jerusalem when he worshipped, just so surely as the old Mussulman had his journeys pointed towards Mecca, just so, whatever changes, whatever modes, forms or fashions of political garments these gentlemen don or take off, they always turn in the end towards the United States of America. Sir, the resolution of to-day is different from the resolution of 1882 and from the resolution of 1870, in this particular, and I invite the attention of the House to it. In 1870 the gentlemen who supported Mr. Huntington's resolution supported a resolution which declared that it was best that this power should be obtained, that it would be well to have a customs union with the United States, or a continental union, but which also declared for the integrity and permanency of the Empire, when it said that the supreme power, which alone has the right to make treaties and to ratify them, should be consulted and should have the rati-

fiction of the result of the negotiations, whatever they were. In 1832, in that ponderous resolution which was sprung upon the House by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that condition was not to be found; but he did have the grace to include the British possessions with foreign states. But in this resolution the bridges have all been burnt. Not only have the Imperial power and the Imperial interest been unrecognised, but it is no longer thought worth while by my doughty and gallant friend on the other side of the House to take account of the British possessions. Now, he asks solely and wholly that we should have the right to negotiate treaties with foreign states, and with foreign states alone; and when he comes down to the gist of his argument, he has mentioned no foreign state, not by principality, no power, outside of the United States of America; and he has declared fully and finally, so that we can no longer doubt it, that what he wants is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and that the only way in which he hopes now to get it is, not by an open, honest and manly assertion of his principles, but by first obtaining this power from the British Government to place our relations with the mother country on a different basis, and in the future, somehow or other, to get at the object which, in an unguarded moment, he said he had in view, by a roundabout way, through powers which he hopes to obtain. My hon. friend in his resolution states that it is of extreme importance to the well-being of the people of Canada that this power should be claimed and granted and exercised freely. If it is of extreme importance, of such extreme importance that the *status quo* is to be changed, it devolved upon the hon. gentleman to give us sufficient reasons for the changing of the position which we now occupy towards the mother country. It was not simply his place to notice some objections which could be made against it, but, in the very spirit of his own resolution, it was his place to show that it was of such extreme importance to the well-being of this country as to justify a movement in such a direction. I leave to the House and the country to say whether my hon. friend has advanced positions, brought arguments, and used proofs sufficient to establish that position. Now, Sir, we may ask ourselves, in the first place, whether within the last few years there has developed any crisis of sufficient importance to make it the first object of this country to change the relation in which we have hitherto stood to the mother country, and to embark upon this new, untried and unknown way. And, first, with reference to the well-being of Canada: Has anything occurred in the internal history of Canada, in its material progress or otherwise, which makes it a point of the utmost importance that a change in the *status quo* should be brought about? I think not. I think the Dominion of Canada during these last years has made within its own borders great progress; I was almost saying unexampled progress, and I do not think I should have been wrong if I had stated so. I know that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition took occasion to teach the people of Ontario during the recess, that since 1867 there had not been one single *iota* of progress made in this Confederation. But, Sir, I dissent from that. From 1867 to the present time, I say Canada's progress has been large, has been important, has been almost unexampled in the history of the world. What, Sir, has she done? Out of the disconnected parts and Provinces which made up this vast territory, she has built up a consolidated whole, a union of sentiment and of peoples which is rapidly throwing off the old garments of narrowness, sectionalism and provincialism, and putting on the new garments of a life which is instinct with hope and promise. In that time she has widened and broadened the facilities of commerce; she has deepened her navigable streams and built her large canals, until to-day we are in sight of an uninterrupted and splendid line of water communication which shall reach from Quebec to the farthest ends of the great lakes,

Mr. FOSTER.

and be solely and entirely within British jurisdiction and within Canadian right. In that time she has extended her railway system to a very large extent, until to-day, from one part of our country to the other, and extending through its different sections, our railway system is developing and making great this country to an extent unrivalled by most countries in the world. Sir, she has established in that time her industrial position. Her factories have been founded; her industrial establishments, of various kinds, have been maintained, and every Canadian feels a thrill of pride when he considers that whereas twenty years ago the quantity of articles manufactured in this country was small indeed, and but little diversified, to-day there is scarcely an article that is needed for the comfort of the home and the life of the people which Canadians do not make, and make well, which they do not make with profit to themselves and employment to the people. In that time Canada has developed her natural resources until her coal production has risen from a few hundred thousand tons to 2,333,000. To-day Canada is exploring her immense natural resources and developing them with ardour, skill and energy, and is reaching out for larger, longer and swifter lines of communication to the great East and to the great West as well. In all this progress, has any threatening crisis been developed? Has any indication of danger been apparent, showing that there is something radically wrong, that that something has reference to the position we occupy with regard to treaty negotiations, and that a change must be made in this respect for the well being of the people? I think not. Take the moral, the intellectual, the social history of this people, and their progress has been onward and upward. Take the position of Canada in the old country, consider her position among the nations of the earth,—her credit has increased, her position has become magnified, and Canada to-day stands as the first colony of the British Empire. She occupies a proud position amongst the countries of the world, and is looked forward to as the future home of hundreds of thousands of the best people in the best countries of the world. I doubt if in the mind of one person out of every hundred thousand of the people in this country, uninfluenced by political necessity, as have toiled in the school, in the pulpit, in the field, in the forest, in the merchants' places of business,—there is the faintest glimmering of an idea that there is something radically wrong which is paralysing all our efforts, and that that something is, that we cannot send a lone Canadian agent trudging over to the capitals of Spain, France or other European countries, privileged by the British Empire to go alone and unattended to negotiate commercial treaties. The idea is not one that has sprung out of the necessities of the case; it is not one that has sprung spontaneously out of the position we occupy; but it is an idea that has been forced into sudden growth by the political exigencies of the party opposite, and if it were not for those political exigencies, it would not be before this House and the country to-day. But it may be that the conduct of the mother country towards Canada, with regard to her relations with other countries, has been so tyrannical, negligent, culpable, and illiberal, that it has become absolutely necessary for us now to have the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties. Is that the fact? I venture the assertion that it is not, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show from history, during the last twenty or thirty years, that the policy of Great Britain toward this colony, and I may say towards all her colonies, has not been one of increasing liberality, instead of illiberality. I challenge them to show that it has not been one in which she has deferred every year, more and more, to the wishes and interests of her colonies, in which her Government and her statesmen have not been more and more anxious to find out the needs and the interests of the people of these great colonies, which form so important

and so vital a part of the British Empire. Take, for instance, the negotiations which lead to better trade relations between the colonies and other countries. If you go back as far as 1865, when commissioners were sent from this country to Brazil and Guiana and the West India Islands, in order to make a report upon better trade relations between this country and them, you will find that the Government of Great Britain approved of the project, and heartily seconded it, stating, however, that these commissioners should not assume an independent position, but should act as gatherers of information to be submitted to the British Ministers at these different places—that the British Government should act, and that the result of the negotiations should be ratified by the British Parliament. Coming down later than that, we find an increasing liberality in these matters, until we come to our position as it exists to-day, when Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner in London, was not only allowed, as representing Canada, to take part in the negotiations for a treaty at Madrid with Spain and the Spanish West Indies, but was nominated as a co-plenipotentiary with the British Minister at Madrid, and was expressly given the authority to conduct the negotiations after he had been introduced by the British ambassador resident at Madrid. In former times, Great Britain often discriminated against her colonies in her treaties. Afterwards she formed treaties with foreign nations, giving the most favorite nation clauses which had their effect upon the colonies, without the consent of the colonies. Then she went one step further, and made no treaties with foreign states in which there was not a clause by which it was allowed the colonies, if they had been included, to take means to be relieved from the treaty on making representations within a certain time; and to-day, she has gone one step further, and, in the inception of treaties, advises with the Government of Canada, and asks its views with reference to the proposals for the treaty. She not only does not now wait till the treaty is made, but actually asks the co-operation of this colony of Canada before the treaty is begun, and is willing to associate a representative of Canada with her own at the negotiations, and to make that representative a co-plenipotentiary and give him the conduct of the negotiations, so far as Canada is concerned. Therefore I say, with regard to this making of treaties and with regard to the negotiations upon which the treaties are ultimately based, the policy of Great Britain has been one of continued liberality and not one of illiberality, until to-day we have every thing that we would have under the motion of my hon. friend if it were carried out, plus the prestige of Great Britain, the experience of Great Britain, the moral force of Great Britain and the army and the navy of Great Britain as well. Therefore I say there is nothing in the conduct of the Home Government, as it has been developed within the last ten years, whatever else has occurred since 1882, to make it of moment or of extreme importance to the people of this country that they should have the power to negotiate their treaties at first hand, to be ratified simply and solely by their own Parliament.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House separated for recess, I was trying to show, with reference to the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that in the first place there had been a sudden and sharp change in the face presented by hon. gentlemen opposite upon the issue which last year they had declared to be of vital interest to the country, and to the continued advocacy of which they had pledged themselves until what they contended for should triumph. I think I showed that the resolution before the House signifies not merely what is expressed by its wording, a sincere desire to obtain the power

for Canada of negotiating her own commercial treaties, but that underlying it is, by the admission of my hon. friend from South Oxford in reality the propaganda which was urged in the country and in the House for the last year or more; and I think it is apparent to the House, as it will be to the country, that there is an attempt made to gain by taking up a different line of canvass and a different line of action, and to enlist sympathies for it which could not have been enlisted for the propaganda of last year, to obtain if possible this one end as a means to another end. I think I did not go beyond the record in saying that that was liable to the imputation of not being an open, an honest and a manly way of prosecuting a canvass and of carrying out a principle before the people of this country. I stated also—as the House well knows—that the first half of the resolution of my hon. friend starts out with this premise, that it is of the utmost importance to the well-being of Canada that thus and so should take place, and I think I showed to the satisfaction of reasonable men that, within the last eight years, and certainly within the last two or three years, no sudden development of note, no impending or threatening crisis had made itself known in the country which could justify the assertion contained in this resolution, that it was of the utmost importance to the well-being of Canada that Canada should have the power conferred upon her of negotiating independently her commercial treaties; and that, if any such thing had happened, if any such crisis had developed, it certainly had not been shown in the remarks of my hon. friend who moved the resolution. I then stated, that, taking the material history of Canada for the last 21 years, taking her intellectual history, her social history, her moral history, hers had been a record of great progress, of progress almost unexampled, and that, in briefly reviewing that progress and that history, it could not be contended that in Canada there had developed an urgent need for a change of policy in this respect. I then stated that, even though the material, the social and the intellectual progress of Canada internally had been marked and steady in that time, it might be that the course of the home Government, by its illiberality, by its culpable neglect of our interests, by its desire to exclude from a front rank of importance and a front rank of consideration, questions which were intimately connected with the prosperity and progress of Canada, had made it necessary that we should have larger powers than we now have; and I endeavored to show to the House, very cursorily it is true, that, in the matter of interference with or the allowing of Canada's fiscal enactments, in the matter of the negotiation of treaties and the ratification of treaties, not only was it not true that the course of action of the Government of Great Britain had been increasingly illiberal, had been ungenerous, had been indicative of neglect, but that the exact contrary was established by the short historical review I gave, that her conduct had been increasingly liberal and increasingly generous, and that, as the years passed by, she has shown a larger interest, a deeper sympathy, and a greater care for the interests of her colonies, Canada included; and so great an interest and so deep a sympathy as to make the bonds which bind her colonies to herself stronger than before, and to give little, nay, to give not the slightest shadow of foundation for the claim that on that account we should cut loose from the status we have now, and cut asunder almost the only bonds now remaining which bind us to the Empire, and should start out on a course which, by the statement of my hon. friend, and by the logic of events which must necessarily ensue, must land us further and further away from the unity of the Empire and bring us nearer and nearer to that absorption which may be our fate when situated alongside countries greater and more powerful than ourselves. As to our fiscal legislation I may say a word or two more. Time was when every Bill relating to customs or to tariff passed by the colonies was



reserved for assent, and did not become law until it had been subjected to examination and review by the home authorities. That time has passed, and gradually little by little, year after year, in the progress of relations and in the course of history, greater and greater concessions in this respect had been given, until to-day it may be stated, and truthfully stated, that Canada is absolutely independent with reference to her legislation, whether it regards her own internal trade or her trade with foreign countries, and the only point in which—and I shall develop this a little more later—the only point in which there is a possible danger ahead of the disturbance of the relations between Canada and Great Britain, and between the colonies and Great Britain, is if, in the course of commercial negotiations and commercial legislation, a state of things should be brought about in which the people of Great Britain, and in other parts of the Empire belonging to her, should be placed in an unjust position by Canada's legislation, should be discriminated against in favor of foreign countries, so that the bond which binds us one to the other and to the mother land, should in that way, by friction and by a clashing of interests, become greatly weakened. Then, Sir, with reference to the negotiations for treaties. If you will allow me I will, a little more in detail, make good the assertion I made before the House rose, and that is this, that the conduct of Great Britain, the course of the Government of the mother country towards her colonies, has been increasingly liberal with reference to the negotiation of treaties. I mentioned that in 1865, when commissioners were sent from this country to Brazil, Guiana and the West Indies, in order to negotiate for better trade relations, they received the hearty approval, the hearty commendation of the home Government; but that at that time she impressed upon them that they were not to assume an independent position, that they were not to conclude any negotiations which would cause a differentiation of duties as against the mother country or other parts of the British Empire, that they were to inform the British Minister at the different places that they visited, and that all results would have to be ratified, after examination, by the home Government. Sir, as years have passed and Canada's relations have been extended to different countries, we find that her course of action has been increasingly liberal. In 1865, or, to go back further, we may say that from 1848, all through the long course of the negotiations which resulted at last in the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and resulted later in the Washington Treaty of 1871, Great Britain behaved with the utmost liberality, with the utmost goodwill, towards Canada in all her efforts to conclude and maintain a reciprocity treaty between this country and United States, not only giving her influence in the negotiations, not only asking the advice of the Canadian Government, but going so far as to associate representatives of the Canadian Government with her own Minister at Washington, and in every way attempting to forward the commercial interest of this country as connected with the country lying to the south of us. In 1871, when the question had so far progressed in the negotiations with the United States that they were ready to sit down and canvass the conditions and terms of a treaty, Great Britain, being mindful of the interests of Canada, asking the opinion of the Canadian Government, feeling that it was a question in which Canada was very seriously and very intimately involved, placed on that commission, with co-equal powers, the man from Canada who, of all others, had the widest and the best possible knowledge of Canadian interests. Sir John A. Macdonald sat with those plenipotentiaries in Washington, the trusted plenipotentiary of Her Majesty's Government, in constant communication with the Government of Canada, and exercising his influence and his great knowledge for the benefit of Canadian interests. Sir, in 1874, when the Government of Mr. Mackenzie tried again

Mr. FOSTER.

to obtain reciprocity of arrangements between the United States and this country, and I thought that the time was opportune and favorable, and asked that negotiations might be undertaken, the British Government empowered them to send, and recognised him as an agent of this Government, and associated him with the British Minister at Washington. The Hon. George Brown, who went there and negotiated directly, was successful in obtaining the draft of a treaty, but which, on coming before the Senate of the United States, failed of obtaining the ratification of that body; in fact, this treaty which was directly negotiated by a representative of Canada, was not only not taken up, but was treated with contempt by the Senate, which has the ratification of treaties with foreign powers. Then in 1878 and 1879, when the Government of Canada thought that arrangements might possibly be made for increased trade with the Spanish West Indies, Spain, and with France, and that direct negotiations would be beneficial to that end, the British Government heartily and willingly assented to the appointment of a plenipotentiary from this country, and Sir Alexander Gall visited London, visited Madrid, and visited Paris, and although his efforts were unsuccessful, we still had the benefit of his direct negotiation, and I suppose that not even hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will always contend that in every case a failure is the result of inefficiency of method. In 1883, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed as ambassador-plenipotentiary to Spain, and he was appointed not only as an agent, not only as co-plenipotentiary with Sir Robert Morier at the Court of Spain, but it was expressly stated in the despatch which I will read :

“ That if the Spanish Government are favorably disposed, full power for these negotiations will be given to Sir Robert Morier and Sir Charles Tupper. Naturally the negotiations would probably be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper, but the convention, if concluded, must be signed by both plenipotentiaries and then entered into between Her Majesty and the King of Spain; that the subject be the regulating of Canadian trade with the Spanish territories specified in the convention.”

In 1888, when the negotiations had progressed so far with the United States of America as to get the assent of their Administration to the appointment of commissioners to sit down with plenipotentiaries from Great Britain, and try and adjust the difficulties on the fishery question, Great Britain, looking at the interests of Canada, and anxious, as ever, that the interests of all her colonies should be subserved, took Sir Charles Tupper, the Canadian High Commissioner and the choice of the Canadian Government, and made him co-plenipotentiary with the other commissioners that were appointed, and he was accorded the support, and the sympathy, and the backing of the Home Government; and I assert, and I think that it cannot be held to the contrary, that there could be no fuller powers, that there could be no fuller methods of negotiation placed in the hands of Canada than were given in 1888, when Sir Charles Tupper, as representative of Canada, and two Ministers of the Crown of Canada, associated with him in the matter of advice and aid, sat there week after week, canvassing these questions and looking out for, and subserving the interests of Canada, as far as that draft treaty went. And to-day Sir Charles Tupper holds an authorisation from Lord Salisbury appointing him as co-plenipotentiary with Sir Clare Forde, to negotiate a treaty at the Court of Spain under much the same terms and conditions which were accorded to him in 1883. Sir, there is no necessity of further carrying out this line of argument; I cite these facts to show that every practical benefit that could be got from sending a man directly from this Government to the Government of any foreign power, is obtained under such liberal regulations as these, under such liberal propositions as these; and added to that comes the experience, added to that comes the diplomatic skill, added to that comes the standing, added to

that comes the advice, and behind all, the power and the influence of Great Britain. Then, Sir, with regard to the matter of treaty ratification. I think with equal emphasis one may state that the conduct of Great Britain has been increasingly liberal, and is now as generous as we can ask it to be. I pointed out before recess that in former times Great Britain would conclude treaties even discriminating against the colonies. I pointed out that not a great many years ago she would form treaties with foreign powers giving them by the most-favored-nation clause a hold upon the commerce of her colonies without asking the assent of her colonies or communicating with them; but that course of action has been gradually modified, until to-day, as I stated before the recess, if a treaty is to be negotiated between Great Britain and a foreign power in which it is possible that Canadian interests may be at all involved, not only does she not conclude the treaty without communicating with Canada, but she sends first a formal official communication to the Government of Canada intimating that she is about to enter into negotiations for a treaty with such and such a power, and asking Canada for her views, and if she wishes to be included in the treaty which is about to be made. In proof of this I hold in my hand a despatch dated Downing Street, 20th August, 1881, which reads:

"DOWNING STREET, 20th August, 1881.

"SIR,—I have the honor to submit to you a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office, stating that negotiations will probably be opened shortly with the Egyptian Government, for the conclusion of a commercial treaty with Egypt; and I have to request that you will inform me, at your earliest convenience, whether there are any matters in respect of which your Government would desire to make any special proposals.

"The colonial article referred to in the enclosed letter is the clause now adopted, excepting the colony under your Government and others of the more important colonies from the operation of the treaty, but providing that its stipulations may be applied to any such colonies on notice to that effect being given within one year from the date of the exchange of the ratification of the treaty.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your most obedient humble servant,

"KIMBERLEY.

"The Officer administering the Government of Canada."

That, Sir, shows, I think, the liberal breadth of treatment which is all that is necessary, and which is all and more, with the attendant circumstances of which I have spoken, than this colony would obtain under the proposition of my hon. friend. My conclusion, therefore, is that there is no impending crisis proved from a review of the history of Canada's internal progress, and that, on the other hand, we may say with equal force, there is no important crisis to-day pending because of illiberal conduct on the part of the British Government with respect to her colonies in this matter of the negotiation of treaties. But, Sir, my hon. friend showed the weakness of his position and its one-sidedness when he came to prop it up by the only attempt at an alleged instance of necessity which he cited, and that was the case of the United States. I showed before that there is no mention made of British possessions in his resolution; and the House knows, without my proceeding to speak further of it, that in the whole course of his argument he seemed to be anxious only to do this: to gain unrestricted trade relations with the United States, and the resolution is drawn in the light of the relations which exist or which he wishes to exist between us and the country to the south of us. My hon. friend has stated that if there had been a resident Canadian Minister at Washington during the last two years, it would have averted all humiliation and all bluster, and all the trouble which has ensued. That is a very strong assertion; it does not lie within the power of any man, to say that that would have been so. It is a thing which it is impossible to know, but it is just the kind of proof that my hon. friend is in the habit of giving this House. It is: what I say, and what I think, and what my opinion is. But Canada is not going to take her one foot off from the solid rock upon which it stands to-day, of a solid relation, and of

a satisfactory relation, to put it down upon an unknown something, at the assertion of, or on the basis of the assertion of my hon. friend. Now, let us examine that strong assertion, that if a Canadian sent from this country had been at Washington during those two years, all this trouble would not have occurred. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Washington commenced to take root immediately the award was made and a large sum of money had to be paid to Canada, a sum of money which the United States thought was inordinate and not justly her debt, and which she ought not to have been called upon to pay? Would the fact that a resident Canadian Minister had been in Washington during those two years have allayed all that discontent or have prevented that discontent from arising in the first instance? Does not my hon. friend know that sectional fishing interests were a large factor in fomenting that discontent and bringing to bear the strong influence that was brought to bear from the New England States towards the abrogation and dissolution of that treaty? Does he think the mere fact of a Canadian living at Washington and representing this Government would have had the effect of soothing these sections, of calming all the discontent of that class of people engaged in the propaganda in which they were engaged and for their own purposes, a purpose proper enough from their point of view? Does not the hon. gentleman know that in 1883 at the very first available moment that notice could be given that the Treaty of Washington would be abrogated at the end of two years, that notice was unanimously given by resolution of Congress, and there was not the voice of any public man raised against the notice being given, which it was known would abrogate that treaty. The hon. gentleman knows too that when President Arthur sent his message of 1883, in which he called the attention of Congress to the fact that the treaty was soon to expire, and that if it was to be replaced by something which would keep the relations of the two peoples well together, it was time to be thinking about it. My hon. friend knows that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States treated it as the idle wind, and by no resolution and by no enactment endeavored to second the intimation of the President. But if we had only had a British-Canadian Minister in Washington, living there and partaking of the hospitality of the good people there, all this would not have happened; the Senate and Congress would have been soothed and everything would have been made plain and satisfactory. Does not my hon. friend know that President Cleveland, in 1886, recommended that, as a way of settling these unsettled relations, a commission should be appointed to sit in conjunction with a British commission to take up the whole matter, and he recommended that in a direct message to Congress? Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Committee of Foreign Relations unanimously authorized Mr. Fry to report against that in the Senate, that he did report a resolution against it, and that that resolution was carried by a majority of thirty-five to ten? But the hon. gentleman seems to think that if we had had a Canadian resident at Washington the Senate would have been mollified, Mr. Fry's tongue would have cloven to the roof of his mouth and there would have been no resolution against the proposal to appoint a commission. Will my hon. friend say, and will hon. gentlemen say, that our contention as to the terms of the Treaty of 1818 was a wrong contention? The hon. gentleman put a question to this side of the House in the course of his speech and he paused for a reply, in the real style of Artemus Ward who used to pause for his replies. He did not get his reply and I suppose if I was to ask a question of that side of the House and pause for a reply I would be in the same predicament. I ask the question now. Was Canada's contention on the Treaty of 1818 right or not? Was it the legal construction or not?

Did we stand by what the instrument gave us or did we go beyond it? All you have to do is to interrogate the history of diplomacy for the last fifty or sixty years, and the history of the diplomatic correspondence of the last three years, and the opinions of the highest law officers and statesmen in Great Britain, and you will find that they say, and say it rightly, that there can be no two opinions as to the solidity of the grounds that Canada takes in her contention as to the Treaty of 1818.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you want a reply?

Mr. FOSTER. Don't bother me.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all right, but you can have it.

Mr. FOSTER. You are too good-natured to interrupt. Is it to be contended that if we had a Canadian representative resident in the city of Washington, that it would have changed Canada's contention with regard to the legal construction of that treaty, and that we would not have contended for our rights and not stood up for what the document of 1818 gave us? It cannot be contended that that would have taken place in the event of our having a Canadian representative in the city of Washington. And it was just because we stood by these contentions that the trouble arose. But the policy which was pursued by this Government was stated to have been at fault, and my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared categorically, with that power of sharp and well defined assertion which he eminently possesses, that the policy of Canada changed in 1887; that it was vicious before 1887 and that as a consequence of information received which was not accessible to this country until Sir Charles Tupper had gone to the city of Washington, the Government made a change in its policy and so made it possible for the President of the United States to say that in 1887 no cause of complaint was found by his Government against the action of the Canadian authorities. I am here to state and to state it emphatically, just as emphatically as my hon. friend made his statement, that no change took place in the policy or in the practical carrying out of that policy by this Government as between the years 1886 and 1887. In the spring of 1887, instructions were issued which slightly modified the instructions of the preceding years in two particulars. One was that in order to facilitate the operations of the fishermen, the Customs Department placed sub-collectors of Customs at certain points so as to make the reporting, the clearing and the entering of vessels a matter of less trouble; and that the captains of our cruisers were allowed to enter and clear vessels as well. There was no other change in the policy either theoretically or practically and the difference between the two years is to be found in this and in this alone; that the American fishermen came down to our banks and to our shores in 1886, without a fair and just knowledge of what their rights were, that it took them the year 1886 to find out just about what the law was and that in 1887 they obeyed the law and there was no trouble. It is amusing to think that this Government possessed no sufficient information of the sentiment of the people, of the sentiment of public men, and of the sentiment of the Government of the United States. Had we not every reason to know what their sentiment was? We had oceans of diplomatic correspondence in which the exact position of the administration of the United States was placed before us. We had resolutions of Congress and of the Senate to show the opinion with respect to this matter; we were in touch with the public opinion of the country as shown through the newspapers with reference to this whole question. Our supply of information here at Ottawa was just as broad, just as generous, and just as reliable as if we had had a dozen men residing in the city of Washington all that time. My hon. friend

Mr. FOSTER.

gives one of the best refutations of his own argument when he stated that when Sir Charles Tupper went there he found the entire press, and the entire Congress, and the entire sixty millions of people dead against the contentions advanced by the five millions of people of Canada. If that were the case it shows that there was something deeper at work, and something so deep that it could not be cured by the mere fact of having at the city of Washington a resident Minister from the Government of this country. Then Sir, to crown his argument as to why it is of supreme importance that we should take this grave step he says, that the British Minister is liable to get into a tiff with the authorities of the country, that an interregnum occurs and in the meantime there will be no representative to rely upon. I suppose he will not contend that a Canadian Minister would not be liable to make a mistake, and that a Canadian Minister might have a tiff or a row and might in that way have to withdraw, but the point I wish to draw his attention to is this, that whether we have a Minister there or not the British Government will also have a Minister there and that we are just as liable to any such difficulty with our representative there as we are now without a representative from Canada. If you will allow my own opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of men who have thoroughly studied this question, it is that if there was anything which kept our rights and privileges for us it was the fact that Great Britain was a party to that Treaty of 1818, that the whole course of her diplomacy was in favor of the justice of our contentions, that the whole forces of her army and navy were behind the sacred character of the treaty to which she put her hand in 1818. If you had swept away that power from us and placed Canada in the position my hon. friend wants to place it in, alone and defenceless in a contention with sixty million of people under the circumstances I believe thoroughly that the last position of this country in the contention, under such circumstances would have been worse by far than the first.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask one question? He has all this high-falluting to himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will sit down and I will wait my turn.

Mr. FOSTER. You look too good-natured to interrupt.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought after all that high-falluting that you would like me to puncture the bladder with one question.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the bladder float as long as you can; it might throw its matter over on you. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) came then to another point. He said that Great Britain could not object to this principle, he did not believe that Great Britain would object, and at last he almost positively asserted that Great Britain would not object. My hon. friend will probably allow that this supposition is in a doubtful category. Is there anything to guide us as to whether she would object or not? She has been kind, she has been liberal, she has been generous in her treatment of her colonies in all matters of negotiations of treaties and the like, but, Sir, I think there is enough on the records to show that there is a limit beyond which it is not possible to go without seriously endangering the present relations which subsist between Great Britain and her colonies. I find, Sir, that in 1850, and from that time forward, the British Government has been jealous of any interference with the equal rights of trade of her own people and of the colonies dependent upon her. As early as 1850, when an Act was passed to promote the entry into old Canada of the products of British North America, although it was not in the end disallowed, yet the objection was brought that it to a certain

extent discriminated against products of like nature from Great Britain and other dependencies of Great Britain. However, with that generous feeling for colonies which are scattered around a common centre, and which she hoped would ultimately become one country, she did not press the objection, and the Act was not disallowed. Coming again to 1860, when it was proposed to extend the existing arrangements and allow reciprocity in all home and foreign manufactures, and to assimilate the tariffs of the British North American Provinces, the British Government again remonstrated on the score of differential duties; but for the same reason as she allowed the others, under the peculiar circumstances and with the aim she had in view of the union of all these Provinces, the Bill was not disallowed; and on the 15th of February, 1861, the Duke of Newcastle waived all objection to it on behalf of the Government of Great Britain. In 1867 the Dominion Customs Act embodied a clause which was wider in its scope, which had not only to do with foreign imports from provinces not belonging to Canada, but from the United States, and the British Government took very strongly the ground that there was a danger to be apprehended in this, that it would give to the products of a foreign country certain privileges which would not be given to like products of Great Britain and other possessions of Great Britain; but in view of her long historical course with reference to the reciprocal relations between this country and the United States, she waived the objection; and also largely because the class of products spoken of were raw materials which did not greatly affect the commerce of Great Britain or other countries of Europe. In 1865, as I mentioned before the House separated for dinner, when the commissioners went to visit Brazil, Guiana and the West Indies, a condition similar to that was laid down. But in 1870 the question was raised in the Australian colonies by a Bill which was passed in one of their Legislatures, and by a demand from most of the Governments of the colonies, based upon negotiations which took place with reference to that Bill, that the colonies of Australasia should be allowed to treat with foreign countries, to make commercial treaties with them, even though they should be to the detriment of and should discriminate against Great Britain or other British possessions; and it is with reference to that Bill that I wish to read, if the House will allow me, the words of Lord Kimberley, as voicing the opinion of the British Government in that respect; voicing it very kindly and in a tentative way, but in such a way as made the Australian colonies think of the step they proposed to take before the step was taken.

Mr. MITCHELL. One of the most weak-kneed Ministers we ever had.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an opinion of my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Given from an official experience.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 13th of July, 1871, in a despatch to the Australian colonies, there occurs these words:

"But a proposition that in one part of the Empire, commercial privileges should be granted to the inhabitants of certain other parts of the Empire, to the exclusion and prejudice of the rest of Her Majesty's subjects, is an altogether different question, and I would earnestly request your Government to consider what effect it may have upon the relations between the colonies and this country.

"Her Majesty's subjects throughout the Empire, and nowhere more than in Australasia, have manifested, on various occasions of late, their strong desire that the connection between the colonies and this country should be maintained and strengthened, but it can hardly be doubted that the imposition of differential duties upon British produce and manufactures must have a tendency to weaken that connection, and to impair the friendly feeling on both sides, which I am confident your Government, as much as Her Majesty's Government, desire to preserve,"

On 19th April, 1872, there occurs in another despatch these words:

"But although for these reasons Her Majesty's Government might not feel justified in refusing to allow the colonists to adopt the policy which they think best for their own interests, they desire to point out that, in order to meet the views of the Colonial Governments as expressed in the papers now before me, it would be necessary not only to repeal so much of the 'Australian Colonies Government Act,' 13 and 14 Vic., cap. 59, as prevents the imposition of differential duties, but to exempt the colonies in question from the operation of any future commercial treaties, which may be concluded by this country, containing stipulations against such duties, leaving them at liberty, subject to the obligations of existing treaties to make such arrangements, as they may think fit, for reciprocity with each other, or with foreign nations; and before so serious a step is taken, they would ask the colonists gravely to consider the probable effects of a measure which might tend, materially, to affect the relations of the colonies to this country and to the rest of the Empire. In the meantime they have thought it right not to proceed in this matter until the Australian Governments concerned have had an opportunity of communicating any further observations which they may desire to make in explanation of their views."

And, Sir, in the same year, in the Legislature of Victoria, a resolution was introduced affirming the position of things as they were, and that it was for the best interest not only of the Empire but of the colonies themselves that the supreme power of treaty-making should remain where it was; and that loyal and patriotic, and I believe, wise resolution, passed by the Victoria Legislature without a division, the mass of opinion in that Legislature being emphatically against the change that had been urged, and in favor of keeping the *status quo*. So much for the possible difficulties that may arise; for, Mr. Speaker, there can be only one object in having an independent negotiation of treaties by Canada direct, and that object is this, that we shall be led, and shall follow out, on the line of our own selfish interest without any regard to the interests of Great Britain or the rest of the Empire. My hon. friend admitted as much. He said that if there was a question as to whether a treaty which was for our benefit would be prejudicial to England, England was quite able to take care of herself, and she might be left to take care of herself. If then, we obtain power, and a negotiator is appointed, he has a right to negotiate a treaty in the interests of Canada, and against the interests of Great Britain or the other parts of the Empire. That gradually leads to a clash and a disturbance of relations; and that is the question, I believe, which has been pointed out in Lord Kimberly's despatch. That is the point, and if it is well taken, then before we assume such a position, we should think well of the possible effect, the probable effect too, which would grow out of a state of things predicated upon powers given to us such as are asked. But my hon. friend says: If she did object, what then? My hon. friend seemed to have a cast of countenance at that moment, far more cheerful than at any previous moment of the debate. When he rose to his full height, and said: "What then?" he seemed to feel within him a satisfaction that the possible "then" would be a clash in the relations between Canada and Great Britain, which would be followed by Canada declaring: We care not to stay with you, unless we get just what we think is for our interests, and by Great Britain declaring to this colony: Go; and then would come that independence, which is but slightly veiled under the motion of my hon. friend, that national future which we are here to found at the very earliest moment, and this would lead us into separation from Great Britain and place us alongside of a military and naval power against which we in our weakness could never hope to raise an adequate barrier, leaving us in a state of weakness and diffidence which would have one of two results, either to make this country lose heart and become discouraged or make it weak and liable to give way to the demands of and become absorbed by a greater power. However, if England did object, my hon. friend was certain we could no longer remain tadpoles. The tadpole existence of the present could not remain. We were here to build up a fuller nationality and that at the earliest moment. If we did not, we were traitors to Canada. Our present status was low, it could

not be borne by honest and high-minded men, and he cited my hon. friend, who sits beside me, who is the President of the Imperial League for Canada, I believe—

Mr. MITCHELL. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER,—as being of one mind with him in believing that the status of Canada was not satisfactory, and in demanding that it should be changed.

Mr. MITCHELL. He differs with you.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend said though they may have the same opinion with reference to the status of this country, they do not agree in the aims by which that status shall be changed. If I understand the position of my hon. friend to my right (Mr. McCarthy), he hopes for no change of status which does not maintain the unity of the Empire, the integrity of all its parts, and if my hon. friend's words are to be taken as true, he means that the status shall be changed by a method which shall not maintain the unity of the Empire and the integrity of all its parts. There is more method in the madness of my hon. friend than we sometimes may think. I have noticed for a number of years that it is a set method with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to weaken in this country the old belief that Great Britain has a friendly feeling towards her colonies, and especially to Canada, a feeling so great as to impel her to give us the support of her military or naval force, if necessary; and that in audience after audience in various parts of this country he seeks to create the impression, and to a certain extent he does create it, that Great Britain cares nothing for us, that she will never spend a copper in our defence, that if we are to be defended, as he stated this afternoon, we must do it ourselves, and need not look to the mother country. There is method in that madness. If there is one way of alienating the people's minds from the position as it is at present, and getting them to look towards some other position, it is to weaken their faith in the bond that binds them to the old country, it is to weaken the impression that they are an integral part of that country, to be defended, if need be, by the force and power of the mother country. I do not believe in that doctrine. Within the last fifteen years the sentiment of Great Britain has changed, within these last years it is changing marvellously with reference to the relations and the interests which should subsist between the central power and her colonies; and if to-day there is any strong opinion amongst the statesmen of both parties in Great Britain, which overshadow every other, I believe it is the opinion that the stability of the Empire and its greatness and place among the nations is intimately bound up with the unity which exists between the central power and all the outlying portions of the Empire, and that the power and strength of the Empire is to be wielded, if necessary, towards conserving the interests and the status of every part of our outlying dependencies. In 1865, we had the statement of the British Government, about the time when we were negotiating with reference to the fortifications and defences of Canada, that the British Government would consider it their duty to put forth all their power and force for the defence of Canada, if needed. Everything which has taken place from that time to this goes to show that the bond has not weakened, but has rather strengthened. Now, if the House will bear with me for a moment more—

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, for an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to see my hon. friend likes the doctrine I preach and wishes more of it. I want to enquire in the next place what would be the advantages of the system proposed over our present system. Let us see if we can bring this question down to a practical test? At

Mr. FOSTER.

the present time what have we? Let us suppose that Canada wants to negotiate for improved trade relations with any country. Take for instance, Spain. What have we now? We have a resident at the Court of Spain, a British Minister of high class, a diplomat, one who has studied the country, one who has studied its statesmen, one who has studied its wants and capabilities, one who has the political, social and diplomatic *entrée* into the government circles and all that is implied in that—we have him there, with the prestige of the British Empire at his back, placed at the disposal of this country to negotiate, in concert with our representative, and to present our claims with reference to trade negotiations. What takes place? From the very first, there is a conference between Great Britain and Canada. The British Minister and the Canadian Ambassador agree together, they consult together, and the product of their endeavors, the result of their negotiations, is a substantial agreement, under the advice of their respective Governments, and when that draft is ratified, when it is signed by these two plenipotentiaries, it is as sure of absolute ratification as it can possibly be, for it has been the concurrent work of the representatives of both Governments that are concerned. I say that is the position at present, and it is a very strong position. What would be the position otherwise? A gentleman would be sent from Canada to conduct an independent negotiation unknown to the country, unused to its ways, without the strong and powerful backing which is given by a national status, who would just at the moment be thrown into a diplomatic society to which he has been unaccustomed, and of which he has no story and thorough knowledge, and he would be at a disadvantage in every respect as compared with the advantage which would accrue in the state of things existing at present. Being an independent negotiator, there would not be the steady concurrence between the representative of the British Government and our own representative, and, if they disagreed, and if, as the result of the negotiation, an instrument was concluded so far as the draft was concerned, it would not be the concurrent work of two governments and that foreign government would not have any guarantee at all that it would be ratified, because the power to ratify it in the end would be the Government and power of Great Britain, and not the Government of Canada. So that we should lose, it seems to me, in that respect, all that at present we gain from the experience, the training and the prestige which is given by the fact that the Minister of Great Britain has concurrent action in these negotiations, and is there to aid and help in conducting the negotiations for this country. There is another question which comes up in reference to this. How are we to enforce treaties? My hon. friend on the other side says we do not need any naval or military power to enforce treaties, that a treaty subsists because of the mutual advantage to the two parties, and that that is a force stronger than navies and armies. To that contention which is urged on the other side, and urged in good faith, it is only necessary to make one observation in answer. There is a mutual advantage which subsists between two men in this country of Canada who make a contract one with the other, and yet there is no contract made in that way which is allowed to depend for its fulfilment solely on that ground. The force of law is there to see that it is carried out. The whole force of magistracy, and the judiciary, and the constabulary, and the military, if necessary, is there to see that what has been agreed upon as a matter of good faith shall be carried out as it was agreed, and without the destruction of its original provisions. Going further than that, do we expect, if that is the case with individuals, that, at this time, when nations are armed to the teeth, when the competition between them for places of advantage, for territories where vantage ground will be

given them, is keen, and the rush for dominion is keen and strong, Canada would have the same probability of having treaty relations that were formed with her and another power fairly carried out and fairly lived up to if she had not some adequate power to enforce the treaty? Sir, it is of essential importance that, in order to the carrying out of treaties which might result between this country and another country, we should have the power to enforce those treaties; and, unless we have the power to enforce those treaties, the treaties might not be worth the paper they were written upon. Then, what will take place? Place this country in an independent position, let it make a treaty and be responsible for carrying out that treaty with a power of immensely greater importance and strength, and the selfish interests which crop up, which inevitably crop up, and which will crop up between nations as between individuals until the millennium comes, will cause an infraction of that treaty. What then can Canada do? There is only one thing. She must either give way, lose national spirit, become dispirited, and give into the demands of the stronger, or she must stand by her rights with her men, she must have her army, she must have her navy, and she must be able to assert on open sea or on open land that which is the word of the document, that which is the condition of the treaty. It is of the utmost necessity, it seems to me, that the power should be behind the treaty. To-day we have that power—the power of Great Britain, the greatest military and naval power in the world. I think, if this measure was carried out, it would lead inevitably and directly to discontent and disagreement. The very fact that a colony has independent power to negotiate will cause a negotiation of articles in commercial treaties which will clash with the interests of other parts of the Empire, and with the interests of Great Britain. If they are denied us, there will be dissatisfaction here. If they are given to us, though they may be unjust to Great Britain or to the other colonies, there will be dissatisfaction there; and this discontent and dissatisfaction will increase and grow, and will have the inevitable result of making a breach and severing the good relations which at present exist and bringing about what I myself should deplore and which nine-tenths of the people of this country would deplore, the separation of this country from the motherland and the disintegration of the Empire of which we form a part. Then, this larger question is involved. My hon. friend may say, one thing at a time, let us get this first, and not bother our heads about the future. But, as everything which exists comes out of the lap of the past and goes forward to the future, I say that we cannot as statesmen, as public men, as thinking men, alter the status which exists to-day or make a single movement towards altering it without carefully considering what will be the other step which will have to follow this first step. If we gained the right to negotiate commercial treaties, I believe it would be against the best interests of this country, that it would lead to disagreement, and to the making and widening of a breach in our relations with the mother country. If we gained that, every other colony might demand it as well, and you would have the seed of separation sown amongst the different parts of the British Empire which would not conduce to their unity, but would lead to their disintegration and disunion. I believe that the true commercial relations of this country are bound up in the maintenance of the Empire. That Empire stretches over the whole globe. It comprises people of all classes and races. It has every kind of climate and every variety of production. It has everything within its own borders which is necessary to the cultivation of trade, of the richness and extent of which we can barely form a conception. I believe that in a merely selfish trade interest, it is our best position to hold to the unity and integrity of all parts of this Empire, because of the great resources of trade, of profitable trade,

which they present to one another as well as to the outside world. Holding these opinions, and believing as I do in this regard, I have no hesitation in saying that I will vote against the motion of my hon. friend, believing, when I do it, that I am doing what is best for this country, what is best for the Empire at large, what is best for the civilisation and progress of the future; and more, Sir, what is in consonance with the best heart and the best mind of the best Canadian people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Amidst the almost universal applause which greeted the hon. Minister of Finance on that side of the House when he resumed his seat, it occurred to me that from two parts of the House, from two seats occupied by his colleagues, there was an ominous silence. Sir, when I heard him decrying the power and the prestige of Canada, and telling the House that if we did have conferred upon us the privilege of making treaties, it would be a barren privilege only, because we had no power, either at sea or at land, to enforce these treaties, I noticed that the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Militia looked very glum. Sir, is it possible that these gentlemen who for years have been devoting their energies and their abilities to developing a great naval and military force in this country, are to be told by one of their colleagues in this Parliament that the whole thing is a farce, that the great militia batteries, "A," "B," and "C," and perhaps down to the end of the alphabet, with all the millions of money that we have expended and are expending in developing a military spirit and a military force—that all this is a farce; that the cruisers the hon. Minister of Marine has armed with great guns at the prow, cruising along the waters of our coast, that all these are play toys? Why, Sir, I am astonished at the Minister of Finance. I thought, from reading his remarks made here a few years ago, when he talked as Minister of Marine about defending our fisheries, that he was going to put a force there that would teach the Yankees to observe treaties; he was going to show them that we were a great nation, that we had the ability and the power to compel them to observe just what provisions we pleased in our waters and in our harbors. When the hon. gentleman commenced his speech he was not satisfied with discussing the important proposition involved in my hon. friend's resolution, but he found it necessary to travel out of his course in order to have the stereotyped fling at the Reform party. He told us that the Reform party had no policy—one thing to-day, another thing to-morrow, and the next day they changed that again. In 1882, he said, they were a free trade party, and in 1887 their leader came out and avowed himself a protectionist. Sir, there never was a more unfair, unjust, or ungenerous statement made by any hon. gentleman in this House as to the policy of his political opponents. In 1882 the Liberal party, professing as they always did profess, and do profess, free trade principles, proclaimed that they were prepared to carry those principles into effect, so far as circumstances would warrant them. In 1882 they proclaimed themselves in favor of a revenue tariff, and that policy they had carried out when they enjoyed the reins of power from 1873 to 1878. But in 1887, when the leader of the Liberal party made his celebrated speech upon which the hon. gentleman commented, what did he say? Did he say that he had changed his principles and become a protectionist as the Minister of Finance stated here to-day? Not at all. He stated that he adhered to and still believed in the same trade principles he always held, but he was manly enough and honest enough to tell the country that such had been the extravagance, such had been the corruption which had marked the administration of the affairs of this country for the previous years, such had been the extent to which our public debt had rolled up, such were the fixed charges that this country was compelled from

year to year to pay, that it would not be fair or just to tell the electors that it was then possible to reduce the taxation to an extent that they would have reduced it if the Reform party had been elected to power four years previously. That was the sum and substance of the Hon. Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, and that was the honest truth. The hon. gentleman and his friends are not always accustomed to tell the electors what the honest truth is, and I have no doubt it surprised him to find that the leader of the Liberal party had not only the courage of his convictions, but the courage to tell the people that the time had not come, owing to the extravagance of the Government, when the country could carry these convictions fairly out. Sir, he tells us that this party adopted first the principle of commercial union. That is merely a freak of his own imagination. The Reform party, as a party, never adopted the policy of commercial union, and the hon. gentleman when he stated that here to-day, must have known that he was misleading the House. The policy of commercial union was advocated by individuals here and there, and by newspapers here and there, throughout the country, but it never was proclaimed by the Liberal party as one of the planks of their platform. Sir, the first time absolute free trade was proclaimed with the United States, it was formulated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and known as the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. That was the policy of the Reform party, and that, without diminution of one hair, is the policy of the Reform party to-day, that is the policy of the party in this House; and I tell my hon. friend, if he comes to-morrow to test the opinion of the electors, it is upon that platform that we are prepared to face him and that we are prepared to win. Any moment that the leader of the Government chooses to face the electors we are ready to meet him on that question. But, Sir, I was relieved to some extent from answering the hon. gentleman on this point, because after he had enlisted the plaudits of all his friends here by telling them that the Reform party had gone back upon their trade principles, he turned around and in stentorian tones announced "What is the policy of that party to-day, as announced by hon. gentlemen opposite? Unrestricted reciprocity." He, Sir, in ten minutes from having made his first declaration, contradicted and answered himself. Now, the hon. gentleman says truly that there were involved in this resolution very important principles, and that the onus lay upon those who proposed them to show to the House that circumstances had arisen that justified such a large advance in our colonial history. Well, Sir, I thought that my hon. friend who occupied the time of the House for an hour and a half this afternoon, did, in a most able and conclusive manner, prove to the House the existence of those circumstances which he calls for. If there is one remark which I would like to make concerning the speech of my hon. friend who has just sat down it is this, that he took precious good care to avoid just those parts of my hon. friend's speech, and those facts which my hon. friend cited in support of his resolution. He spoke of the marvelous development of this country, socially, politically, morally, and every way else. Well, Sir, there is no man in this House or out of it who has a stronger belief in the undeveloped resources of this country than I have. I believe we cannot use language too strong to depict what this country is capable of becoming; but I also believe at the same time, so far from having developed these resources as you would have done if you had adopted a fair and generous policy for the last ten years, you have done all in your power, by restrictions upon trade and by your fiscal legislation, to dwarf, and suppress, and keep dormant those undeveloped resources. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows himself that he drew rather a strong bow when he spoke about our wonderful advances in trade and commerce. He knows

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.)

that from 1873 to this day, so far from the aggregate of our trade having increased, it has largely diminished.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman knows that the aggregate of our trade in 1873 was \$217,000,000, and last year it had fallen to \$193,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Much greater than it was in 1877.

Mr. DAVIES. Although there have been fluctuations since, the hon. gentleman knows that our aggregate trade has largely diminished since the year I have spoken of. The hon. gentleman cannot go through the Maritime Provinces from which he comes without seeing that the condition of trade in the principal cities there is such that they have no reason for congratulation. Does St. John, or Halifax, or Fredericton, Pictou, or Charlottetown, or any of the Maritime Province cities, afford evidence of the progress to which he has referred? Not at all. But the contrary is the case, and this is due I believe almost entirely to the false policy adopted by the Government. But supposing all the hon. gentleman has said were true, supposing the towns of Canada had developed morally, socially, politically and in every other way in the measure and degree he states to-night, what does it prove? Does it prove that we should remain quiescent and not progress in our political development? Does it prove that the rights and privileges we possessed years ago, before our prosperity was equal to the present, would be sufficient to meet our requirements with our present development? The argument is directly against the hon. gentleman. We are in a constant state of evolution and development. Not many years ago these were mere Crown colonies, governed from Downing-street through family "compacts." Does the hon. gentleman imagine that the privileges we possessed then would satisfy us to-day? He knows that such is not the case. It is well known that as we progressed we gained responsible government, and we gained it through the Liberal party, and we obtained it moreover in spite of the prophecies and predictions similar to those in which the hon. gentleman has indulged to-night: the Empire was going to be disintegrated, our connection with it was going to cease, as soon as we obtained responsible government we were going to be gobbled up by the United States! These are old, stale and refuted arguments which have no force. They are old women's tales, as an hon. friend reminds me. We have heard them over and over again, and whenever proposals are made by the Liberal party with a view to extending our rights, we hear the same stale argument; we are going to cease connection with Great Britain and be swallowed up by the United States. We have, however, arrived at a stage in our history when we are not afraid of the future, and not afraid of what the future will bring. We are prepared to legislate for Canada as she is, to leave it to our children to legislate for Canada as she will be in coming years. If our development leads us on to Imperial Federation, if it leads us on to complete independence, if it leads us on to annexation with the United States, that is a question which the men of that day will determine and not us. We are here to legislate for Canada as she is, for the people as they are in their best interests and according to our best judgment, and it is not for us to discount the future or to predict what the future will be a quarter of a century hence. The Finance Minister has told us that Canada is the first colony of the Empire. So she is; and what does that prove? Is that any reason why there should be a withholding of the rights that belong to the first colony? I rather fancy that if the first colony has outgrown its swaddling clothes and become a full man, it ought to be clothed with the habiliments of a man. We ought to assume the responsibility

which the importance of our position has thrown upon us. That is what we ask in the measure involved in the resolution before the House. We have gone on developing our political system year after year. After we had united in one confederacy, we found Great Britain was disposed more and more to yield those rights, without which we cannot properly discharge our duties. The hon. gentleman truly has said that, a few years ago, the last remnant of the power of control, I may say, which Great Britain exercised over the commercial policy of Canada was withdrawn. The Royal instructions which authorised the Governor General to withhold his assent from any Bill discriminating against Great Britain were altered, and that clause was withdrawn. To-day, Canada stands in the position that she is complete master of her commercial policy. She can make what laws she likes, in her own interests. She has acted in harmony with that view, and, at the instigation of the Tory party, she has done so in the most selfish manner imaginable. When the Government came down, in 1878, with their policy known as the National Policy, what did they do?

Mr. HESSON. Sought to build up the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At whose expense? What was the policy they proclaimed, rightly or wrongly? It was Canada for the Canadians. They said, we are going to legislate for the people of Canada and for Canadian interests. It matters not on whose toes we tread. Some said at that time: You are going to discriminate against Great Britain, you are going to legislate in favor of Canadian products and against the products of the mother country. The answer that rang out in the leading organs of the party, and which was repeated on every platform, was: So much the worse for Great Britain. Those gentlemen said: It may be true that we are legislating against Great Britain, but this country has reached that stage when it must look out for itself; England was looking out for herself and all her commercial policy was directed to the promotion of her own trade and commerce, and we must do the same. That was the policy hon. gentlemen opposite advocated, and Great Britain conceded to us complete control of our commercial policy, and the right to discriminate against Great Britain or any other country. So, to-day, we are complete masters, so far as legislation is concerned, of the situation. That being so, what does this resolution involve? Does it involve anything treasonable? No. It involves a proposition which is the entire complement of the other. We now possess the power by legislation to control our commercial policy as we please, and we now ask that the power we have shall not be a power merely in name but one in reality, and having that power we shall have the means conceded to carry it into effect. That is what is asked by this resolution. We can legislate in any manner we please on questions of tariff, and we ask now the power to appoint agents at foreign courts so that we may negotiate our own commercial treaties. If that is the case, the hon. gentleman is bound to show that, involved in that proposition and underlying it, there was something dangerous to the existence of the state and inimical to the best interests of the people; and he has failed to show this in his speech against the motion. The hon. Minister complained that the resolution did not go as far as previous resolutions which have been moved in this House. It goes as far as it is necessary to go. It is quite unnecessary to insert in the resolution the words "the other colonies of the British Empire," because that involved other considerations and a great many other questions might be raised. We wished merely to test the opinion of the House and the country upon the broad general proposition, and it is no use in shirking or denying the fact that the resolution, while mentioning foreign countries, specially and particularly relates to the nation with which we conduct nine-tenths of

our business outside of Great Britain, viz., the United States. We have as neighbors, as rivals and as customers 60,000,000 people. Our lumbering interests, fishing interests, farming interests, railway interests are all interwoven and bound up with that country. Their well-being means our well-being. Our social interests are wound up with theirs. You cannot go from Ontario to Prince Edward Island and enter any family without finding that a large number of their relatives and friends are across the line. Our social interests are, therefore, bound up with theirs and our commercial interests are in the same position; and this being so, we shall have more business with them in the future than with any other part of the world. The question presents itself how can we promote these relations with the United States? Now, Sir, we have had delicate fishery questions arising between Canada and the United States for the past few years. We have common fishing grounds, and, as was natural, complications arose between the American fishermen and our fishermen as to their respective rights in our waters. We have the anomaly that while those difficulties were intensifying year by year until they brought us, as was said to the verge of war, yet while we were within two or three days journey of the capital of the United States, under our present system which the Minister of Finance commends and insists shall remain, it took us eight months to communicate between Washington and Ottawa. Why, any practical business man must see that this is an obsolete system and that it belongs to a by-gone age. A merchant in Ottawa can communicate with a merchant in Washington and get his answer in a week, but if Mr. Bayard wanted to lay a complaint before the Canadian Government as to the action of the Canadian Custom house officers or the Canadian fishery officers towards the American fishermen it took him just eight months to do it. Is that reasonable? In 1885 there was no trouble, because our waters were thrown open to the American fishermen, pending the possible solution of the question in an amicable way. In the beginning of 1886 before the trouble arose Secretary Bayard sent a most important communication to the Canadian Government. He had to send it to the British Minister at Washington, the British Minister had to send it to the Foreign Secretary at home, the Foreign Secretary had to send it to the Secretary for the Colonies, the Secretary for the Colonies had to send it to Lord Lansdowne the Governor General, and Lord Lansdowne had to lay it before his Cabinet. After all this circumlocution an answer went back in the same round-about way. The Governor General had to send it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in England, that Secretary of State sent it to the Foreign Secretary, the Foreign Secretary sent it to the British Minister at Washington, and the British Minister sent it to Mr. Bayard. What was the result of all this? The result was that a communication which Mr. Bayard addressed to the Government of this country on the 28th of May, 1886, which should have been answered under any circumstances within a month, and before the fishing season commenced,—and which if the answer had been dictated by men having the best interests of the country at heart might have averted all the differences which subsequently ensued,—was not answered in Washington until the following January, six or eight months after. In the meantime the fishing season was over and all the complications had arisen. Bitter animosities which it will take years to eradicate were engendered during that fishing season, and those difficulties were intensified. Secretary Bayard in a communication which he made on 8th February to Mr. Phelps, remarked: "It may be noted that the reply to my note of the 28th May, 1886, is dated on the 28th February, giving some eight months for the completion of the circuit of correspondence." We are dealing here with facts as they are, and not with facts as we would like them to be, I



ask any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has given any consideration at all to the complications which have arisen and must continue to arise from this fishery question, whether the state of facts, as I have depicted them, where it takes eight months for an answer to a note sent from Washington is what they believe is proper? The hon. gentleman told us that we had pretty much all we wanted under the present system. He told us that in 1871 the Canadian Minister was associated with the British Minister in the negotiation of the Washington Treaty. He told us that in 1874 the late Hon. George Brown was associated with the British Minister in the treaty of that year, and he told us also that which was not an historical fact, that that treaty having been agreed on was treated with contempt by the United States Senate. A gentleman occupying the responsible position of Minister of Finance in this House and in this country, ought to measure his words more carefully when he speaks of the action of a body like the Senate of the United States. The statement he made is not historically true; that treaty did not come before the Senate until it was too late for them to take it under consideration, and I have the best means of knowing from conversations with some of the Senators who were Senators at the time and who are Senators yet, that there is no doubt if that treaty had come before the Senate earlier, it would have received the Senate's assent. That, Sir, is the fact. The policy which we propose in the resolution here to-night, is not a new policy for the Liberal party. Before those gentlemen, who occupy the Treasury benches, got this country into the terrible state it is in now, and which was depicted by Sir Charles Tupper last year, before they irritated and annoyed and brought us into a state of commercial war with sixty millions of people, what did this Reform party do? We submitted a proposition in 1884 for the settlement of this very question. We submitted a proposition that the Government of the day should send negotiators to Washington to try and settle the differences between the two countries arising out of the abrogation of the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty. We told those gentlemen what would take place when those fishery clauses expired. We knew from past experience that if the fishermen of the United States came to our waters and came in contact with our men and if we attempted to enforce the Treaty of 1818 against them, as we had enforced it in 1871 and 1875, the result would be to bring about a state of things that would end in the disruption of the friendly ties existing between the two countries, and we told the Government that. We went further, and declared as part of our policy in 1884, that in the negotiations which we advised should take place, Canada should be represented by a nominee of her own. That was our policy in 1884; but that was laughed at and sneered at by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. What was their answer to this? They said: "Oh, we the great Canadian people are not going to humiliate ourselves by suing for terms or negotiating with our neighbors to the south. We will stand on our dignity and we will make them come and bow the knee to us." In 1885 we repeated our request, we warned those gentlemen what the result would be, and we told them that the door was not even then closed against amicable arrangements. We told them that even then, if they would send a representative to Washington clothed with proper powers, and a Canadian, as he ought to be, intimately acquainted with the question, the result probably would be that some settlement would be agreed upon between the two nations; but they would not do this. They were then so full of this idea of Canada's greatness and power, they were so full of military ardor that they determined to put on cruisers and at all hazards maintain the strict letter of the Treaty of 1818. The Government refused our advice then and in 1886 they carried

Mr. DAVIES, (P.E.I.)

out for the only year in the history of their political career their policy in its integrity. What was the result of this their policy being carried out? They seized over 68 American vessels and out of this number only 6 or 8 were seized for transshipping fish. They seized American vessels in every harbor and port on the most trivial excuses, they treated them with alleged inhumanity and acted then towards them in such a manner that the fishermen spread abroad through the United States the bitterest possible feeling against Canada. In the spring of 1887 the Government were again warned by a mutual independent friend that matters had reached such a crisis that if they went on with their work another year it meant war. They sent Sir Charles Tupper in hot haste to Washington and Sir Charles Tupper had consultation there with the Hon. Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State. He learned, as he told us afterwards, that the policy of the Canadian Government had been a false one, that we had been running in the wrong track, that we had been brought face to face with sixty millions of irritated people, and unless we were prepared to take the consequences of commercial war, we must back down from the position we had taken. Sir, we were told more than that. Mr. Secretary Bayard told Sir Charles that not only must our policy be changed, but the method of carrying on intercourse between the two nations was so cumbrous that it must be changed also. I am reading now from the confidential letter Mr. Bayard addressed to Sir Charles Tupper on 31st May. After speaking of the commercial relations, he says:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to."

Sir, that was the opinion of the Secretary of State of the United States. Sir Charles Tupper, the leading man in the Government of the day, the man who put the Government where they are, the man who led them while he sat in his seat and made them change their policy and bite the dust, reciprocated the sentiments of Mr. Bayard, told him it was so, acknowledged that he could not defend the policy of his subordinates, and said he believed the time had come when the policy inaugurated by the Government should cease, and a policy of peace and reconciliation should be introduced. Well, Sir Charles Tupper returned to Ottawa, and what did he do? Was the policy of 1886 duplicated again? Why, the hon. Minister of Finance says he made no change in his policy. How dare he stand up in this House in the presence of those who know to the contrary? I tell him he never dared to seize an American vessel in 1887. He went through the farce of having his cruisers cruise along the coast, but he took good care that American vessels were not interfered with either in the harbors or out of the harbors. As 1887 went by without a seizure and without trouble, the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries backed down from the policy he had adopted and the captains of cruisers and the collectors of customs took good care not to repeat the fire-eating policy of the previous year. We know that the leading power in the Administration did not approve of that policy. We know that the man second in command, the most powerful in their Government, stood here and asked the House to excuse the youth and inexperience of the hon. Minister of Finance who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, saying that he for one would not be prepared to endorse or support the extreme contentions that hon. gentleman had put forward, but telling us that they were young in diplomacy and that some allowance should be made for them. What did Sir Charles Tupper say with reference to the policy which the Minister of Justice had so strongly endorsed, which the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries had inaugurated, and which he is standing here alone today to endorse and approve of? He said:

"I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right for the representatives of a Government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can sustain in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

He threw these young gentlemen over; he told them they had gone too far; he told them, young men, you do not know where your policy is leading to, and I, standing here as Finance Minister of this country, tell you I will not endorse it or permit it; and from the time that word was spoken, the hon. gentleman changed his policy and never interfered with an American ship or an American sailor. What further did Sir Charles Tupper say? He wanted to let them down easy. They did their duty in taking the course they did while they were playing at diplomatic correspondence; but, he said, when it comes to business, practical business, their contention will not stand for a moment. I will give you his own words:

"When it comes to a question of conference, to a question of international discussion for the purpose of ascertaining whether between the extreme contention on the one side and the extreme contention on the other, any standing ground may be found on which the two parties may meet and settle a dispute of great international difficulty by mutual concession, the case is entirely altered, and the responsibility resting upon the plenipotentiaries of any country would be very great if they refused to consider fair and reasonable concessions on the one side and to meet them by fair and reasonable concessions on the other. So that I have no hesitation in saying that, dealing with this great question in that spirit, dealing with a question that is of vital importance to the British Empire, of vital importance to the Government of Great Britain, who were constantly threatened with embarrassment and serious difficulties and collisions with the great country to the south of us, a question too of great magnitude to the United States of America, a question of still greater magnitude, in my judgment, to the people of Canada, one on which we had more at stake and more to lose in a great struggle of that kind than either of the great countries to which I have referred—I say, looking at the question in that broad and national spirit, looking at it with a desire to remove the possibility of what I consider would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the civilised world, a collision between the two great English-speaking nations, looking at it from that broad standpoint, it would have been criminal on my part and on the part of those who represented Her Majesty's Government and the interests of the people of Canada if they had by making fair and reasonable concessions, not endeavored, to find a common ground that would present a solution of those important and serious questions."

Sir, he said in other words that if he had maintained the high and untenable contentions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that day, he would have been a criminal in the eye of his country; and he refused to entertain them, and entered on this treaty with Mr. Bayard. Sir, the hon. gentleman wanted facts. I ask him just to look at that one fact alone, that this country by his incapacity was brought to the verge of war with a neighbor, and the triangular duel under the present system of diplomatic correspondence had been carried on for some time and had not settled the difficulty. Sir Charles Tupper went down to Washington; he had a few days' conference with Mr. Bayard; and within one week they agreed upon a *modus vivendi*. What does that show? It shows that difficulties between nations can be settled in the same common sense way as difficulties between individuals, by conference, by friendly communications, and not by employing a third party three thousand miles away, through whom your correspondence must be sent. Now, the hon. gentleman asked us: What facts can you bring forward to justify this proposition of yours? Well, Sir, we need not do anything more than cite in support of our position the statements made by his own colleague, the late Finance Minister. What position were we in? If we were to state it in our own language, we would be told that we were exaggerating. Let me read you the condition of affairs as they existed in 1887, as described by Sir Charles Tupper himself:

"I have told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been on the Statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada, I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling

and intercourse between two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. No man who knows anything of the intimate commercial relations which exist between Canada and the United States could contemplate such an Act going into operation without feeling that it would tear up from the foundation those intimate social and commercial relations which exist between these two countries, which, in friendly commercial rivalry, are making rapid progress which has attracted the attention of the civilised world."

Sir, does the hon. gentleman want stronger proof than that, that we have been brought to the verge of commercial war, which the hon. the Finance Minister stated was the next thing to actual war, and which between the two great English speaking nations, was the greatest curse that could be inflicted upon mankind. What brought us to that? It was the policy of the existing Government, and the clumsy method which existed of carrying on diplomatic correspondence between the two countries; and I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that if we had had our representative at Washington who would have kept this country informed of the actual state of the case and of the actual feeling that prevailed in the United States, there would not have been found in Canada any body of men so mad as to have driven affairs to the point that the then Government brought them to in 1886. They would have been told, in 1886, by their agent in Washington, what they were told by their special agent, Sir Charles Tupper, in 1887; they would have been told that their policy was inimical to the best interests of Canada, that it had driven 60,000,000 of its people into a state of irritation against Canada, that commercial war was impending, and that unless Canada retraced her policy, the greatest evil that could happen to civilised mankind would happen to us. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? He says: You ought to be satisfied, because practically you get pretty nearly all that you are asking for. But we do not. I have already pointed out that the resolution before the House contemplates our obtaining power to make our own commercial treaties. Involved in that would be the necessity of our appointing agents at the capitals where we would make commercial treaties. At Washington, for instance, we would have an accredited agent, whose duty and business it would be to keep the Government of this country informed of the state of political feeling in Congress and among the people of that country, so that we would be able to legislate with full knowledge of the facts, and not, as we have been hitherto legislating, in ignorance of the true state of affairs. It is not very long since we had the privilege conferred upon our Canadian representative of co-operating with the English plenipotentiaries in the negotiating of treaties. Canada has suffered in the past extremely from not being represented at the making of treaties affecting her interests. Those conversant with history know what an immense slice of territory was taken from us owing to the ignorance and supineness of Mr. Baring in the negotiation of the Ashburnham Treaty. By that treaty a large portion of Canada, including some of what are now the finest seaports in the United States, were given away to the Americans by the British plenipotentiary. We lost that through the ignorance and imbecility of the English plenipotentiary. Had Canada's interest been properly represented then, had the policy we advocate now been then in vogue, Canada would not have been deprived of her territory and her interests would have been saved. When Mr. Baring, on reaching home, learned the great crime he had committed against Canadian interests, history records that he wept. "He gave to memory all he had—a tear." His weeping, however, did not recoup Canada for the loss of her territory, the loss of which we to-day mourn. But we are told that we have waterways extending from the Atlantic and away back

through our country, during the summer, to the centre prairies, and that we are independent of the country to the south of us altogether, and that we must have all our commerce carried on through our own territory; and the hon. gentleman gave us a history of the immense commerce that flows through our canals and lakes. But how long is it since that same hon. gentleman and his friends advocated that we should subsidise a railway to be built through American territory in order that we might reach the sea quicker than we can do by our present routes? Have they forgotten that they subsidised a line to carry Canadian products through American territory? I am not going to detain the House at great length on this question. I think the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution gave, in the strongest way, the reasons in support of his motion, and I am not going to repeat, if I can avoid it, any of the arguments he used. The hon. the Finance Minister has said that the Treaty of 1818 was made by Great Britain, and that the whole course of her policy since then has been in accordance with the policy adopted by Canada in 1886. Has the hon. gentleman ever taken the trouble to read the history of this question? Does he know that the statement he made is at direct variance with all the facts? Does he not know that the policy of Great Britain was in direct opposition to the policy attempted to be carried out by him in 1886, and in the carrying out of which he so signally failed. If he will go back to 1871, he will find Lord Kimberley laying down the policy of the English Government, with reference to the Treaty of 1818—not the policy which our Government attempted to carry out in 1886, but a policy more consonant with the general policy of the Empire. Lord Kimberley said in that despatch which he wrote in 1871:

"The exclusion of American fishermen from resorting to Canadian ports, except for the purposes of shelter and of repairing damages therein, purchasing wood and obtaining water, might be warranted by the letter of the Treaty of 1818, and by the terms of the Imperial Act of 1859, Geo. III, chap. 28, but Her Majesty's Government feel bound to state that it seems to them an extreme measure inconsistent with the general policy of the Empire, and say they are disposed to concede this point to the United States Government under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent smuggling and to guard against any substantial invasion of the exclusive rights of fishing which may be reserved to British subjects."

Here the policy laid down by Lord Kimberley is in direct opposition to the one the hon. gentleman adopted, and yet the hon. gentleman has the hardihood to stand up and tell us that in carrying out the policy of 1886, he was merely carrying out the general policy of Great Britain from 1818, which he gave us to understand she was ready to support with her guns and men-of-war. Such is not the fact. Lord Kimberley said he was in favor of maintaining intact our territorial rights and preventing any substantial invasion of our exclusive rights to fish, and I have yet to learn that the American Government's contention in that respect was to break the Treaty of 1818. It is not; but on the other point which led to all the trouble, the exclusion of American fishermen from our harbors, the compelling of American vessels to enter at a custom house every time they came to port, the policy of harassing them in every conceivable form, the policy of refusing them even the common rights of humanity—in that policy the English Government, I am proud to say, never was in unison with ours, and that policy was condemned in the most vigorous and strong language by Lord Kimberley in the despatch I have just read. The hon. gentleman talks about our adopting a policy which would be unfriendly to Great Britain. I want to ask him whether it is a friendly act towards Great Britain so to conduct our negotiations and our commerce with the United States as to bring the people of that great country into the state of mind in which they were in 1886 and 1887? Is it friendship to England to bring her to the verge of war with sixty millions of people? Is it friendship to England

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

which adopts a policy leading to the passage of a Non-Inter-course Bill by the Congress of the United States, which only awaits the proclamation of the President to bring it into force against this country? The man who is truly friendly to Great Britain is the man who cultivates friendship between the United States and this country. The closer the ties that bind us socially, commercially and in every other way, the better it is for us, the better it is for Great Britain, and the more it is in the interests of civilisation. There could not be a greater curse to mankind, there could not be a greater evil to Great Britain, than a war between her and the United States of America. She has her enemies at home. She has her enemies in Russia. She has her possible enemies in France and in other countries, who are watching for an opportunity to take her at a disadvantage. Her friends are here; her friends should be here; her friends will be here. The English-speaking races of America will be England's friends in the time of her trial if this country so conducts her relations with the United States as to cultivate friendly, and kindly, and amicable feelings with that great country, and not irritated, and harsh, and unfriendly feelings. That man is not only the true friend of Canada but the true friend of the Empire and the true friend of British connection who takes care that the relations between Canada and the States shall be of the most cordial and kindly nature. The hon. the Minister of Finance talked as if there was no use in having treaties at all, because, according to his contention, treaties cannot be enforced except at the point of the sword. The hon. gentleman cannot have read history aright. According to his view, what has been the use of the time, and the energy, and the ability which have been expended by the smaller principalities and states and kingdoms of Europe in making treaties with the larger powers? Denmark, Switzerland, Belgium, the Argentine Republic, all these have their treaties with greater powers. They do not pretend to support them by the extent of their armaments. They could not do it, as we know. There is a higher power which supports those treaties. Take the treaties between the greater powers themselves and you find that if one of them objects to a provision, it soon finds means to denounce the treaty. Take the treaty in reference to the Black Sea. So long as it suited Russia to observe that treaty she observed it, and when she saw fit to change it she insisted upon having it changed to meet the circumstances of the day. I am not afraid, if we made a treaty with the United States of America, that it would not be carried out in good faith. No one doubts that it would be carried out in good faith.

Mr. HESSON. They have broken it before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When have they done so with us? The hon. gentleman knows that we tried to carry out a policy which his own leader condemned as inhuman, and in that matter certainly we were to blame more than the United States. If we had a treaty with the United States, I have no doubt that they would carry it out in a manly way. I know I am talking to some hon. gentlemen who have no faith in the United States of America, but I am glad to know that they are few in number, and that that great country is looked upon with respect and held in honor, by the great majority of the people in this country.

Mr. HESSON. How about the Fishery Treaty?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have already told you something about that, and I think we have no reason to be proud of the circumstances connected with that.

Mr. HESSON. How about the lobster cans?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think it becomes Canada, with her duty upon peach baskets, to talk about the lobster cans. It does not become a Dominion that was mean and contemptible enough to put on the discriminatory duties in

reference to the Welland Canal tolls to talk about honor and good faith. In my opinion the honor and good faith of Canada have been tarnished by the present Government in both those respects. I believe that in some respects the United States have acted meanly towards Canada, and notably in that matter of cans, though that was not a matter of treaty, but if they did, they had their match, and more than their match, in the present Government. If they found a depth of meanness, you found a lower depth, and you have tarnished the good name of Canada and made it stink in the nostrils of the people of the United States. If we look at the bickerings which take place between Canada and the United States year after year in reference to such matters as the taxes upon tins, and the taxes upon peach baskets, and the rebate of duties granted on the Welland Canal, and if we look at the consequences of these things and see that to-day we have not escaped from the perils of these consequences, it behoves us to pause and not, as the Minister of Finance has done, to endorse the existing condition of the relations between the two countries. To-day we stand face to face with a claim for \$25,000 to \$30,000 for the illegal seizure of the vessel *Bridgewater* in the port of Shelburne; we stand face to face with large claims for the infraction of the Treaty of 1818, and the illegal treatment of the American fishermen; we stand face to face with a Non-Intercourse Bill, which has been passed by Congress, and which is only awaiting the proclamation of the President to bring it into force; we stand face to face with a Bill which was introduced in Congress the other day, the effect of which, if it were carried, would be seriously to injure this Dominion. Gentlemen who come from the Maritime Provinces know well that, if the Non-Intercourse Bill were brought into force, it would be the greatest calamity that could happen to the people of those Provinces. It would mean ruin, or next to ruin, to many people there and to many industries there. It would be a terrible blow to the commerce of the United States, it is true, but that is no compensation to us. Their commerce, which extends all along the 3,000 miles of co-terminous frontier, would be seriously injured, but is that any consolation to us when our business would be damaged tenfold as much? It is not to the interest of this country that a state of feeling of this kind, rendering such proceedings as this possible or probable, should be kept up between these two countries. It is neither in the interest of this country nor in that of Great Britain. The motion of my hon. friend has been dictated by a serious consideration of facts as they are. He has had the manliness and the courage to express his view as to whether we are drifting. Hon. gentlemen opposite may indulge in their jingo policy. They may boast that they are going again to put their cruisers on the water, and to intensify that feeling which Sir Charles Tupper said they had brought about two years ago; but that is not a policy in the interests of Great Britain, it is not a policy in the interests of Canada, and it is not, I believe, a policy which the electorate will endorse. Since the great policy of unrestricted trade with the States has been started, the people have risen from one end of Canada to the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, and hundreds and hundreds of electors who voted for the Conservative party before will in the future sustain that policy. We accept the challenge which the hon. gentleman throws down. We pit Free Trade with the United States against the National Policy. The National Policy is ruining the Maritime Provinces, and I believe it is ruining other parts of the country. We are prepared to go before the country with a policy of unrestricted trade against their National Policy of restricted trade, and we believe that the majority of the people will endorse

our view, and the sooner the contest is brought on the better for us. Sir, we have discussed in every newspaper in the Dominion, in every gathering in the Dominion, the political status of Canada to-day. The warmest friends of the leader of the Government, and his strongest supporters, are telling him that they are dissatisfied with the state of matters to-day. Some of them want Imperial Federation. They are like children crying for the moon. Sir, there is a great deal in the idea of Imperial Federation which commends itself to my mind, a great deal that I am in hearty sympathy with; but I look upon it as an impracticable idea. It only can be carried out when you can get the English people to alter their fiscal policy and to levy discriminating duties on the food of the people of that country; and you have yet to point to me a statesman of even second-rate standing in England who has adopted or dared to advocate the adoption of that policy. It never can be adopted by Great Britain, and until it has adopted it Imperial Federation will only remain an idea floating in the mind. I am not myself in favor of it, although, as I say, there is a great deal in it that I sympathise with; I am not in favor, either, of annexation. I am in favor of Canada as she is, and I am also in favor of Canada, now that she has reached her present stage of national manhood, being given the rights and privileges which belong to a full grown man. We have the liberty to arrange our commercial policy by legislation as we please; we want, as the complement of that, liberty to negotiate our commercial treaties. One is the complement of the other, and they are both closely allied. They are both necessary for the attainment of the one great object; Canadian prosperity—both necessary for the development of Canada's great resources; both necessary to enable us to grow as we would grow if the shackles which these hon. gentlemen have imposed upon our industries were taken off; both necessary to enable us to obtain freer trade relations with our neighbors to the south. I myself have no reasonable doubt that if we had that great boon conceded to us, together with our right to legislate as we please in commercial matters, with a party in power in sympathy with the movement, that two years would not roll over our heads before we would obtain reciprocal free trade with the United States. Sir, hon. gentlemen can carry out their policy. What are they going to do now? What are they going to do the coming Session? They cannot remain as they are; they have got to discover some other *modus vivendi*; the existing relations between the two countries are strained, they are strained, Sir, to the verge of breaking. There may be some younger men in their ranks, fire-eaters, who are willing to shoulder the responsibility of non-intercourse with the United States, to talk about "the flag" and that kind of thing; but the maturer minds among them see the danger, the maturer minds among them know that they have got to do as they did in 1837; they have got to come down from their high horse, they have got to speak with a subdued voice, they have got to negotiate as reasonable men with their neighbors to the south, and in order to negotiate as reasonable men, they ought to have, and should have, a duly accredited agent there, keeping them acquainted with the facts as they exist, with the trend of public opinion, with the wishes of the people of the United States, which, I believe, all tend towards closer connection with the Dominion of Canada.

House divided on resolution (Sir Richard Cartwright):

YEAH:

Messieurs

Amyot,  
Armstrong,  
Bain (Wentworth),  
Barron,  
Bécharé,  
Bernier,

Edgar,  
Edwards,  
Eisenhauer,  
Ellis,  
Fiset,  
Fisher,

Macdonald (Huron),  
Melatyre,  
McMillan (Huron),  
Meigs,  
Mills (Bothwell),  
Mitchell,

Borden,	Flynn,	Neven,
Bourassa,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bowman,	Geoffrion,	Perry,
Brien,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Campbell,	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Guay,	Robertson,
Casey,	Hale,	Ste. Marie,
Casgrain,	Halton,	Semple,
Charlton,	Innes,	Somerville,
Chouinard,	Kirk,	Sutherland,
Colter,	Lauderkin,	Trow,
Couture,	Lang,	Waldie,
Davies,	Langelier (Quebec),	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Weldon (St. John),
Dessaint,	Lister,	Wilson (Elgin) and
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Yeo.—66.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Audet,	Dickinson,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Madill,
Baird,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mara,
Barnard,	Foster,	Marshall,
Bell,	Freeman,	Masson,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Mills (Annapolis),
Boisvert,	Gordon,	Moffat,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Moncrieff,
Boyle,	Guillet,	O'Brien,
Brown,	Haggart,	Porter,
Burns,	Hesson,	Prior,
Cameron,	Hickey,	Putnam,
Cargill,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Carling,	Ives,	Skinner,
Carpenter,	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Chisholm,	Labelle,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Landry,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Languevin (Sir Hector),	Thérien,
Colby,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Costigan,	Laurie,	Tisdale,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Oculombe,	Macdowall,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	McCarthy,	Wallace,
Daly,	McCulla,	Ward,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	McDougall (Picton),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McDougall (Cap Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Denison,	McCreavy,	Wilson (Lennox),
Desjardins,	McKay,	Wood (Brockville), and
Dewdney,	McKeen,	Wood (Westmorel'd). 94
Dickey,		

Resolution negatived.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company."—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Calgary, Alberta and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act of incorporation of the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 45) to revive and amend the Acts relating to the St. Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 48) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorise the issue of debenture stock.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

## BILLS OF EXCHANGE, ETC.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes. He said: I explained the object of this Bill so fully, in introducing it to the House, that I presume it will be unnecessary that I should speak at any length now as to the changes it will make. My explanation will be found on page 16 of *Hansard*. The Bill is undoubtedly one of considerable importance, although the changes it makes are not very sweeping or radical. It aims at a consolidation or codification of the laws relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes in the different Provinces of Canada, with the view of assimilating as far as possible the laws relating to these subjects in the several Provinces. I have taken steps to have the Bill, since it was introduced, circulated as widely as possible among those persons carrying on business in Canada who are likely to be most interested in the subject, and among banks, boards of trade and chambers of commerce in the different localities. Suggestions have been and are still being made as to amendments which it may be proper to make when we go into committee on the Bill. I move the second reading now, but wish to explain that it is not my intention to move the Bill into committee until ample time has been given to hear from the classes in different portions of the Dominion whom it more particularly affects.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am very glad to hear that the hon. the Minister of Justice does not at present intend to press this Bill further than the second reading. It is in itself a very important Bill. It attempts to consolidate the laws relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes. I notice, in looking over a portion of the Bill, for I have not had the opportunity yet of going over the whole of it, that if it were carried in its present form it would make radical changes in the law in a good many particulars. I dare say, if I had the opportunity of going through the whole Bill, I would find other changes than those which have occurred to me, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the Bill for some time, if at all this Session. If we are to codify the laws—and I admit it is important that we should do so if it can be done successfully—with regard to bills of exchange and promissory notes, we ought to take care not to alter the law in any particular in which it is not deliberately intended to be altered; and I am quite sure the Bill as it stands would produce alterations other than those the hon. gentleman contemplates.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it is his intention to codify, if not this Session, at any Session, the commercial laws of the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not my intention to make any effort of that kind this Session. I have not formed any definite design in that respect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to send this Bill to a special committee—the Committee of Banking and Commerce—which in some

pects would be a good body to discuss it? Or does he propose to refer it simply to the general Committee of the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Committee of the Whole House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course it can be discussed there, but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, as far as the convenience of discussion goes, and the convenience of allowing bankers and all others interested to be heard, that it should be referred to the Committee of Banking and Commerce. On one or two occasions we have dealt with Bills of a somewhat similar character in that fashion; and although I am aware that the province of a special committee is more particularly to deal with private Bills than measures introduced by the Government, still it might be better for all parties concerned that bankers and merchants, who are more particularly interested in this Bill, should be allowed to appear and be heard before a committee, which cannot be done if the Bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are no doubt advantages in the course recommended by the hon. gentleman. Still that matter has had my attention, and I think it will be better to refer the Bill to a Committee of the Whole House, and then, if any special reasons arise, it may be referred to a special committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### SPEEDY TRIAL OF INDICTABLE OFFENCES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) to make further provision respecting the speedy trial of certain indictable offences. He said: The object of this Bill is to make the provisions of law with reference to speedy trials applicable to all parts of Canada. I shall have to move two or three amendments, not of very great importance, but inasmuch as the Bill is a re-enactment of the law with regard to speedy trials, I will avail myself of the opportunity of the Bill being before the Committee of the Whole House to suggest these amendments.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider the propriety of extending the provisions of this measure to several misdemeanors which are not at present susceptible of that kind of trial. I do not know how it would work in the other Provinces of the Dominion, but I know that in Quebec it would reduce immensely the cost of the administration of criminal justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman intends to extend this to the County Courts of Prince Edward Island? The word "Judge" in each Province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, means any Judge of a County Court, according to the Bill. But in Prince Edward Island, County Court Judges have no power to deal with criminal cases. They have no criminal jurisdiction, so that it would be impossible to apply this measure to them. It may, or may not, be advisable to give criminal jurisdiction to the County Courts, but at present they have no such jurisdiction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Neither have the County Court Judges in Nova Scotia, but I have had negotiations with the Provincial Government of Nova Scotia, and any legislation necessary there to implement the legislation here will be adopted. I intend having the same course pursued with regard to Prince Edward Island, if it can be done. The Provincial Government of Nova Scotia are entirely willing, in fact are desirous, to see this Act passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend referring this Bill to a special committee, or to the Committee of the Whole House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To the Committee of the Whole House.

#### MASTERS' AND MATES' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 26) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said: I stated, on the introduction of the Bill, the object we had in view. That was, to extend the provisions in regard to the coasting trade, which now include the ports of the United States and ports in Newfoundland, so as to include ports in the West India Islands, and the ports of St. Pierre and Miquelon. The object of the Bill is to make to some extent more uniform the regulations in regard to the coasting trade, because vessels which can go to the ports of the United States and of Newfoundland, under the present Statute, have on many occasions to pass those ports to which this Bill extends the coasting regulations. There seems to be no reason why a master having a coasting certificate should not have the same right to clear in the ports in the West Indies, and in St. Pierre and Miquelon, as he has in the ports of the long coast of the United States, in the southern portion of which he is close to the West Indies, and in the ports of Newfoundland. I have been spoken to by several hon. gentlemen in regard to some amendments looking to the extension of the Bill still further, and, therefore, I propose only to move the second reading now so as to give hon. gentlemen the opportunity of giving due notice of amendments they desire to make, and to enable those who are interested in the coasting trade to see how far it is safe for us to go in that direction. I may point out that the Act referring to the certificates of masters and mates engaged in the coasting trade is more stringent in Canada than in any country in the world. In England, they have not gone as far as we have done in this direction, the great object there being apparently to safeguard particularly those ships which are engaged in the seagoing or foreign trade, and the home trade passenger ships. For these reasons, I will only ask to-day that the Bill should be read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said: The only change is as to the mode of marking the capacity of barrels. At present the marking has to be made on the stave where the bung is. That is very inconvenient. Where there are many tiers of barrels, that is the part of the barrel which is not visible, and, when barrels are rolled around, it is difficult to see the marking on that part of the barrel. It is now proposed to provide that the marks shall be on the end of the barrel, and also that they may be made by painting as well as by burning or cutting into the wood.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the meaning of the exception?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That refers to a different class of barrels and casks containing spirits. There is a regulation in regard to the marking or branding of those casks, and they are marked or branded by regulation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the end or on the stave?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the end.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If they are marked on the end by regulation in the way in which the Minister proposes that other casks shall be marked, I do not see the reason for the exception.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Estimated expense required in connection  
with the High Commissioner's Office..... \$7,753 37

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance will remember that, when this item was up before, I desired to obtain from him information as to how a saving was effected by the appointment of Mr. Chipman in the office of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. gentleman will remember that we were told that that appointment involved no additional tax at all on the people of this country. But I observe here that the salary for the High Commissioner's Office in which Mr. Chipman was, is given at \$7,753 as against, apparently, \$7,500 asked the year before. It appears to me extremely difficult to see where the saving comes in.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is about right; the saving is not very large, I find, so far as the salaries in the High Commissioner's Office are concerned. There is, however, a saving, I suppose, of a certain amount which has been effected in the transfer of Mr. Reynolds to that office, a clerk having been appointed in his place at a smaller salary, saving, I think, nearly \$400. Although that does not appear in the item of salaries in the High Commissioner's Office, it is yet that much saved to the service, Mr. Reynolds having been a clerk in the Lands Department of the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not exactly see that. Of course \$400 is a very small sum compared with the increase of \$2,300 in the other. But I observe that for the present year the salaries are only \$7,500. The Minister now asks for \$7,753, an increase of over \$200 over the current year's salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. That is made up partly of statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, it does not appear that there is any saving at all, except the \$400 to which he alludes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not think there is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statement made to the committee was explicit, that the transfer imposed no additional tax on the people. It appears now that, according to the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that transfer involves an additional charge to the people of this country of \$2,350, less \$400, as I understand the Minister, a charge, in other words, of \$1,950 additional, whereas we were told, in discussing the item, that the transfer imposed no tax on the people of this country. It appears to me that there is a discrepancy between the Minister and his colleague on this point.

Mr. TUPPER. Not at all. The hon. gentleman who last spoke does not seem to understand the explanation, and speaks of the difference of \$400 in the salary as against a salary of \$2,000. The Minister of Finance explained to the hon. gentleman that these two officers exchanged places, and that they were receiving, one a salary of \$2,350 and the other some \$400 less. They were both in the service, they both received those salaries, and, as I stated to the committee once or twice before, an officer receiving a lesser salary than Mr. Chipman takes his place in London, and Mr. Chipman comes across to a position here. I think that bears out what I said, that it was an exchange of one officer for another, the officer taking Mr. Chipman's place receiving

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

less now than he did before, and Mr. Chipman receiving no more in consequence of the change.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all very plausible, but there is just this little point that my hon. and juvenile friend, the Minister of Finance, fails to put before the House. He says that the gentleman was taken from the Department of the Interior; presumably he was not wanted in the Interior. I presume the place has not been filled in the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. His place was filled.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, where is the saving? You take a man and put another man in his place in the Interior; you transfer a gentleman in the Interior to London, and you bring a London man at over \$200 additional into the Fisheries Department, which is distinctly an addition to Fisheries Department. Then, where is the saving? There is one additional man employed in the department of my hon. friend. I do not think that my hon. friend is treating this House fairly in not putting the thing fairly before the House. Why not come out at once, if an officer is required in that department, and say, we want an additional man, and we have taken him, and we have endeavored to take him in such a way that the increase would not be any more than we could help.

Mr. CASEY. I do not quite understand the basis on which Mr. Chipman was paid last year. I find that he received, as assistant secretary in the Immigration Office, London, \$2,250; he received for services in the Colonial Exhibition, \$1,000; he also received, as private secretary to the Minister of Finance, \$537. I fail to see how he could be performing the duties of assistant secretary in the Immigration Office in London and also acting in connection with the Colonial Exhibition, and at the same time performing his duties as the private secretary of the Minister of Finance. I see that Mr. Chipman received last year \$3,867.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the officer who takes Mr. Chipman's place, and how has a saving been effected?

Mr. FOSTER. I gave that statement before, but I will give it again. Mr. Chipman was clerk in the High Commissioner's Office in London, receiving last year a salary of \$2,250. If he had not been changed, of course he would have remained there and received that amount, plus the annual increase. Having been transferred to a department here, that placed no additional burden upon the public service. Then, in the place of Mr. Chipman, a Mr. Reynolds was transferred from the Interior Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did he get?

Mr. FOSTER. His salary for the current year was \$1,450. He would have received that salary if he had remained here. So there is no increase, so far as that goes. Into Mr. Reynolds' vacant position a man was promoted, an officer in the service, at a salary of \$100 less.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much?

Mr. FOSTER. \$1,000. In his place Mr. Sutherland came in, a new appointment, at a salary, I am told, of \$800. So, taking the matter all through, there is a considerable saving; there can be no increase, so far as I can see.

Mr. MITCHELL. By the hon. gentleman's own statement there is a new man put into the Department of the Interior. They take a man at \$1,000 from the Department of the Interior and send him to England. Mr. Chipman, at a salary of \$2,250, is brought out to the Marine Department, and they put in the place of the man removed from the Interior, a new man at \$800 a year. If that is not an increase of one officer and an increase of \$800 to the expense of the country, I do not understand it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is this: We were told, when objecting to the increase in the Marine

and Fisheries Department, that no real addition was made to the burdens of the people. It now appears from the statement of the Minister of Finance that there was an increase to the public burdens and to the expense of the Fisheries Department, of the entire salary of Mr. Chipman, less \$400, which was saved by these transfers. So there is an actual increase of \$1,900. The words used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were explicit: "The transfer imposed no additional burden on the people of the country." It now appears that the transfer did impose an additional tax on the people, namely, the whole amount of Mr. Chipman's salary, less the savings which the Minister referred to, so that the addition was \$2,250 less \$400. That I understand to be the state of the case, as the Minister of Finance has explained it. There is an increase in the Minister of Marine's Department, and we are voting as much, or a little more than usual, to the High Commissioner's Office; so it is perfectly clear that there is an increase of \$1,950 in the total charges.

Mr. TUPPER. I think it only proper that I should set myself right as to one point. I quite admit there is a new feature introduced into this case. It certainly was not known to me, the last time the committee sat, that another officer had entered the service in connection with the transfer of the officer to the London office. I confined my argument entirely to the facts with which I was familiar, and those were, that Mr. Chipman had been transferred to the Marine Department, that his place had been filled by an officer already in the service, who was paid a much less salary than that received by Mr. Chipman. But I think hon. gentlemen will bear me out in this, that no real increase has been shown even yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. I think, at all events, that is a fair view. I say that no real increase has been shown in connection with this even yet, for those two officers, who are doing the work done outside the Marine Department, together do not receive the salary Mr. Chipman received. But I want to know if hon. members are not familiar with the custom and practice which prevailed under both Governments by which I would have had the right, when called to the department, to take in a new man from outside of the Civil Service altogether, and place him in the service and employ him as my private secretary. I do not think this claim I make on behalf of the position I at present hold is an extraordinary claim. I say the House has never demurred to that practice hitherto.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is Mr. Chipman in that position?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not follow the discussion. Mr. Chipman was not taken from outside the service. I had a right, from the practice which has never been challenged, and which has been followed by members of both Governments, to choose as my private secretary the man I wished particularly to act in that capacity, and I had the right to go outside of the service and obtain the services of any gentleman I preferred. Instead of doing that, which would have added to the expense somewhat, I took an officer who was already in the service. Moreover, I did not add one dollar to the salary he received last year, and his place was taken by an officer who was receiving a still smaller salary and who was already in the service. Then it appears that the place of this officer was filled by a lower paid officer whose services were needed. I did not confine, however, the justification for this transfer or my selection to the points just mentioned to the committee. I claim that there is work for this officer in the department, that he is needed, and that the department has not too many officers. I am not going over the whole ground, but I desire to call the attention of hon. members to that feature of the case. I have made good, I think, the claim

that the work of the department has enormously increased of late, and requires for its performance a stronger staff than has hitherto obtained. So my justification was not the one to which allusion was made; but I again say I was not personally aware of the fact that this low paid officer had been taken from outside the service into the Interior Department in connection with the transfer of Mr. Reynolds to London.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has admitted that he was wrong in the statement he made the other day, in saying that a saving would be effected by the transfer of Mr. Chipman from London here.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TUPPER. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth that I did not utter. I hope the hon. gentleman will have the courtesy to allow me to make a correction. What I stated was, and I state it again, not that a saving had been effected, but that an officer paid a much larger salary had been exchanged for an officer paid a less salary, both of them being in the service, and that no additional burden was placed on the public revenue in consequence of that transfer. I corrected that statement, to-day, somewhat by saying I was not aware a third officer had been called into the service.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then the hon. gentleman admits that he was wrong in the statement made that no extra charge was placed on the public by reason of these changes. So the hon. gentleman has practically admitted the statement I made. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have risen in his place and, in face of the facts and of his own admission, have stated that I did not correctly make a statement. He has endeavored to cloud the question up with a lot of matter that has nothing to do with it. What have we to do with the practice of bringing in an outside man as private secretary to a new Minister? It has nothing whatever to do with this transaction, and he merely brings it forward to cloud up the matter, and to show that he might bring that man in but he did not do it. He goes to London and brings a gentleman out as private secretary, at a salary of \$2,250, which is a thing unheard of.

Mr. CASEY. And \$600 extra.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know about the \$600 extra, and I will leave that to you to explain. It is a thing unheard of, to take a gentleman at such a salary as private secretary to a Minister, and more especially so if he gets that \$600 extra. My hon. friend still persists in saying that there is no extra expense to the country arising out of those changes in connection with that department. I do not place much importance on this thing, but I want to tell my hon. friend that he had better not try to bulldoze this House and to bulldoze individuals in this House. We have experience of his respected father's efforts in that way and of his great success in bulldozing, but while we might stand it from a man of great ability and long experience like Sir Charles Tupper, we can scarcely stand it from a man of the hon. Minister's youth and inexperience. I ask the hon. gentleman to be a little more careful and precise in the future when he makes those statements to the House, and particularly, when he is corrected, not to tell a gentleman that he is misrepresenting him. The facts of the case are these: Mr. Chipman had \$2,250 a year, and he was transferred from London, and that expense was added to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Can anybody deny that? A man in a minor position at \$800 or \$1,000 a year is sent to London and a new addition to the staff of the country is put in the place of the man in the Interior Department who succeeded to Mr. Chipman's position in London. It is as



clear as the nose on your face that an additional expense is created, even assuming that Mr. Chipman's salary is the same as it was before the man transferred to London had his salary increased. Will my hon. friend, in the face of these facts, say that no additional expense has been placed on the country?

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) who has just sat down has disposed of the facts as to the extra cost entailed. It seems perfectly clear that even although the changes from London to Ottawa and from Ottawa to London may not involve in themselves any extra expense, the other changes that are made necessary, involving the taking of a new man into the department here, have added very considerably to the cost. The question is not so much whether those changes were made, but as to the statement made by the Minister when his attention was called to the matter. The hon. the Minister stated positively that no extra expense had been incurred, and he tells us now that he made that statement without full knowledge of the facts, and that he only spoke of things within his own personal knowledge. It is to be expected that as yet there are a great many things in his department that do not come to his knowledge, but until the time that he obtains that complete knowledge of his department, which he will no doubt eventually have, he should hesitate to make such a positive statement to this House. I understand from his remarks that Mr. Chipman is to be his private secretary, and he told us that he could have taken another man as secretary from outside the service who would be allowed \$600. Had he done so that would not have added to the cost at all. There is an allowance of \$600 to each department for a private secretary, and the Minister was saving nothing whatever by taking a man from inside the service. I understand that Mr. Chipman will get this \$600 as private secretary.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Then, he will get altogether a salary of \$2,850 a year?

Mr. TUPPER. He got that last year and he gets the same this year.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said the department was undermanned and that he needed to get another man. He, however, takes Mr. Chipman in as his private secretary, and if Mr. Chipman is acting as such, he cannot add any strength to the general staff of the department. Any trusted shorthand writer could act as private secretary as well, but here the Minister brings in a man of high rank in the service and puts him into the office of private secretary, so that his services rendered to the department generally cannot amount to much, and he cannot assist the department to get away with the enormous amount of work which the Minister says has to be done there. I asked about a quarter of an hour ago, how did Mr. Chipman last year manage to discharge his duties as assistant secretary to the Immigration Office, for which he was paid \$2,250, while at the same time he was paid \$1,000 in connection with the Colonial Exhibition, and \$537 out of the \$600 voted for the whole year for his services as private secretary during part of the year? It is quite impossible he could do all those things in the same year, and I want an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The answer to that is this: With reference to the \$1,000, it was for services rendered the year before, which were paid for this year, so that falls out.

Mr. CASEY. No, it does not. How did he manage to discharge those duties the year before? It comes to the same thing.

Mr. FOSTER. He was secretary to Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Finance, and he received \$537 as secretary. While Sir Charles was Minister of Finance he also supervised and carried on a good deal of the work of the High

Mr. MITCHELL,

Commissioner's Office at home, and Mr. Chipman was here and was of essential service to Sir Charles Tupper in that particular.

Mr. CASEY. That is exactly the point. Mr. Chipman was out here acting as private secretary to Sir Charles Tupper when he was Minister of Finance, and at the same time he was being paid as assistant secretary to the Immigration Office in London, when he was not there at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all; the work of the Colonial Exhibition was over then.

Mr. CASEY. I am not talking about the Colonial Exhibition.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you talking about then?

Mr. CASEY. I am talking about the item I mentioned. The Minister told us that Mr. Chipman accompanied Sir Charles Tupper to this country when he was Minister of Finance, and that he was paid \$537 as secretary to Sir Charles Tupper, while at the same time he was drawing a salary as assistant secretary to the Immigration Office in London, England, and he was not there at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I explained that. Although Sir Charles Tupper was here as Minister of Finance he was part of the year in London, and while here and while in London he supervised the work of the High Commissioner there, for which no extra salary was given him. Mr. Chipman did the work under Sir Charles Tupper both here and in London.

Mr. CASEY. I am not speaking of Sir Charles Tupper's pay; I am speaking of Mr. Chipman.

Mr. FOSTER. He did the work while he was here.

Mr. CASEY. How could he do the work of the department in England when he was in Ottawa? The whole amount of it is that he was receiving two salaries for performing one duty. He was paid \$2,250 a year for performing duties in England when he was not in the country at all. That is a most scandalous state of affairs. The Minister says that the services in connection with the Colonial Exhibition were rendered the year before, but were not paid till this year. That does not alter the question at all. When a man is paid \$2,250 a year, I do not think he ought to have time enough to spare to enable him to render services to the Government worth another \$1,000. I think that this is one of the greatest abuses under which our executive Government labors; this hiring of men who have already large salaries, and giving them large bonuses for other services which they render during the time that they are already paid for by the Government. It is a rotten principle, and it is time that public attention was more markedly called to it. Again, I want to attack the whole system of these allowances for private secretaries. Instead of engaging a secretary for \$600, as might in most cases be done to begin with, the Minister of the department either appoints someone who is already receiving a high salary, as my young friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done, or else, after appointing a man private secretary, he gets him appointed as a first class or second class clerk, and he draws two salaries for doing only one kind of work. The whole system requires to be changed. We want to know what we are paying for a private secretary; and to appoint a man as private secretary while he is a first class or second class clerk is a fraud on the revenue.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not quite understand the nature of Mr. Chipman's present duty; will the hon. Minister explain it? What is he engaged at? Is he private secretary, or is he private secretary and first class clerk, or what does he do?

Mr. TUPPER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not present when the vote for Mr. Chipman was passed, when this question was raised, and when twenty different mem-

bers put the same case in twenty different ways. I have explained the matter until I am tired doing so, and I think the House has reason to complain of the time taken up by the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the electors will complain.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chipman is receiving the same salary this year that he received last year, and the electors will find fault, I think, with hon. gentlemen opposite for not being more vigilant last Session when they voted these amounts to Mr. Chipman, the principle of voting which they are now for the first time questioning. Mr. Chipman is occupying the position of a chief clerk in the Department of Marine, and, as I have stated before, he is receiving, in addition to his salary as chief clerk, an allowance of \$600 for acting as private secretary.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I understand that you are paying Mr. Chipman about \$2,200 a year for work which used to be done for \$1,450, and that you are sending Mr. Reynolds to Britain to fill the place formerly occupied by him. And then, as another act of favoritism, for it is nothing more than that, Mr. Chipman has come out here and has been promoted over his predecessor in office, and is to have rolled up into one the salaries which two men formerly drew, making his salary \$2,950; and that is the first administrative step of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is extremely glib in giving his replies to questions which are asked here in the interest of the country. I have asked for information, as I had a right to do. Perhaps I ought to have been here before, but it is not, or ought not to be, too late to prevent leakage. Whatever explanations the Minister makes, it is quite clear that all these charges involve extra cost. He has a new appointment at \$800, a promotion of another officer, and Mr. Reynolds, I suppose, will have an increase in the Supplementary Estimates; and then there is the favorite from Halifax put in to draw three men's salaries to do one man's work, to please the Minister of Marine. It is rather an expensive beginning with the young gentleman. I submit this is a pure job, and ought not to be sanctioned by Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. Well, the purity of the job will, perhaps, recommend it to the consideration of those who understand it. The hon. gentleman should not be surprised to find that when an officer vacates an office, his successor goes into that office at a considerably reduced salary. If that does surprise him, he will find that the Civil Service is simply full of that kind of surprises. It is the invariable rule. It is very improper to place a man in an office made vacant by the death or removal of a civil servant, at the same salary as his predecessor received, even though he does the same duties; and instead of there being this favoritism, or this nasty phase of the question in connection with my department or any other, I may tell the hon. gentleman—because it may possibly soothe his feelings, and calm his mind—that Mr. Chipman, instead of receiving such an immense amount of favors, is receiving the salary which he received last year; and the man would be very unreasonable in the Marine Department who would complain of Mr. Chipman's being removed to a sphere in which he works side by side with him, when he receives no increase of salary. No injury to any man in the Marine Department is done by Mr. Chipman earning his salary at Ottawa instead of in London. These are the facts, and I fail to see the utility of the frequent suggestions of jobbery and favoritism, and the many insinuations that have been thrown across the House in connection with this appointment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have just got from the Auditor General's Report a statement of the amounts drawn last year by Mr. Chipman. As assistant secretary in the Immigration Office in London, he drew \$2,250; for services in

connection with the Colonial Exhibition, he drew \$1,000, and travelling expenses, \$537; in all, \$3,787. Now, I think, if the hon. Minister of Marine, when he rises to respond to questions put to him from this side of the House, would endeavor to treat members with a little more of that courtesy which is becoming to a man of his years, and not indulge in sarcasm, we should get on very much better than we do. The appointment of this man, Mr. Chipman, we have a perfect right to criticise. It is quite clear that a salary has been paid in excess of what is necessary, and that he has been placed in a position where he is drawing two salaries, and another man has been sent to take his place across the Atlantic. The whole thing has been done evidently for the purpose of favoring Mr. Chipman. He must be a pet of the Minister of Marine, or of some other man in the Government, when he is placed in a position to draw more than one salary. In looking over the Auditor General's Report we find that many are drawing extra allowances of this kind, and if the Government are determined to continue this practice we are determined to expose it, and to protest against a system that is most objectionable. The Civil Service has been led to the idea that they should not be content with one salary, but should have more than one. It is a growing evil in all the departments, and every man in the service is waking up to the fact that it is his own fault if he does not get something in addition to the salary he receives. I think it is time a stop should be put to this system, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should endeavor to correct the flagrant error he has committed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the Minister of Finance has correctly appreciated the point that was taken by one of my hon. friends here as to the employment of Mr. Chipman in connection with the Colonial Exhibition. I think it is a most objectionable practice. Mr. Chipman was employed at a salary of \$2,250, to discharge the duties of secretary to the Immigration Department in London, and he received a further sum of \$1,000 for doing something, in 1886, in connection with the Colonial Exhibition. No man can properly fill two totally distinct offices. If he did his duty as assistant secretary, it required all his time; and this practice of giving civil servants extra salaries, of which this is a most conspicuous case, is one of the most flagrant abuses that can crop out in the Civil Service. We find whole pages of names of men who for some reason receive double salaries. Mr. Chipman is not the sole offender; there is that to be said for him; he is only one among eighty or ninety in a similar position. Now, I tell the hon. Minister of Finance, who I dare say desires honestly to enforce economy in all departments of the Civil Service, that there is no bank or mercantile establishment in this country in which men who are called from one piece of work and put at another are allowed to draw two distinct salaries. The process is growing up into an extreme abuse in our service, and it is high time that it should be checked. So far as regards the remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in reply to my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), the whole of this discussion arose from the Minister having made an incorrect statement to the House, as to the result of placing Mr. Chipman in his office. He stated expressly, in so many words, that it would entail no additional tax on the ratepayers, and it turns out, from the statement of the Minister of Fisheries, that it involves a considerable addition, and the hon. the Minister now admits he was mistaken. Under such circumstances, he has not the right to object to my hon. friend calling his attention to the fact that he was mistaken.

Mr. TUPPER. Nor do I. I only object to the hon. gentleman repeating arguments which have been all gone over before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will learn that in carrying the Estimates through Supply, he must answer the questions put to him, or very little progress will be made.

Mr. TUPPER. I answered them several times.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not satisfactorily. The Minister of Fisheries must appreciate and understand that. My point is that this is a very gross abuse, which it is high time should be checked. It may be occasionally necessary to give a man additional work to do. It may have been that Mr. Chipman did his work particularly well in connection with the Colonial Exhibition, or whatever it was. I do not object to his being withdrawn from his proper work and employed to do other work, but what I do object to—and this is the first time it has come to our notice in the Auditor General's Report—is that a man should be paid two salaries. He could not have earned the two, because if he had been discharging his duties in the one capacity he could not perform them in the other.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with many of the remarks that have been made by my hon. friend. I am sure none of us wish that a wrong impression should go to the country. I do not think it is quite fair to state that the evil of paying double salaries is on the increase. On the contrary, it is on the decrease. Very great care is taken in all the departments that civil servants shall not be paid for extra services and extra time. It is said there are a large number so paid, but if we take up the list, we will find that the parties are almost entirely outside of Ottawa. For instance, very often a collector of customs issues bounty checks, for which he is allowed a small amount as a fee, and he appears as receiving double pay. Then lightkeepers are also signal station keepers, or may be paid for copying work for the Meteorological Department. They receive a small amount for that extra service, and in that way the whole service is much more economically conducted than it could be by appointing independent officers. Then the collectors of customs are at times given charge of the savings banks, by which means we avoid employing two different men, but the collector appears as receiving double pay. In the departments at Ottawa, outside of payments for the calculation of savings banks' interest, and for bounty work in the Fishery Department, there is very little extra pay given. I think, therefore, that the system, instead of being on the increase, is on the decrease. With reference to what was said about Mr. Chipman, his payment for services at the Colonial Exhibition is a matter which occurred some time ago, and was, I suppose, fully discussed when the item was before the House last year. That exhibition entailed a great amount of labor on the High Commissioner's Office, and I believe Mr. Chipman rendered important services and worked very hard, and it was thought only right by Sir Charles Tupper that he should receive some acknowledgment. As to his being secretary of the Immigration Department, the High Commissioner's Office is not simply an immigration office, and it is on that account we have this year brought these salaries under the head of Civil Government. Mr. Chipman was secretary in the office, and during the years Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Finance, he also, both here and in London, supervised and carried on to a large extent the work of that office. He did not only do the work of private secretary to the Finance Minister, but also the work of secretary connected with the High Commissioner's Office, which was under Sir Charles' supervision here. With reference to private secretaries, I think the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) was a little unreasonable in his statements. A private secretary is not in the possession of a sinecure. Any person who has had practical experience will know that. He must be a trusted man, one who will be the confidant of the Minister; he has a great deal to do, not only with the Minister's private

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

work but with departmental work as well, and he works, not merely eight hours per day, but as long as the Minister has work for him to do. It is perfectly absurd to think you can get a man to do that for \$600, and the practice has been, under other Governments as well as this, that the Minister shall have the choice of his confidential clerk or secretary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But not to appoint a gentleman of high grade in his department.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a little out of the regular rule, but still it is not quite right to say that an inferior class of men can do that work, or that a man could be got to do it for simply the sum of \$600. I simply make these remarks as modifying, I think, the rather inordinate criticism of some of my hon. friends on that side.

Mr. COOK. There is an old saying that there is no harm in a wrong act if it never comes to light. That is, if you make a false statement, and it is never proved to be false, there is no harm done. Therefore, I suppose the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister, if it had not been discovered, would have gone to the country as all right and proper. I think the castigation which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has received is not exactly fair. The Minister of Finance is an older man and has had longer experience, and has been doing a moral work for a number of years. He has been an advocate of the great temperance cause for a number of years, and that is a moral question.

Mr. BOWELL. It has not made much impression on you.

Mr. COOK. If he does an immoral act, I do not think his young friend should be castigated for it. I am sure the gentleman who has been spoken of now is a valuable public servant. Mr. Chipman has been in the Tupper family for a number of years, and Sir Charles Tupper, knowing his value, and knowing that his son was going to occupy a very prominent position, naturally thought he would endeavor to send him out one of the best private secretaries he could find, that he would send him out such a man particularly as was referred to by the Minister of Finance just now, when he said it was very important to have a good man of that kind as private secretary, because a good deal of the departmental work must be performed by him; that is, I suppose, that he performs the work and the Minister gets the credit of it. Therefore, it is easily understood why this man Chipman was sent out by Sir Charles Tupper, because he knew he was going to assist in the departmental work of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Therefore, taking it all in all, I think the Minister should not have received the castigation he has on the ground of immorality, but that the castigation should have been directed to the one who first made the statement. The other Minister, being the younger man, could not but pick up the statement of his father in politics, and he may not have been aware himself of the fact. I protest against statements of this kind being made by the moral portion of the Ministry. If the statement had been made by some who do not climb the moral ladder, and do not get to the top rung, I would not have thought so much of it, but I am surprised when it came from the Minister of Finance, who always perches on the top rung of that moral ladder. It is not the first time the hon. gentleman has been caught this Session in committing acts of this kind. Only a few days ago the hon. gentleman was caught in the same trap, and he might have said, I beg your pardon, I was—ah, ah, ah—I did not quite understand, I was mistaken. That is the apology which is made for a direct violation of the truth.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. From the explanation which the Minister of Finance has given as to Mr. Chipman's salary, it is clear that he is paid for his duties as private secretary to the Minister of Marine, and not as a first class clerk.

It is clear that he is paid \$2,800 for discharging his duties as private secretary. The Finance Minister tells us that the duties of a private secretary to a Minister are very important. Well, if they are of such importance as to require the payment of \$2,800, it is the duty of the Government to submit that amount in the Estimates for the payment of a private secretary, and not to ask for \$600 for that purpose and then give him an additional salary of \$2,200 for discharging duties which the Finance Minister has stated cannot be discharged by Mr. Chipman or any other private secretary because the duties of private secretary are so great as to require all his time. Would it not be far better if it appeared in our Public Accounts, or in the Auditor General's Report, that these two salaries were not paid? If it is necessary to have a man of such ability as Mr. Chipman is described to be, to discharge the duties of private secretary for the Minister of Marine, why should the two salaries be put in the accounts? The Minister says that it is the desire of the Government to avoid paying officers two salaries. Well, here is an opportunity to carry out that desire. I say that this man Chipman receives a salary for being private secretary to the Minister of Marine, and therefore the vote should be \$2,800 to pay for a private secretary to the Minister of Marine, and not \$600 for a private secretary and the balance for a first class clerk.

Mr. TUPPER. That, of course, is a fair question for discussion; but, in reference to taking high class clerks as private secretaries, I think there is a precedent. Mr. Buckingham, who was the private secretary to the Premier in Mr. Mackenzie's Government, was a first class clerk when the Premier desired to make him a private secretary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. TUPPER. And, further, that high class clerk, while drawing his salary as private secretary, was promoted and was made a Deputy Minister in another department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He was not a first class clerk when he was appointed secretary.

Mr. TUPPER. What class was he? My information—and I got it from the books—is that he was a first class clerk. He was promoted, however, while acting in the capacity of private secretary, to the higher position to which I have alluded.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken.

Mr. TUPPER. I am corrected in this: He was made a first class clerk while he was private secretary, and he was further promoted when he was private secretary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was promoted, I think, from a second class clerk and private secretary to the position from which the hon. gentleman's chief dismissed him, that is the position of Deputy Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman has assumed what was not the practice in former times, and what I trust is not the practice in most of the departments at the present time, that is, when \$600 is voted for a private secretary, or for a clerk who is made a private secretary, that the whole of that sum must necessarily be devoted to the payment of that private secretary. I think that has not been the rule, I am sure it was not the rule formerly, and I suppose it is not the rule now in all the departments of the public service. The hon. gentleman, in making a chief clerk a private secretary, has adopted a practice that is almost if not altogether without precedent. Certainly, the practice usually is to take some intelligent and well-informed man, a good shorthand writer, one in whom the Minister has confidence, and appoint him to some position in the public service, if he is not already there, as a third or second class clerk, and then supplement his salary with the \$600 voted for a private secretary. But when the hon. gentleman takes an officer who

is already high in the public service, he is taking a party who is supposed, in point of rank and the importance of his service, to stand above that of private secretary, and if he makes such an officer a private secretary, he certainly ought not to supplement his salary by the vote of \$600. If the hon. gentleman chooses to take Mr. Chipman as a chief clerk in the public service, and use him as private secretary, Mr. Chipman on no public ground whatever is entitled to \$600 as private secretary. He is entitled to the maximum sum of the class to which he belongs, but beyond that, he is not entitled to receive anything from the public Treasury. Now, the hon. gentleman will see, I think, as the vote stands for private secretary, that in every instance he is not to receive more than \$600. It is not an appropriation absolutely made to the private secretary, it is an appropriation placed under the control of the Minister, so that he may supplement his private secretary's salary, if it is not already adequate, by the addition of a sum not to exceed \$600. He may vote one hundred, two hundred, three hundred, four hundred, five hundred, or the whole six hundred; but when the hon. gentleman takes one of the highest officers that he can find in this department, and uses that public officer as his private secretary, then that officer ought to be content with the sum which he receives and not supplement his salary by \$600 more. Now, the hon. gentleman is in this position: he is giving to his private secretary a salary \$600 higher than that of a chief clerk. That, I think, is clearly a misuse of the sum placed at the disposal of the Minister. If he chooses to employ an officer occupying so high a position in the public service, that officer certainly has nothing added to his duties or his responsibilities by being made private secretary of the Minister; he is occupying, or is performing, in point of rank, a service that is regarded in the public service as inferior to that which appertains to his office; and being less in point of responsibility—because no active intelligence is required on his part, he is merely required to be an expert shorthand writer and a good scribe—and when the hon. gentleman takes such an officer and makes him a private secretary, he has no right whatever to add to the salary which pertains to his public office the sum of \$600, or any portion of it.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had this pretty well ventilated, and I would suggest now that we take a vote upon it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the vote is taken I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement which the Minister of Finance made a few moments ago. He stated that this custom of granting double pay to servants in the departments was not increasing, that it was on the decrease. I have before me the Auditor General's Report of last year, in which I find that there were 396 persons who were granted double pay for their services, that is, received pay for more than one office, last year; but I find this year that there are 484 such persons. Now, it is singular that statement after statement, made by hon. gentlemen opposite, are disproved by the Opposition, after enquiry. The Minister of Marine has clearly made an error in stating that a saving had been effected with regard to Mr. Chipman. The Minister of Finance comes to his relief, and makes the statement that the practice of giving double pay to officers is a good deal on the decrease; but, when we compare last year's figures with this year's figures, we find that the number has increased from 396 to 484. Now, with regard to Mr. Chipman's appointment as private secretary for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, possibly it was thought desirable that a man of his extended experience should occupy the position of private secretary to the juvenile Minister, and so the change is made that he may fulfil the duty of dry nurse in the meantime until the juvenile Minister has reached the period in his history when he is able to discharge all the duties himself. Well, if it is considered necessary on that ground, we had better let the

item pass; but it does appear singular that the Government should have pursued the course they have taken, and brought this man over from the city of London, where he was filling a position, and installing him in another position here, giving him double pay, and then increase the service by the appointment of a new man; and, in the face of all these facts, for the Minister to tell the House that a saving has been accomplished by the changes is certainly very strange. There is another matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House. Last year, when we were discussing the duties of High Commissioner, there was an extended discussion on the fact that the High Commissioner was then performing the duties of Finance Minister while he was supposed to be performing the duties of High Commissioner in London, thus virtually filling two positions. The First Minister—who I am sorry is not present—got up and stated to the House that such was not the fact, that we were finding fault with a man who occupied the distinguished and lucrative position of High Commissioner in London, and who, resigning that position, as it were, came to Canada and accepted a salary of \$7,000 in place of \$10,000. I will read what the First Minister said in regard to this matter:

"But there is one thing that is most extraordinary, and it is this, the utter reluctance of hon. gentlemen opposite, the party of reform, to consent to an economy or any saving of any kind. My hon. friend enjoys the high, honorable, and useful position of High Commissioner, at a salary of \$10,000 a year, besides the allowances which some hon. gentlemen have cavilled at so much from time to time. But because he undertook to perform efficiently the duties of High Commissioner, while at the same time he acted as Finance Minister, saving the whole of the \$10,000 to the country, and performing the duties of both offices for \$7,000, the hon. gentleman says at once that this is an abuse that an hon. gentleman should consent to work for \$7,000 when he might have drawn the whole \$10,000."

Now, Sir, what do we find? In looking over the Auditor General's Report I find that Sir Charles Tupper, whether he was High Commissioner or whether he was Finance Minister, has drawn no less than \$18,694. Last year he drew for salaries alone, \$13,845 81. When he was here as Finance Minister no doubt he was sent to Washington as plenipotentiary, and while there he drew as salary for services, \$5,378, while at the same time he was drawing his salary as Finance Minister at the rate of \$7,000 per year. Then again, during a portion of the year he drew part of his salary as High Commissioner and almost the entire items of the office for contingencies. Altogether he drew \$18,694. That is a pretty good sum for one man to draw, in the face of the statement of the First Minister that Sir Charles Tupper had most willingly and magnanimously resigned the distinguished position he occupied in London and thrown away \$10,000 a year, and come out here through pure patriotism and was now serving his country at the rate of \$7,000. But we find in the Auditor General's Report, on picking out the different items, that he got \$18,694 in place of \$7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I think an explanation is probably needed on the top of the address to which we have just listened, and the explanation is this: The First Minister's statement, I think, was correct, and has been carried out. When Sir Charles Tupper was Finance Minister he did not draw a cent as High Commissioner. That would be impossible.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman state the time at which Sir Charles Tupper ceased to be High Commissioner, and drew his salary as Finance Minister? The items are so mixed up it is difficult to make them out.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish my explanations, I think this can be done without further details. It is certain that Sir Charles Tupper did not, while drawing salary as Finance Minister, between the date of his appointment as Finance Minister and the date of his resignation, draw salary as High Commissioner. The Auditor General would not allow him to draw two salaries;

Mr. McMULLEN.

there is no doubt about that. There is not an hon. gentleman here who believes such could be the case. As to the contingencies of the High Commissioner's Office, it must be remembered that the office went on, and the contingencies had to be paid in the usual way. With regard to what was spent at Washington, while Sir Charles Tupper was acting as one of the Fishery Commissioners, that is a matter we have already discussed in this House. It was not payment for services, it was not a voted salary, it was simply for expenses incurred, as must be incurred by anyone occupying a representative position, such as his was. If the hon. gentleman will read the debates in the English House of Commons over similar expenses incurred by Mr. Chamberlain, as one of the High Commissioners, he will find the expenses were very much larger than this amount, and also that when Mr. Labouchere, acting in the role of the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), attacked that item, Mr. Gladstone rose and defended it very strongly, on the ground that a representative occupying such a position had duties to perform which necessitated certain expenses. So it is not quite true to say that the First Minister was wrong in his assertion that no amounts would be paid for salary as High Commissioner during the period in question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman. If he will look over the Auditor General's Report he will find an item of \$5,378.85 for services, and also an item for travelling and expenses as plenipotentiary to Washington, \$3,118.45. The last item covers travelling and other expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. What I said is true all the same.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; he was drawing his salary as Finance Minister of this country, and he was drawing double pay for the two offices. That is quite clear.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. ELLIS. I should like to ask if Canada paid any portion of the expenses of the commission?

Mr. FOSTER. It paid the proportion of the expenses incurred by her own commissioner and her own aides, and nothing else.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should be sorry to enter into any discussion as to the amount expended by Sir Charles Tupper when occupying such a responsible position. I do not question the amount. I assume the expenses would be in some degree measurable by the position held. It is not a question in regard to which I will cavil; nor do I understand that my hon. friend cavils about it. The point I understand him to take is that \$5,378 were paid as salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood my hon. friend to make that out from the Auditor General's Report. My hon. friend does not raise any question about the \$3,000. We should like to know what that amount of \$5,000 odd was for.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not paid as salary. I do not know how it is entered in the Auditor General's Report, but it was for expenses incurred in connection with the commission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the \$5,000 to which my hon. friend referred, covered travelling expenses to Washington and expenses while there, and the \$3,000 are other travelling expenses incurred by the late Finance Minister. That, I think, is the state of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. He went to London.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He certainly did not spend much of his time here.

Mr. FOSTER. The item of \$5,378 was for travelling and living expenses in connection with the commission. The other \$3,000 was for travelling expenses incurred by him as Finance Minister while here and for his visit to England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the House in Cromwell Road maintained intact during the time the hon. gentleman was Finance Minister here, because it looks like it?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It did not matter to him, because this country paid his income tax; but I do not know where his residence was, Ottawa or London. I think a jury would have fixed it at London.

Board of Examiners, Civil Service Act..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. This shows a reduction, owing to the fact that by law we shall have but one primary and qualifying examination per year, and it is proposed that not only shall we have a reduction in the contingencies, but also a reduction in the salaries of the board of examiners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the present moment, considering, as I understand, that several thousand men have passed the examination and qualified, whom it is not intended to appoint, the Minister might save this item altogether. It appears to me that the holding of examinations of candidates for the Civil Service, under existing conditions, when there are already thousands of these lads scattered over the country at present qualified, is making a farce of the whole thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the item of reduction?

Mr. FOSTER. The reduction on the vote is \$2,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How is it distributed; how is the reduction made out?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a reduction of \$2,000, but the regulations with regard to the salaries of the examiners has not yet been decided upon.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will an examination be held this year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; there will be one per year, as was the case last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many names are on the list as having passed the Civil Service examination and as eligible for appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. That would be difficult to state, if you took eligibility for appointment to mean possibility of appointment. Of course, a great many of those who passed and did not get positions in the Civil Service made places for themselves elsewhere and are not at the call of the Government, even supposing places were found for them. There is always that fact to be taken into account. You cannot, therefore, say that the total number of young men who passed are now in a position to enter the Civil Service, because a large number have gone into other employments. These are the figures of those who passed the examination: 1885, 878; 1886, 830; 1887, 936; 1888, about 510.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be about 2,500?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, about 3,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And with that number on the lists, making every allowance for those who go to other pursuits, the hon. gentleman proposes to continue the system and to add another 2,800. Does he really believe that there is any benefit to the young men themselves or to the country in this?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a Civil Service system, and by law the mode of entrance into that service is by passing a

certain examination. That ought to be open to the young men of this country next year as well as to the young men of past years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Once in three years would be quite frequent enough.

Mr. FOSTER. You will see that the Government, with the sanction of Parliament, has reduced it one-half; that, I think, is satisfactory for a first step.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have not told us yet how you will effect any reduction, whether you are to follow the same principle of examinations, whether you are to cut down the pay of the examiners, or how it is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated to the House that we held but one examination last year, and that is fixed by law. We hold one preliminary and qualifying examination each year. We hold the same promotion examinations that we previously did; both the general promotion examination and the excise promotion examination.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At how many places are the examinations held?

Mr. FOSTER. In fifteen different localities. I presuppose that there will be a reduction of the contingencies, a reduction to a certain extent in the pay of special examiners, and as I said before, it is proposed to make a reduction in the salaries of the examiners.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister tell us how many of those who passed the examinations during the year mentioned received appointments?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can the Minister tell us if it is sometimes the practice of the Government to appoint officers to positions in the departments who have not passed these examinations?

Mr. FOSTER. Officers are not appointed to a position in the Government who have not passed the examination otherwise than is provided in the law. Men of special technical qualifications are allowed, under the Civil Service Act, to be appointed without examination.

Country Savings Banks..... \$15,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with this, I may call to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and also to the attention of the House, that his predecessor intimated—if my memory serves me tolerably distinctly—that it was the intention of the Government to reduce the rate of interest, at any rate, on all deposits of a very moderate sum, in the savings banks. Apparently, the policy announced by that gentleman has not been carried out. I would like to have from the Minister of Finance a statement as to what the Government proposes to do in that regard.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not aware that it was stated that the Government proposed to reduce the interest. I know they took power last year by the Act to reduce it. I cannot say that their intention to do so was stated in the House; in fact my memory would serve me in a different direction, that it was not stated in the House that it was the intention of the Government to reduce it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will look up that point, but I had some considerable discussion with the Minister of Finance on the subject, and I certainly understood him, and so did other gentlemen on this side, that he had made up his mind to reduce the rate of interest to the same rates paid by banks in this country. I think that he referred to the larger class of deposits, and my impression is that as to the smaller class he did not very much pledge himself or pledge the Government, but as to the larger

class of deposits he did; that is a point that we can easily verify by the records. No doubt the number of deposits are large, and a very large percentage of the deposits are held in quite considerable sums, as was shown by the returns brought down here. They vary, no doubt, in the post office savings banks somewhat, from the amounts in the Government savings banks, to which I am now referring. It was of the larger deposits, I fancy, to which the Minister of Finance spoke, and I should like to know whether the Government—supposing that my recollection proves correct—hold themselves in any way bound by what their former Minister of Finance stated, or whether they have altered their opinion on this subject, or whether the intention of the Government is now to maintain the full rate, particularly on sums not in excess, let us say, of three or four hundred dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a little difficult to discuss that question unless we knew what did take place in the House. Suppose my hon. friend allows that question to remain over until concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. gentleman's recollection differs from mine, we can discuss this question by assent, and of itself when some other item is disposed of. That will be a better course, because putting those things off to concurrence, and looking at the manner in which concurrence has been conducted recently, I must give the hon. Minister notice that I will have to object. In the old time when concurrence used to occupy several days, that might have been done with propriety, but of later years, concurrence, I am sorry to say, has been rushed through in a few hours, and perhaps both sides of the House are to be blamed for that. It is quite clear we cannot hold over matters until concurrence, under such circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to discuss this when we are on some similar item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We had better arrange to discuss this point specially after another item has been passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain how this reduction of \$1,500 was effected?

Mr. FOSTER. The saving has been effected by the gradual carrying out of the policy announced to the House with reference to the Government savings banks, that is, that when an opportunity arises on the resignation, decease or dismissal of a savings bank keeper, that the savings bank deposits should be transferred to the post office savings bank department, and put under one management, thus effecting considerable saving. The saving here of \$1,500 is due to the fact that during the past year seven banks have been transferred from the list of Government savings banks and placed under the management of the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister state how it is that the office of assistant receiver general at Halifax costs nearly double that at Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a special arrangement in Montreal by which the work is done for a lump sum, and this arrangement, I think, has existed for some time. A very large business is done at Halifax, and in Halifax the business is not done in a Dominion building, but we have to hire offices for the purpose, whereas in St. John and in Toronto the business is done in Government buildings.

Brokerage and commission on sinking fund of  
1874, 1875, 1876, 1878 and 1879..... \$5,453 24

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many years has this arrangement to run?

Mr. FOSTER. I think until 1892. It is an arrangement which is binding on us until that time. At the end of that  
Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

time, I see no reason why a different arrangement cannot be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure of his date?

Mr. FOSTER. January 1, 1882, to January 1, 1892, terminable on one year's notice from either side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with that matter, can the hon. gentleman state what arrangement exactly has been made with respect to the sinking fund and the five per cents which were converted into fours some time ago? There was a dispute as to whether the sinking fund could be at once reduced or not, and I have not yet heard what conclusion the Government came to on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. That matter, I think, has been already brought up, and I think the answer was that some negotiations were going on. These negotiations have been concluded, and it was found it was not possible to apply the sinking fund to the diminution of the total debt, but that it was not in the nature of a new loan, being simply a conversion, and the sinking fund liability remains intact. That is how we are advised by judicial authority on the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose, in that case, the hon. gentleman can have no objection to bringing down the correspondence and the opinions. The matter is one of some considerable moment. Is that the opinion of our Minister of Justice or one obtained from English authorities?

Mr. FOSTER. We obtained an opinion from our own Minister of Justice, and I think we had opinions as well from English authorities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. the Minister of Justice recollect the details of the matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I could not remember them very distinctly, but I think the opinion was based principally on the representations made in the circular, and the circular represented that the sinking fund would remain in connection with the new loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Shall I move for the papers?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I will bring down all the information I can.

Dominion Loan of Canada reduced..... \$4,145 61

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the department where the notes, after having been sent in, are recounted, resorted and destroyed, and where the new notes are signed, and I have been enabled to make that reduction without any harm being done to the public service. The reduced staff is owing to a change which has been made in the mode of operation. The Deputy Minister, when in London, and also when in Washington last year, studied the methods in vogue in the two countries, and it is by means of the improvements introduced, which do not necessitate so much work, but at the same time ensure equal safety, that I have been enabled to make this large reduction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might mention that there is considerable difficulty in obtaining decent specimens of ones and twos in many quarters. They are often very dirty and tattered, and it is high time they should be replaced.

Mr. FOSTER. They will soon be replaced. The new ones are under way now.

Mr. COOK. Do the Government propose to issue any other notes of a different denomination from what is issued at the present time?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change contemplated.

Printing Dominion Notes ..... \$43,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How is it there is such a large increase, \$3,000, in printing?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look at the amounts expended in previous years, he will find that we have always voted too small an amount. I am not quite sure whether this will cover the expense, but I thought it was better to put in what I supposed would cover the expense than to put in a lesser amount for the sake of showing more saving here. Our printing is done under contract, and the terms are explicit.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Were there any tenders besides those of the contractors?

Mr. FOSTER. The tenders upon which the present contract is based were issued some two or three years ago. I think there were other tenderers besides the successful ones. The present holder of the contract is Mr. Burland, and it is one of the conditions of his contract that he shall remove his establishment to Ottawa. He will be here and his work in operation by the first of May, and a better supervision, of course, can be then had over the work.

Miscellaneous Expenditure, including N.W.T. .... \$20,000

Mr. MITCHELL. What is that for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will find the details on page C 67 of the Auditor General's Report. It is principally for disbursements connected with the administration of justice in the North-West Territories.

Senior Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada... \$500

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this the librarian?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is included in the contingencies, and is paid under an Order in Council. I remember that the hon. gentleman called my attention to his salary last Session. Some additional duties have been imposed on him since by regulation, in the way of keeping the library open for additional hours.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is entitled to an extra allowance?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What increase is proposed to be given him?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can hardly say, because I have not mentioned the matter to my colleagues.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to add my own views to those expressed by hon. friends to my left. Having due regard to the onerous and delicate duties performed by this gentleman, duties which require special knowledge, I think he is entitled to a reasonable increase.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Mr. Ternent's time is entirely devoted to the library.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the hon. the Minister of Justice think that three messengers are absolutely necessary for the Supreme Court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am informed they are, and I do believe they are, because they are not only attendants for the judges, but likewise for the officers of the court and for members of the bar during the sitting of the court.

Clerk, Exchequer Court of Canada ..... \$1,100

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why this increase?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The vote for clerical services in the Exchequer Court last Session was taken in a tentative way. The court had been only a very short time established, and we were not aware what volume of business would have to be done and what staff would be required. After communicating with the judge and the registrar, I took a vote of \$800. No appointment has been made under

that because it was found that the staff that would be required would be a second and third class clerk. It was necessary to have a gentleman possessing legal qualifications to be the first clerk of the registrar, more especially as the registrar's duties called him away from the capital frequently. It is desirable the person to take his place should have professional training. Under these circumstances, I agree there should be a second class clerk, and it is necessary to have a third class clerk for purely clerical work. I do not think the staff can be reduced properly below that. The volume of business is considerable indeed, and is increasing, and I therefore ask for a vote of \$1,100 for a second class clerk and \$600 for a third class clerk.

Printing, Binding and Distributing the Supreme Court Reports..... \$2,000

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is the printing done?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is done at our own printing establishment here.

Mr. AMYOT. Do the Government intend diminishing the price of the report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The price of the report will be reduced, I think, in a very short time. I am asking for an increase in the vote for the purchase of books for the Supreme Court library, for the reason that the library has become defective in its complement of American law reports. I believe the amount required will be about \$3,000, and I proposed to ask for \$1,000 each year, for three years, for that purpose.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I hope something will be done to give better accommodation to the Supreme Court library. At present the books are scattered round, and some are in the judge's retiring room, to which we can get sometimes, but I think that some further provision should be made for that library.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that this \$1,000 is for the purchase of American law books?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. American law reports.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is astonishing to me, that gentlemen who have shown such antagonism to the Americans in regard to an exchange in trade, should ask for an appropriation in order to get American law reports. That is a most marvellous proposal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It shows a desire to investigate both sides of the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. You may desire to investigate, but it seems to me that you always give a pronounced opinion against the Americans beforehand.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before this item is entirely disposed of, I desire to say, from a layman's point of view, and from a public point of view, that I think it is very desirable that the Government of the country should find some more suitable accommodation for the Supreme Court. It appears to me, coming to the Capital, and seeing all these magnificent buildings, where all the other departments are so handsomely and properly housed, that it is not creditable to the Government, or to the country, or to the Capital, or to the legal profession, that the Supreme Court, the highest court in the Dominion, should have to put up with such miserable accommodation as it has. I speak only from a public point of view, and I think the Government and this Parliament should take the question into consideration whether more proper accommodation should not be given which would be suitable to the dignity and convenience of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What are the items with reference to the salary of the registrar and marshal of the Vice-



Admiralty Court of Quebec? What obligation are we under to pay for that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are under no obligation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why should that not be paid in Halifax and other ports?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that will have to be done.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This is a legacy from the Imperial régime.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In case this is extended, does the hon. gentleman propose to provide for the payment of the officials in the Vice-Admiralty Court on the lakes?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know that. The amount of business done there is pretty well compensated, I think, by the fees, and the hon. gentleman will see that the salaries are provided for the judges, and in the Province of Quebec for the registrar and the marshal, while in the lower Provinces, the marshal and registrar are paid only by fees. I have lately had a return of the business done at the different places and the amount of fees received by the different officers, and I may have to call the attention of the House to that subject hereafter. I may mention, however, that the judge in the Province of Quebec receives no fees, whereas in the other Provinces the judges' salaries are considerably supplemented by fees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That might be a reason for legislation and for adopting a rule for all these courts. They all stand on the same footing and are under the same control, and I do not know of any reason why the litigants should pay fees in one Province that they would not be called to pay elsewhere, that what is paid by the litigants in one Province should be paid out of the public Treasury in another. It seems to me that there should be a uniform rule adopted.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Have any further steps been taken to extend the jurisdiction of the Vice-Admiralty court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there should be uniformity in this matter, but we have been expecting from year to year Imperial legislation on the subject, but we have received no further assurance since I last spoke on the subject. We had the assurance that legislation would take place, but no satisfactory result has been reached.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to make any suggestion this year as to the salaries of the judges in the Province of Ontario?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should prefer to answer that question a little later.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not want to precipitate any expression of opinion from the Minister of Justice, but the matter was before the House last year, and the Minister of Justice introduced a Bill dealing with the question, but that was withdrawn. While I do not wish to precipitate any expression of opinion on his part now, I think it is due to the country that he should, during this Session, deal with the matter, not merely by expressing an opinion at a later stage, but by acting upon any view he may entertain in regard to the matter. There is a very decided opinion, and a very strong opinion, entertained amongst the bar of Ontario in regard to the salaries of the Superior Court judges, and I do not think the Government will be unduly embarrassed in this House—at least I trust not—in dealing with that matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I observe, and it is a subject which has been brought up many times since Confederation, that, in the smaller Provinces, such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, the salaries of the judges are much smaller than they are in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. DAVIES, (P.E.I.)

Those judges have just as important duties to perform, and probably as many cases come before them as come before the judges in the larger Provinces, because where there are more cases there are more judges. I do not see the justice of giving our judges \$4,000 and the other judges \$5,000 and \$6,000, and I think the Minister of Justice should take this matter up and should remedy what I have always considered to be a very great injustice.

Mr. MULLOCK. Another matter to which I intended to call the Minister's attention is the position of the junior judge of the county of York. He is compelled to reside in the city of Toronto, and he is dealt with, so far as his salary is concerned, in the same way as any county court judge who lives in a much less expensive place. I think the duties of the junior judge of the county court of the county of York are, at all events, as onerous as those of any judge in the service of the country; and on his behalf I would ask the Government to see whether they cannot put him on a much better footing—in fact, I think it will be necessary for the Government, at an early day, to consider whether it will not be proper to appoint an additional judge in the county of York, having duties that will require his continuous attendance in the city of Toronto. At present you are applying to the junior judge of the county of York those regulations that are strictly only applicable to a judge who has to go on circuit in country districts, whereas, the judge of the county of York has to discharge duties rural as well as urban; he has to act as judge for the city of Toronto, having a population of now nearly 200,000, and in addition—

Mr. MITCHELL. Don't stretch.

Mr. MULLOCK. Well, 175,000 inside the city—I said nearly 200,000. Then, if we count the suburbs with the population of the city, there is not much short of a quarter of a million of people in the judicial district of the county of York; and you have but two judges for that whole population, namely, the judge proper, and his junior. I need hardly mention to this House, who are so familiar with the facts, that the judicial duties connected with the metropolis of Ontario are extremely onerous, on account of the large amount of business done there, and it is quite absurd, it is an actual injustice, to expect the junior judge of the county of York to discharge those duties efficiently, with what slight assistance he can have from the senior judge, who, of course, does all he can—yet two are, in my judgment, unable to keep up with the work properly. Then it is manifestly unfair to require the junior judge to reside in the city of Toronto and discharge those duties and receive but \$2,000 a year, not nearly as much as the Minister of Marine proposes to give to his private secretary.

Mr. COOK. Whilst I have a great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), and whilst I have great respect for the bar of this country, who want an increase in the judges' salaries, I must say that the bar of this country does not pay all the taxes. There are some other people in this country who require to be consulted besides the bar. The lawyers do not pay all the taxes. I do not know that the people of this country are unanimous in favor of increasing the salaries of the judges; a great many people are of the opinion that they are pretty well paid already—\$5,000 and \$6,000 a year is a pretty fair salary to live upon. With all due deference to the hon. member for North York and his opinion, and the opinion of the bar, I must express the opinion that a large number of the taxpayers of this country are not in favor of increasing the judges' salaries.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is it the intention of the Government to provide for the salary of an additional judge for the Supreme Court of the Province of Quebec, the office for which has been created?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am making some enquiries on that subject now, and will be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer in two or three days.

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

### After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate ..... \$30,638

Mr. FOSTER. The same as last year, with an increase of \$100.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of the increase? We find, from year to year, that there are increases taking place in connection with the expenses of the Senate. From looking over the Auditor General's Report, and some bills in connection with items at one time or another supplied them, my impression is that, from year to year, they have increased, and purchases are made without any reason whatever. We are quite willing, of course, that the old senators should enjoy the dignity of their position, but at the same time it is desirable that we should lend that criticism to these items that they deserve at our hands. Now, for the last number of years I think the House is quite aware that, regardless of expense, a great many things have been added to the Senate in the way of items. I have had a look over the accounts myself, and in a great many things I think they have supplied themselves regardless of cost. Of course, whatever is considered necessary for their own convenience and comfort it is our duty to pass, but I think that these items should receive, at our hands, careful criticism, and that at least we should intimate to them courteously that we are not disposed to allow items to be passed, of the necessity for which we have no evidence whatever, without giving them that criticism that they deserve.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman perceives that the increase is very small, only \$100 on the whole estimate. That increase was, I believe, given to an attendant in the reading room. There has been no increase in the officers or in the sessional messengers. The estimate is practically the same as that of last year.

Mr. MILLS. Is that officer to whom the increase was given still in the employ of the House, or was he a retired officer?

Mr. FOSTER. I think he is one of the attendants in the reading room.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year we had tradesmen's accounts, \$3,459.73, and unforeseen charges, \$2,968.75. These are two very large items. What are they supposed to cover?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think anything could be more explicit than the list given in the Auditor General's Report. Every item is there set out, and the items have passed the Auditor General's scrutiny. As the hon. gentleman will see on reading over the items, they explain themselves. They include trunks for stationery, the same as members of the House of Commons' trunks, paper holders, ink bottles, knives, and spoons and other articles necessary for the restaurant, and so on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is an item for Brussels carpet, 550 yards, \$619.13. Undoubtedly where that carpet was put down something was taken up; what was done with that? We know that the carpets are not used till they are worn out. I fancy they are used for a while and then taken away or sold. What was done with the carpet which was replaced by the 590 yards?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell, but I will make careful enquiry about that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it right to have information on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; I will get the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a matter that deserves our consideration. We are here for this purpose and we have a right to discuss these items.

Mr. DAVIN. Last year I entertained the hope that the Minister of Justice would have succeeded in securing for the judges in the North-West and Manitoba an increase of salary, and indeed for the judges all over the country. It is but right that those hon. gentlemen who do not take the view adopted by the hon. gentleman who spoke just before recess, should show that there are members in this House who do not take the narrow and short-sighted view respecting the remuneration of judges that seems to prevail among some hon. gentlemen. I will deal with the judges in the North-West. I say that \$4,000 a year for a judge, for a man capable of adjudicating in criminal and civil matters, for a man whose education represents a large amount of capital, and who must be a man of learning and of distinguished ability—I say that, with the high rate of living that prevails there, \$4,000 is a contemptible salary, and a judge cannot keep up his position and live on it. I should like to remark that I think our senior judge, Mr. Justice Richardson, who really performs the duties of a chief justice, should be in the position of chief justice, and when the additional salaries are given to judges, he should obtain extra pay and should occupy the position of chief justice in the same way as we have chief justices in the various Provinces. The idea which seems to prevail amongst some hon. members, that a more crude state of things will satisfy the North-West than will satisfy any of the Provinces, would be entirely removed if they were to visit the North-West.

Mr. MULOCK. We do not have to go there for it.

Mr. DAVIN. I am much obliged to you. Those hon. gentlemen would find that the people of the North-West were just as highly civilised, and were as much advanced in the arts of life, as the people of any part of the country. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), who spoke this afternoon, uttered sentiments that I heard members of our own party utter, but not publicly, last year. Those hon. gentlemen rise and say: \$5,000 a year seems good pay for a judge,—and their memory probably reverts to their book-keeper or to some man engaged in their employ not requiring the same class of mind, not requiring the same training or the same learning, and they think that if their book-keeper can live on \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year, why should not a judge be able to do so? Those hon. gentlemen have almost a resentment in their minds the moment it is proposed to add to the salaries of the judges. I say it is short-sighted on their part, because they themselves may go into court, especially a rich man like the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), and \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$50,000 of his money or property may depend upon the result of the trial of the case. If you lower the salaries, what do you do? You lower the class of men who go on the bench. And, at the present moment, I may tell you this, that I notice, and it was the subject of remark among leading men in Toronto when I was living there, that our best and ablest men did not wish to go on the bench. Why should they, when they make \$15,000, \$16,000, \$13,000 or \$10,000 a year in their profession. The dignity of being a judge is a very fine thing, but dignity cannot be kept up without the sinews of war any more than any other position can be maintained, and if you place men in positions of dignity and give them miserable salaries not sufficient to enable them to keep up their position, you lower and humiliate them. Suppose it comes to be the rule that only an inferior class go on the bench, what would be the result? You will have men by-and-bye, as surely as I am addressing

this committee, who can be approached. Up to the present moment the character of our bench in Ontario, and in every part of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, stands as high as the bench in England, and there has not for many years been an aspersion upon the honor of the ermine; but if, while the incomes of merchants and contractors and men in every walk of life are increasing, you keep down the incomes of the judges who carry out the law, the men who, as Burke said, speaking of the bar, had had more to do with the advance and progress of government than any other class of men, if you lower their salaries and keep them down, the result will be that you will have a pettifogging class among your lawyers and an inferior class of men on your bench, and some day or other they may be approached. If that time should ever come, what will happen? Will you have justice? Will you have the same confidence in going before your courts which you have now, will you be certain, as you are certain now, that the man who presides in your courts will hold with unwavering hand the balance of justice? No. We shall be in something the same position as the people of the United States, where they elect their judges and where judgment is decided sometimes before the judge goes on the bench. Now, Sir, referring more particularly to the North-West, let me call your attention to the fact that the judges in other parts of the country have a larger salary, while in the North-West the expenses of living are greater. What I should like to see would be a general measure raising the salary of the judges all over the country. I should like to see this House rise above that petty, green-grocer spirit of discussion that I am sorry to see sometimes prevails here. When I see my friend the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) shedding deciduous tears over a taken up carpet I admire him just as I admire the Egyptians we read about, who used to shed penitential tears over the smell of a deified onion. That was a long time ago, Sir, and I think that my friend is in a backward state when he sighs and almost sheds tears over that decapitated carpet. I should like to see this House raise itself above that miserable and narrow spirit that sometimes cries out when the salaries of judges are mentioned. Let us decide to pay the men properly who shed lustre upon the country, in whose hands our lives and property are placed, who have the greatest possible influence on opinion by virtue of the high office which they hold. No man of reflection can doubt that judges have the greatest possible influence on the progress of the country, or that they have the greatest possible influence upon a healthy public opinion in the country such as we should not have if we had judges morally weak, judges not sound in learning, and judges not capable as we have them to-day. I may say that I should like very much to see the salaries of men occupying other important positions in the service of the country raised, but I will not go into that now. I think the amount of pay to the Ministers of the Crown is simply ludicrous, it is so small.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is more than some of them are worth.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know anything about that, but I think it is too small, however. I am mainly interested now about the salaries of the judges, and I hope that if the Minister of Justice cannot see his way to bringing down a general measure such as was contemplated last year, that we shall have in the Supplementary Estimates an item giving the judges of the North-West \$5,000 a year.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; in the Maritime Provinces also. I hope we shall have the judges of the North-West receiving \$5,000 a year, and Chief Justice Richardson \$6,000 a year. I do not see why, in the Maritime Provinces and the North-West, judges who are equally learned, who have the same

Mr. DAVIN.

great interests vested in their office, should be placed in an inferior position as regards salary to other judges.

Mr. AMYOT. It is, perhaps, well that we should know in discussing this question what are the salaries of judges in some other countries, and I think that would be a very good argument in favor of increasing the salary of our judges, and would form a very good precedent for us here. In England the Lord Chancellor has got a salary, not of \$6,000, but of \$50,000 a year, and we must not pretend that because we live in a colony our intelligence and our knowledge of law is not as high as in England. When our judges have all their time employed in the administration of justice, I do not see why we should not pay them equally well as they are paid elsewhere. I have heard it said that in commercial pursuits men are not paid so highly as our judges, but we must remember that in commerce men sometimes make \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year, and if you take the stock of intelligence possessed by business men you will not find that it is very much higher than that of an ordinary judge. We do not grudge commercial men their successes, but we think that judges should be recompensed because of their position, their ability, and the knowledge and experience of some thirty years which they bring to the bench. We must remember that great expenses are incurred by judges in studying at a college or university, and that the judge sacrifices everything in this world for the administration of justice. We find that in England the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary have \$30,000 a year each, the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, \$25,000 a year each, Court of Appeal—Master of the Rolls, \$30,000; judges, \$25,000. Court of Chancery—Lord High Chancellor, \$50,000; five judges, \$25,000 each. Court of Queen's Bench—Chief Justice, \$40,000; fourteen judges, \$25,000 each. Admiralty Court—President, \$25,000; judges, \$25,000 each. Court of Arches—\$25,000 salary for the judge. County Court Judges from \$7,500 to \$9,000 each, and the Recorder of London, \$17,500 a year. It may be said that this is for England, that it is the mother country and that their blood is purer, and the judges there are worth more, but let us take the salaries of judges of poor Ireland. In the Court of Appeal—three judges have \$20,000 each. Court of Chancery—Lord High Chancellor, \$40,000 a year. Master of the Rolls, \$20,000; Vice Chancellor, \$20,000. Court of Queen's Bench—Chief Justice, \$25,000, and six judges at \$19,000 a year each. Court of Exchequer—Chief Justice, \$23,000 a year, and two judges at \$19,000. Divorce Court—salary of judge, \$19,000. Admiralty Court—salary of judge, \$6,000. Bankruptcy Court—two judges at \$10,000 each. The Land Commissioner's Court Chief Justice, \$19,000 a year, two Commissioners at \$15,000 a year each, and a third Commissioner at a salary of \$10,000. It must further be remembered that those judges live cheaper in England than they can here. In Scotland the salaries of the judges are as follows:—High Court of Session—Presiding Judge, \$25,000; three judges, \$18,000 each. Second Division—Chief Justice, \$25,000; three judges at \$18,000 each. The Outer-house Court—five judges, \$18,000 a year each. I suppose I will be answered that those high salaries prevail in Great Britain, but let us take the salaries paid to judges in other colonies with a very much smaller population than we have in Canada, and we will find that they are paid far higher than our Canadian judges. In Australia, New South Wales—population, December, 1886, 1,001,966—Judge in Chief, \$17,500 a year; five Puisne Judges at \$13,000 a year each. Victoria population upon the 30th June, 1887, 1,019,106—salary of Chief Justice, \$17,500; five Puisne Judges, \$15,000 each; Judge in Equity, \$5,500; Bankruptcy Judge, \$7,500. In South Australia—population in 1886, 1,342,614—a very much smaller population than Canada—the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court gets \$12,500, and three Puisne

Judges, \$10,000 each; three District Judges, \$8,500 each. West Australia—principal city, Perth, with a population of 10,000—Chief Justice, \$5,000; Puisne Judge, \$3,500. New Zealand—population in March, 1886, 578,482—Chief Justice, \$8,500; four Puisne Judges, \$7,500 each. Tasmania—population on 31st December, 1886, 137,211—Chief Justice, \$7,500; Puisne Judge, \$6,000. Fiji Islands—population in 1884, 3,613 Europeans, 121,000 natives—Chief Justice, \$7,500, with \$1,500 bonus. Jamaica—population in 1881, 580,000—Chief Justice, \$10,000; First Puisne Judge, \$6,500; Second Puisne Judge, \$5,000. Trinidad—population in 1881, 153,028—Chief Justice, \$9,000; two Puisne Judges, \$5,000 each. Windward Islands—population, 119,546—Chief Justice, \$7,500; two Puisne Judges at \$5,000 and \$4,000. Barbadoes—population, 171,860—Chief Justice, \$7,500. Coming to the British possessions in South America, British Guiana had a population in December, 1886, of 274,311—Chief Justice, \$2,500; two Puisne Judges, \$7,500 each. British Honduras—population in 1881, 27,452—Chief Justice, \$5,000. I might go on and speak of the British possessions in Africa. Cape Colony—population in 1885, 1,250,000—Chief Justice, \$10,000; two Puisne Judges, \$7,500 each; the presiding Judge of the E. D. Court, \$8,750; the presiding judge of the High Court, \$10,000; two Puisne Judges, \$8,750 each, and two other judges, \$7,500 each. Natal—population in 1884, 424,495, of which 35,000 are Europeans—Chief Justice, \$7,500; two Puisne Judges, \$5,000 each; judge of the Native Court, \$4,000. Sierra Leone—population in 1881, 60,546, including 163 white residents—Chief Justice, \$6,000. Gold Coast—Chief Justice, \$7,500; Puisne Judge, \$5,000. These figures show that among all the colonies, Canada is the one in which the judges are the most poorly paid, and I think I will not be contradicted when I say that our judiciary is one of the finest in the world. From the Supreme Court down to the most humble court we have selected the most intelligent, honest and learned lawyers who have consented to go on the bench. We must not forget that the liberty and the security of the subject are entirely in the hands of the magistrates of our courts. If a merchant collects his dues, it is because of the respect which the courts command by their honesty and integrity; if property is secure, if we walk safely in the streets, if women are respected, if general order prevails in society, if the people are happy in fact, the reason is to be found in the good organisation of justice, and the character of the magistrates presiding in our courts is the very essence of that organisation. There is one thing, however, which I would like to see disappear entirely from our judiciary, that is, the hope of promotion. I know of one instance—I will not give the name—of a judge, in the hope of promotion to another court with an increase of \$1,000 a year in salary, committing the greatest possible injustice, and showing himself blind to the interest he had in hand. I would like the judges to be so well paid that when they go on the bench they forget the rest; they are above all suspicion and entirely independent, and living exclusively within the walls of that sanctuary of the law. Now, some gentlemen find the salary of \$4,000 or \$6,000 extravagant. Do they forget that the judge to whom they apply for justice has bought and has in his house many law volumes, reports of all kinds, a library worth, perhaps, \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 worth? Do they forget that he cannot speculate in stock or in timber, or engage in any commerce whatever? Do they forget that his whole family depends upon his small salary? If a judge confines himself to that hard labor, and consents to spend the whole of his life in the service of the bench, we must be grateful to him; we should remove from him all temptation to venality, and place him in a position where he will have nothing in view but the honest administration of justice to his fellow countrymen. The liberty, the morality, the security of the people, are in the hands of the judges.

I think they are not sufficiently paid, and those who respect their country and understand its true interests will not begrudge a few thousand dollars to have a good set of independent judges.

Mr. COOK. As I have been referred to by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I would just make a few remarks. The hon. gentleman has made an allusion to the judges of the land in the most uncomplimentary terms. The most unkindly out which the judges have ever had in this country, to my mind, has been administered by the two gentlemen who have just spoken. The gentlemen say that the judges are not well paid. Now, I will appeal to the Minister of Justice whether when a vacancy occurs he finds any difficulty in filling the place. The hon. member for Assiniboia stated that as a lawyer the judge would earn from \$10,000 to \$25,000 a year. I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Justice and this House the amount of money that can be made by a lawyer in his capacity as a lawyer. If that is the case, it strikes me that he is levying too extensively upon the suitors. If the law of the country was so amended that the taxes upon his legal account should be reduced to minimum or maximum—if you like to put it that way—it should come within the radius of a reasonable salary for the year. But if a man can make at his profession \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year, I contend there is something wrong in the system. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said they were all educated and able men. I believe the bar and the bench of Ontario are all capable, educated men, honest and above reproach, but the hon. gentleman says that unless we increase the salaries there will be a tendency, probably, for these men to do something wrong. I would impute no such motives to any of the judges of Ontario. I do not know anything about the judges of the North-West, concerning whom the hon. gentleman appears to know most.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. I did not say that any of the existing judges could be approached. I said that if this thing went on, you would have men going on to the bench who might be approached. I was looking forward to the future.

Mr. COOK. We are legislating for the present. We are paying salaries to men who are keeping the position at the present time; and let posterity take care of itself. My hon. friend, with his exalted, his overpowering eloquence, his great educational attainments, of course, looks forward probably to the future; but let my hon. friend remember that he is not one of the greatest tax-payers of the country. Look at the Estimates. Here we have \$36,000,000 to be voted under the Estimates before us, and then we have the Supplementary Estimates to come down, which will likely add to that about \$2,000,000 more, making \$38,000,000 altogether. Then there are the other statutory expenses we have to meet. Then we have the expenses on land in the North-West, which hon. gentlemen opposite, in their mode of book-keeping, transfer to capital account. Then we have the magnificent management of the Intercolonial, by which \$500,000 of money of the country is expended yearly on a road which is not of great utility. With reference to the judges, I am not aware that they have petitioned the House for an increase of salary, or that they are clamoring for more salary. It is generally conceded that the judges are pretty well paid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. COOK. I know that they live in pretty good style, at all events the judges in Ontario. But they have something more to look forward to. After serving a term of office, I think, in the neighborhood of fifteen years, they are entitled to be superannuated with a two-thirds allowance. But my hon. friend speaks here about the education of the judges. There are plenty of men who are educated

as highly as the judges on the bench now, and there are many lawyers in this country willing and able to occupy these positions, provided that the gentlemen who are on the bench now, feel inclined to retire. The hon. gentleman speaks as if there was nothing else necessary to make a judge but education. I think it requires a little common sense as well. Sometimes you will find educated cranks—men who have more education than they have common sense. It would be out of place for me to attribute anything of that sort to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but I have often heard it said that is he an educated crank. Now, I wish to say that the large expenditure the taxpayers of this country have to meet, not the lawyers only, nor the judges, nor the members of Parliament, nor the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that have to meet this large expenditure, it is the people throughout the country, the farming community more particularly; and I would like to ask the farming community, the tax-paying community, whether they wish that the salaries of these men should be increased. I have no hesitation in rising and objecting to an increase of salary to the judges. Some people may say we have no right to discuss the question of the judges of the land. Why, who makes the judges but Parliament? Who should be the master of judges but Parliament? Who makes Parliament but the people, and who are the masters of the whole situation? It is the people, and should they be taxed simply because it happens to originate in the cranium of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the salaries of the judges of the land should be increased? The thing is outrageous. I am sure the intelligent taxpayers of this country will not agree with my hon. friend who would like to be a Minister, and expects some time or other to occupy a seat on the Treasury benches, and who therefore would like to have their salaries increased. I believe he cannot be a judge, because he is not a lawyer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes he is.

Mr. COOK. Well, that alters the case. He is making two or three places for himself. If he does not happen to be made a judge, why, he may yet be made a Minister, and in either case he favors an increase of salary. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will remain in support of his family. You know that an Irishman is allowed to speak twice, and if he makes a slip of the tongue he is allowed to correct himself. I refer to my hon. friend as a man of family. Well, I believe, he has not any that he pays taxes for. I understand he is not a man of family at all, and therefore I stand corrected. It was not a question to him of the taxes for his family which he would have to pay. But I say the taxpayers of this country will not consent without protest to an increase of this kind. At all events, as a representative of the people in one constituency, I will always raise my voice in defence of the taxpayers against any measure to increase their burthens.

Mr. DAVIN. As my hon. friend says that an Irishman is allowed to speak twice, probably you will allow me, Sir, to say a few words in reply. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), in a speech characterised by the best possible taste, told the House that I was an educated crank. I am very glad that is the case, because it will bring my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook) and myself shoulder to shoulder; we shall make a good team; and the only difference between us is this, that while I am an educated crank he is an uneducated crank. That, of course, gives him a great advantage over me, because it is well known that education while it sharpens some of our faculties, does undoubtedly take off to some extent the exuberance of our natural faculties, and my hon. friend, if he had been an educated crank, never could have given us the apotheosised ignorance, the exuberant non-sensical flamboyant display of nature in its most charming phase such as we had a moment

Mr. Cook.

ago. The hon. gentleman first said I was a man of family. Well, he made a great mistake there. He is a man of family, and I look forward with joy, and pride, and hope to the future—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentlemen are too previous. Not in regard to myself or in regard to anything that relates to me, but for Canada, because I know this, that, my hon. friend being a man of family, the beautiful qualities he has just displayed will be manifested to a remote posterity, and when we have passed away, ages hence, another Cook may arise and, so to speak, fry himself as we have seen my hon. friend do here this evening. I will pass now from the hon. gentleman and will say this in regard to the subject, that nothing which he has said has changed my mind on this matter. In fact, he has displayed the quality that I say we should stamp out here, a sort of resentment against giving a just remuneration to the judges, a sort of resentment against education, and I hope that those members of this House who do not happen to be lawyers or who do not belong to a learned profession, but who have had the advantages of a good education here in Canada, will show that this House is capable of giving an opinion worthy of a great Parliament on a question like this, and that we will not trouble ourselves with rigmarolism such as we have just listened to from my hon. friend.

Mr. COOK. Since hearing the speech of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I will take back what I said, as to his being an educated crank. Still, he assured the House that he was educated, and in that capacity he reminds me very much of some educated men, who are like cultivated land—the more they are cultivated the poorer they become. I have another thing to say about my hon. friend, which I hope will not ruffle his good hair in reference to a matter pertaining solely to himself. If he did go on the Treasury benches, if he had been called to the Ministry, he would, of course, have made a little more than he is making, but I see that he is doing for \$4,000 for his Regina paper. That is a very good reason for his supporting the Government, and for his getting up and denouncing everything the Opposition may say in reference to the expenditure, and for his standing by the Government in their wanton extravagance.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I did not expect that the first time I would speak in this House would be to urge any increase of expenditure in this Dominion, but in this case I regret to say that there is such a discrimination in the salaries of the judges that I cannot but protest against it. It is all very well for those hon. members representing the Province of Ontario, where the judges are paid much more than in the other Provinces, besides receiving large perquisites, to say they do not want any increase in that direction, but in the other Provinces where the judges are not so well paid, where they do not get, by way of incidentals, any increase of salary, with a salary from 25 to 30 per cent. less than that of those of Manitoba for example, I believe the actual system is unfair. Because judges are in such a good position that the representatives of their Provinces are prevented from asking an increase of their salary, it does not follow that the representatives of smaller Provinces should not ask that their judges should be put on the same footing as those of the larger Provinces. There cannot be two opinions on this question. If we want to attain a higher standard in the selection of our judges, we must give them such salaries as will induce the proper men to ascend the bench. Now, we see that young lawyers in the prime of life are getting more fees from their clients than the salary they would receive if they accepted a position on the bench, and, therefore, when they are asked to accept the honor of being appointed judges, they decline. It is only after having practiced for a number

of years that they will accept that position, simply for the honor of the position, and they do so at such a stage of life that they are almost disabled and have to be superannuated in a very short time. I believe that the Dominion at large is losing, from the fact that these judges are appointed when they are too old to be efficient in the service they are called upon to perform. Let us pay our judges for the position they hold. I protest in the name of the Province of Manitoba that the poor pittance which is given to our judges is not in proportion to the high position they hold. We have not two or three courts in that Province, with judges appointed for each of them. We have only one, the Court of Queen's Bench, and our judges have to sit in our three large judicial districts, on all cases, both criminal and civil, and therefore they have to do in our Province twice and three times the work of the judges in the other Provinces, who are merely confined to a single court. And in our Province, where living is perhaps more expensive than it is in Ontario, it is unfair that our judges should be so poorly paid.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I believe the item was passed, and there is no item for judges' salaries.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a subject that I have frequently brought before the House on former occasions. I have never felt otherwise than that the judges of the smaller Provinces have been unfairly dealt with in the arrangement of salaries at the organisation of Confederation. That has been continued for upwards of twenty years. I have repeatedly brought this matter before the House, and I feel that the time has now arrived when, either the salaries of the judges of the larger Provinces should be lowered to those of the smaller ones, or the smaller ones should be increased to those of the higher. In order to test the opinion of the House, I will move this amendment—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen that we pass the present vote, because it does not include any amount whatever for judges' salaries; and I have promised the hon. member for North York to speak to this subject later in the session, so there will be ample opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will just read to the Chairman the amendment I proposed to offer, and then I will withdraw it, if my hon. friend desires it. I think this is a matter upon which such a gross injustice has been perpetrated upon the judges of the smaller Provinces that it ought to have been remedied before. This is my amendment:

That the Committee do not pass upon item 26 until provision be made to include therein such sums as will place the salaries of the judges of the North-West Territories and the Maritime Provinces upon the same footing as those of similar Courts in Ontario.

Dominion Police. .... \$19,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you call for \$1,400 more?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The new building which will be ready in early summer will require three additional policemen.

Kingston Penitentiary..... \$121,128 58

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The increases in the salaries are altogether statutory, under the Act of 1887; they amount to the sum of \$1,440. The retiring gratuities are as before; officers' uniforms, a slight increase. The increase in the cost of maintenance is estimated for on three grounds. In the first place, the rations have been increased. The rations given at Kingston are not yet up to the regulation allowance, but they have been considerably increased during the last year. The report of the warden states that the rations have been found insufficient, and have been increased. In

the next place, new clothing has been required for the convicts; and furthermore, a slight advance in the prices of some supplies, has been estimated for, making the estimated increase for maintenance, \$2,595.54.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the clothing made in the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the number of inmates increased?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not materially.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the material for clothing purchased?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Altogether by contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice the expenses in connection with this penitentiary are increasing every year, and it has now reached the highest figure that it ever reached yet, *per capita*. I notice that it cost per head, for each convict in 1878-79, 56 cts.; in 1867, 51 cts.; in 1885-86, 49 cts.; in 1884-85, 53 cts. I notice from the Auditor General's account that there are 553 inmates in this penitentiary, and it costs us a little over \$4 a day to keep these people. I would like the Minister of Justice to explain the item for the tailor instructor, William Gemmill, who is paid for five months' services \$199.98. I notice the same gentleman is paid a gratuity allowance of \$1,272.65. I would like to know on what basis the gratuity allowances are made to people occupying his position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Penitentiary Act he will find that all officers or persons who are not eligible for superannuation, are entitled to retiring gratuities. When they have reached that period of life when they are unfit for service any longer, or when they have been injured in the service, they are allowed retiring gratuities, which are fixed according to a scale laid down in the Act. In the case of Wm. Gemmill, the Order in Council under which a retiring allowance was made to him, was dated November 22, 1887. It reads thus:

"That on account of age and failing health, vouched for by medical testimony, Wm. Gemmill, tailor and trade instructor of the Kingston Penitentiary, having been retired from the service, be granted a gratuity \$1,272 65, being half a month's pay for each year of service up to five years, and a month's pay for each year of service in excess of five years; said amount to be charged against the retiring allowances for Kingston Penitentiary."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister says the material for the clothing was provided for by contract—were tenders asked for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Although the Minister has explained that they made a larger allowance for rations on the report of the warden, I think that is hardly sufficient to warrant us to grant this increased amount. If we turn to the Auditor General's Report we find that the same number of inmates has been maintained there for even a less amount than what was appropriated for that purpose last year. That being the case and the cost of living at the present time not being higher, there must be some other explanation than that given by the Minister. While I am perfectly willing that every due allowance should be made to the inmates there, and that any reasonable amount should be granted to the officers, yet I feel that year after year the expenditure of these institutions is increasing, and unless we guard and protect the public interests more than we have done in the past we may expect these increases to continue until they become a great burden to the Dominion. The Auditor General's Report shows that of the appropriation of \$118,000 last year, only \$112,470 60 has been expended. That being the amount necessary for

the efficient service of the penitentiaries during that year, it seems to me that the increased amount asked is unnecessary, that when they were able to limit the expense to the amount I have stated during that period the committee should not now be asked to make an enormous increase and advance the amount to \$131,138.58. The Minister should give some further explanation of the matter than simply the warden's statements. We all know that the officers in charge are liable to recommend large expenses to suit their convenience and the convenience of the subordinates, and the Government should certainly have some other means of ascertaining the requirements of these institutions other than the warden's statements. We know they are prone to extravagance and to expend money when it is unnecessary, and the Government being the guardians of the public purse it is their duty to see that they obtain all information necessary to securing a proper idea of the necessity of the amount to be appropriated for these institutions. I hope the Government will place themselves in a position to be able to come down more definitely with their estimates, and in view of the fact that the expense last year was confined to \$112,000, the Government should not require at the present time the enormous increase they are at present asking.

Mr. CASEY. I should like to obtain from the Minister of Justice some information with regard to what I consider the most important subject connected with the penitentiaries, namely, the question of the industries carried on in those places of punishment. There are industries carried on in Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul, at Dorchester and elsewhere, but I find a great difference in the results of those industries. At Kingston 580 convicts produced \$1,645 worth of goods as the result of their labor during the year; at St. Vincent de Paul 325 convicts produced products of the value of \$1,621; at Dorchester 175 convicts produced goods to the value of \$3,756, and in the Manitoba Penitentiary 100 convicts produced products of the value of over \$1,900. This shows that in Kingston there was the least percentage of receipts from the industries of convicts, although they had the larger number of convicts and probably the best trained staff to employ them. The question of prison labor is admittedly a very difficult one, and a great many of our laboring class object to allowing convicts to do any remunerative labor whatever, but I think in view of the large amounts spent on our penitentiaries we have a right to expect that convicts will be made to do something to maintain themselves and relieve the country to some extent of the cost of their maintenance. The penitentiary is not purely a punitive institution, or it should not be so at all events, whether it is so or not. The object of penitentiary management should be to reform the convict to this extent that when he is discharged, as he must be at the end of his term, he should cease to be a dangerous character to the community, and should be capable of earning his living and be willing to do so. Every convict during the term of his confinement should be trained in some employment so that after he leaves the penitentiary he would be able to earn a livelihood, and the country would thus be saved from the great danger, which is increasing every year, of so many convicts being turned out of the penitentiaries in no better shape than when they entered them, on the average. The objection to convict labor hitherto has been this, that convicts were made to labor in penitentiaries and the product of their labor was sold at lower rates than the products of free labor could be sold at. If this rule were instituted, that the products of penitentiary labor were not to be sold at lower rates than the average rates paid for the products of free labor, the objection to this class of work would cease or almost cease. I do not see that the working classes could then complain of being undersold. If those convicts were not in the penitentiary, they would be working at

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

some trade or industry and would therefore be competing with the working classes of the Dominion at large. If this plan were carried out, I do not see that the working classes could complain, and I do not think they would do so. On the other hand, by the wholesome training of the convicts to some employment, they would be, first, turned out better men than when they entered, and, second, a very large part of the cost of the penitentiaries would be paid. It is absurd that 580 convicts could not earn in a year more than \$1,655 or about \$3 per head per annum. It is an absurd amount for them to earn. I believe that while a man is undergoing a sentence in the penitentiary his time belongs to the country, and that it is perfectly legitimate and proper to make him earn his keep while he is in prison and save that amount to the public revenue.

Mr. MULLOCK. If a convict cannot do that they ought to turn him out

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend suggests that if a convict cannot earn his keep he should be turned out, but possibly they may find some more efficient method of inducing the convict to work than that. I believe that a convict would rather work than be idle. Any hon. gentleman may ask himself if such misfortune should happen to him as to be confined in a penitentiary, whether he would rather sit down idle in his cell or work. I believe a convict would prefer work to idleness; he would be the better for working and money would be saved to the country as well. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice if he has maturely considered this question of employing convict labor and whether he has considered schemes for making prisoners work profitably to the country, without interfering unduly with the trade of free laborers and whether, if he has not, he is favorable to the plan. I cannot speak of the present time, but the Minister is no doubt aware that at the Auburn State Prison in the State of New York the prisoners used to work.

Mr. SCRIVER. They are not employed now and a very bad state of things prevails there.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend tells me that the convicts are not employed there now; but I know that a few years ago the prisoners in the Auburn State Prison—corresponding to our penitentiaries—were employed, that they paid very nearly the whole cost of the penitentiary, and I believe in some years earned a surplus. I have seen it so stated in American newspapers, and they ought to be an authority on the subject. At the present time they have ceased this work out of consideration to the clamor raised by free workingmen, and a very bad state of things prevails as must be the case where any large number of men are kept idle, meditating on their past misdeeds and laying plans for future depredations on the public when they get out. I consider that this question of convict labor is very important both for the sake of the convicts themselves, the sake of the taxpayer, who has to foot the bill for the maintenance of those convicts, and for the sake of the public in general who are exposed to danger from those convicts when they are turned out at the end of their term. I hope the hon. Minister has given his attention to the subject, for I am quite certain that he has the will and the intention to do what is right, and I am perfectly satisfied that he has the ability to carry out any such project successfully.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject has occupied my attention, but I am glad to be able to say that the question has not yet reached the magnitude of a problem of any considerable importance, for reasons which I will presently state to the hon. gentleman. In the first place, I would explain to him that the receipts which are entered in the Estimates as derived from the industries of the penitentiaries, do not by any means indicate the results of the labor of the

convicts. Those are merely the receipts which are paid into the Receiver General from sales made at the penitentiaries, and no sales are made from the workshops of the penitentiaries excepting to the officers or in connection with some little work done for them at the institution. The hon. gentleman will see that the sum which he mentions for Kingston, \$1,645, includes \$571 of gate money.

Mr. CASEY. What is that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the entrance fee charged to visitors. The cash proceeds therefore of labor from Kingston and most of the other penitentiaries are very small indeed, resulting from the rule that articles are not made for sale. The case of Dorchester Penitentiary is an exception to that, and it arises from these circumstances: When the establishment was created at Dorchester the penitentiaries of St. John and Halifax were amalgamated. In both of these institutions they had a considerable quantity of machinery for the manufacture of woodenware, and the machinery which was used in those penitentiaries was put into the Dorchester establishment and has been kept in operation ever since. They turn out buckets, pails and wares of that description there, which are put on the market under the restriction which the hon. gentleman mentions. We do not undersell in any way the other dealers in such goods, and that is the only class of goods that we manufacture for sale as anything like a business in any of the penitentiaries. As regards the way in which the prisoners are employed I will explain that the matter has not reached the proportion of a formidable problem for these reasons: In nearly every penitentiary in Canada, we have buildings to be completed in order to finish the original structures, and these additions are necessary now in order to make the establishment at all fully equipped. Kingston might have been expected to be an exception to that, because it is an old institution, is thoroughly walled, and is a very substantial structure indeed, but this state of things exists at Kingston. For a number of years previous to 18 months ago, one of the largest buildings was occupied by a contractor who had machinery carrying on the operation of making locks. He had convict labor employed under contract with the Government, and his employment extended to between 80 and 90 men. Under the provisions of the Penitentiary Act passed six or seven years ago it became unlawful when his contract expired to renew it, and in consequence of that his contract fell through at the date when it lapsed by its own terms. It is true that we had thrown upon our hands the labor of these 80 or 90 men, but we formed a plan to utilise the large workshops, no longer necessary for machinery of that character. Under the provision of the law which made the labor of convicts no longer open to contract, we formed the plan of turning that workshop into a penal establishment and erecting in it cells, for prisoners of a more aggravated type; prisoners who require to be secluded and to have a larger cell in order that the work may be given them in their cells. Ever since that time a large force of convicts has been employed. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, we have a valuable quarry on the grounds at Kingston Penitentiary and a considerable force is kept there quarrying; there is also a large force cutting the stone to build the cells of the new penal establishment; a large force is also employed on the farm both in actual farm work and in fencing and things of that kind, and others are also employed in the workshops. The information that I have, from the reports of the officers and from my own observations in visiting the establishment, is that there is no idleness in the prison whatever, nor any necessity for a single man or woman who is able to work being idle for want of work. Almost the same state of thing exists in other penitentiaries, except that the facilities for finding work are greater, in consequence of the

establishment being incomplete. At St. Vincent de Paul we have a great deal of work now going forward. We have from the quarries a large quantity of stone for the completion of the new wing, but even under those circumstances I propose not to go on with that to any considerable extent this year, because we have more pressing wants there. We want to erect a boundary wall and other works of that kind which will require all the labor we can get from the able-bodied convicts. In Dorchester we find the same state of things exists but on a smaller scale, excepting where the convicts are employed in the workshops and on the machinery I mentioned a few moments ago. In British Columbia, the convicts are employed in a larger proportion at farm work than in other penitentiaries, and, excepting within the last few years, there have been very few attempts, no complete attempts at all, to carry on trade teachings at that institution. Two or three trade instructors have now been appointed, and the workshops are being organised there on the same principle as in Kingston and other establishments.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman has given his attention to the question, but I think there is yet very decided room for further improvement. I do not see why it is impossible to make these prisoners, over and above the necessary building and repairs of the penitentiaries, earn a very large proportion of the cost of their maintenance, if not the whole of it; and I think it can be done without injustice to the laboring classes, and with great relief to the taxpayers. The total sum expended for penitentiaries is very considerable, over \$353,000; and when we have many hundreds of convicts not earning on the average more than a few dollars per head while in the penitentiaries, I think the Minister will find it to be his duty to look into the matter and see whether more could not be done. He says a great deal is done in the way of completing and making additions to the different penitentiaries. I cannot quite understand that from the Estimates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may explain that hitherto a vote has been taken by the Minister of Public Works for works of that kind, and convicts have been employed in connection with them. I think, however, that the work can be wholly carried on under the trained inspectors we have now, and I intend by-and-by to ask for votes for this services, instead of in connection with the Public Works Department.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that a very small expenditure on capital account is asked for at Kingston, and nowhere else—\$373.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not been customary to charge the construction of buildings in connection with penitentiaries to capital account. The practice is rather anomalous, I am aware, but the work has hitherto been done by the convicts, and capital account really represents very little more than repairs to fences and property of that description.

Mr. CASEY. The item of working expenses has not been explained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Working expenses include heating, light, maintenance of buildings such as can be done by convicts, machinery, armory, kitchen, stationery, the farm and stables.

Mr. CASEY. It is a very large item, and I think it ought to be put more in detail in future estimates. It amounts to over \$20,000 at Kingston, and to proportionate sums in all the other penitentiaries. But coming back to the question of labor, I have no doubt the hon. Minister is familiar with the system practiced in Ireland, where after a certain period of solitary confinement and meagre diet, the prisoners are gradually trained to behave themselves,



and after that they are given a certain amount of liberty, taken out in camps to work in quarries and upon farms at some distance even from the penitentiary. The system has been found to work admirably; the men have earned their keep and have been better for doing so. The hon. Minister says the question is not of very great importance yet; but, when he counts the number of men in the different penitentiaries, he must see that it is a very serious one. There are 580 at Kingston, 325 at St. Vincent de Paul, 175 at Dorchester, 100 at Manitoba and 115 at British Columbia, over 1,000 in all, earning very little towards their own keep. I think it will be quite possible to establish a system under which they could be put at profitable manual labor, which would do the men good in body and mind, and relieve the taxpayers. I do hope the hon. Minister will take the matter into his consideration, and, without regard to any prejudices, try to devise some system for employing these convicts, and I have no doubt if he gives his attention to it he can do it. If he could not devise a scheme of his own, there are plenty of schemes in existence elsewhere which he could copy. I think it is a very serious question indeed, and one better deserving his attention than many others about which he will no doubt be worried a great deal during the next year.

Mr. ELLIS. If Manitoba has anything to complain of with regard to the judges, it certainly equalises itself with regard to the penitentiaries; for not only is the salary of the warden of that penitentiary out of all proportion with the work he has to do, compared with the salaries and work of the wardens in the other penitentiaries, but the whole cost of that penitentiary is far out of proportion to the cost of the penitentiaries in the other Provinces. The mere item of maintenance alone costs \$120 a head in Manitoba against \$55 in Dorchester, \$70 in Kingston, \$90 in St. Vincent de Paul and about the same in British Columbia. If you take the whole charge per head, you will find that it is about \$210 in Kingston, \$250 in St. Vincent de Paul, the same in Dorchester, \$400 in British Columbia, and \$500 in Manitoba. Certainly that part of the expense might be looked into a little more sharply than it has been. Another discrepancy appears in the pay of the chaplains. In Dorchester the chaplain gets \$600, and in Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul they get \$1,200 each. I do not say that one gets too much, but if the chaplain at the Kingston penitentiary is properly paid, the others are insufficiently paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say a word with regard to the Kingston Penitentiary, as we have not yet reached the Manitoba Penitentiary. I heartily endorse the remarks made by hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Casey) with regard to utilising the labor of the convicts. Many hon. members must have noticed in the public press that very often when the inmates are let out, they are very apt to commit some fresh crime in order to get back to the penitentiary to put in there perhaps the balance of their days. They have evidently such an easy time there, and are so well fed and clothed, that they do not at all fear returning. If they were worked so that they would have to make a living, I have not the slightest doubt that a great many people would be deterred from committing crimes that take them into those places. But the fact is that when a man comes out, he has a very pressing recollection that he was fed and clothed, and had nothing to do while there. The result is that after putting in 10 or 15 years in the penitentiary, he will prefer to perpetrate crime at the risk of being sent back there, rather than work, because when a man has been a great many years idle, the probability is that he will try by some means to secure a living the balance of his life without doing anything. We ought to make the penitentiary a terror to evil-doers instead of making it, as it is now, a retreat for them. I can well remember when in the Kingston penitentiary a large

Mr. CASEY.

amount of prison labor was done, when boots and shoes were manufactured there to a very large extent, and some of the best wearing boots that could be had were made by the convicts. Of course, influences were brought to bear by Trades' Unions and others on the Government, which resulted in putting a stop to convict manufacture of that description. Well, it is not in the interests of the people that we should listen to those remonstrances and keep a thousand men comfortably housed and clothed for nothing. If a different system were adopted, the number found in these institutions would become decreased instead of increasing annually as it does now. Criminals would be led to understand that if they commit a crime they would be liable to be treated with stern justice and suffer a penalty in proportion to their misdeeds. I hope the Minister of Justice will take this matter into consideration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject is important, and I do not wish to be understood as underrating its importance. What I meant was that, in all probability, for about a year to come, all the labor we can avail ourselves of in Kingston will be usefully employed in fitting up a building. When that is done, it will be necessary to take some measures to provide actual work and remunerative work for the convicts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Kingston Penitentiary we have expended \$1,024 on tobacco, 2,561 pounds. How has that been distributed? Is a prisoner permitted to have tobacco when he wants to smoke?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Tobacco is given in sparing quantities, and only to those who, when they entered the prison, were addicted to its use. It is not given to young convicts, and is withheld in all cases where there is any breach of discipline, or want of activity in the work. The practice has been for many years to make an allowance to convicts, who are well behaved and industrious, and have been addicted to its use, and I have not felt myself called upon to restrict the number.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot say that I have very much to charge against giving a moderate allowance of tobacco to those who have been addicted to its use. Its deprivation would be a torture which I do not think we have the right to inflict on prisoners; but the main point is not that they should be very grudgingly treated in the way of diet, but that, while being reasonably well fed, they should be made to really earn what they eat. It would be quite possible to arrange some plan by which no convict would get more to eat than he earned in a day's work. Let him earn his three meals a day or go without a part of them. Allusion has been made to Trades' Unions objecting to convicts being employed on remunerative labor. No doubt, if the old plan of selling penitentiary-made goods cheaper than other goods were carried out, they would have reason to complain because there would be undue competition, but I think if the prison goods were sold at the ordinary prices of similar goods made outside, the Trades' Unions would have no reason to complain. And, if they did complain their complaints should not weigh against the interests of the greater mass of taxpayers.

Mr. TROW. I would not think it would be proper or right to inflict upon criminals in the penitentiary any such hardship as my hon. friend professes, namely, that those who do not work should not eat. I am afraid my hon. friend would fast sometimes himself if such a rule were applied. With reference to Manitoba Penitentiary particularly, there is a very large garden there of inexhaustible fertility. I notice that the managers purchased lately a potato digger for \$25, yet at the same time purchased their potatoes, vegetables, &c. I am sure the parties incarcerated there are capable of raising, at all events, all the vegetables consumed in the penitentiary. It is essential that criminals should

work, and they have lands of such fertility that there would be no difficulty whatever in supplying all their wants in the Manitoba Penitentiary. I notice a very large item for fodder for horses, while there is no better hay land to be found than around that penitentiary, and the hay can be purchased there for \$3 at least a ton put up by their own people. I would ask the hon. the Minister, also, why there is such a discrepancy between the price of beef and the price of mutton, the one being six and a half cents and the other fifteen cents a pound?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to answer when we come to the vote for Manitoba.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the prisoners in our penitentiary are treated far too well, especially in the Kingston Penitentiary. When we send criminals to the penitentiary they ought to be well cared for, but I notice in many of the courts of Ontario that prisoners, when being sentenced, prefer to have one year added to their term in order that they may be sent to Kingston rather than remain at Toronto. That seems to me rather a strange fact. A man is up for sentence. He can get off with two years in the Central Prison, but he prefers three years in the Kingston Penitentiary. It seems to me that that is an indication that the prisoners in Kingston are treated far better than they deserve, and I know that that is an evil which exists in most of our prisons throughout the country. In Hamilton, for instance, there are many men who prefer being in gaol to being at large, and I think it would be a good plan to adopt some more severe measures with those criminals who are sent to the penitentiaries. Then, as to the expenditure for tobacco, it is not pretended that tobacco is essential to the life of man. On the contrary, it is known that it is injurious to the system, and I think the Government would perform a good act if they were to deprive these men of tobacco and reform them in that respect. If they were kept for three or four years without tobacco, they might be entirely weaned from the use of it, and everyone knows that tobacco is not good for the human system. I agree with my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the tobacco ration should be withdrawn, and that the prisoners do not deserve any such consideration.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not agree with my friends in their mode of reforming prisoners. I do not believe that punishment, and starvation, and torture, and deprivation are calculated to make men better. I have no doubt that due regard is paid in the penitentiaries to the morals of the inmates. My friends seem to intimate that men desire to go to the penitentiaries. They must be very degraded indeed if such is the case, but I do not think that holds good to any extent whatever. It is a great punishment for a man to be deprived of his liberty, and I do not think many men desire to return to the penitentiary, no matter how easily or how kindly they may have been treated there. I think it is well to keep them employed, and I understood from the statement of the Minister of Justice that they are all employed, if not in manufacturing goods for the market, in labor for the institution. I am sure my friends are quite as humane as I am, but I dissent from the mode they advocate for the reformation of these unfortunates in the penitentiaries. There may be some very hardened cases who like solitary confinement and who would rather have that than labor for their living, but I believe there is not one man in five hundred who does not prefer his liberty and prefer to get his living outside to being confined in gaol. I do not think this mode of reforming criminals suggested by my friends is correct at all. As to the use of tobacco, I do not use tobacco myself, but I would not be disposed to deprive those who do, and I think the public can afford to indulge those poor unfortunates in a smoke if they desire to

have it. The question of their morals, however, is very important, and I understand there are clergymen there as salaried officials to attend to their spiritual wants. I think some plan might be adopted whereby their morals might be improved by other means than the infliction of punishment. If my friends are correct there ought to be a treadmill there, something to torture the inmates. I do not think so myself. I think the great method of reformation is the exercise of kindness, not indulgence, and I believe that kind treatment will do more than anything else to reform a criminal.

Mr. CASEY. I agree so much in sentiment with my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Gillmor) that I am sorry he should have misunderstood what we have been stating. For my part, I have not been advocating a plan to make the convicts work as a means of punishment, but as a means of reformation. I think it is much more wholesome, and for that matter much more pleasant, to make a man work than to confine him in a solitary cell. I believe that any one who had the choice would prefer to work rather than to be shut up by himself to brood over his past crimes and to plan new ones. I advocate giving convicts sufficient food and sufficient work at the same time. The Minister says the convicts are largely employed at present in completing repairs and so on. I hope he will be able later on to mention how much has been saved in this respect; but, from the returns brought down, I cannot think that these men have been fully employed, and I think there is room for the Minister to exercise his ingenuity in providing for their profitable employment. It is not proper, of course, to make the penitentiary a place of pleasant retirement for two or three years. A friend of mine has called my attention to the fact that, in the charitable institutions in Toronto, they used to give a bed and breakfast to tramps free, but now the tramps are called upon to cut from a quarter to half a cord of wood each, according to the accommodation they get; and my hon. friend, who is thoroughly informed in regard to the subject, says that there have not been a quarter of the number of tramps applying for relief at these charitable institutions, since that plan was adopted that there were before; which, he says, proves that tramps and criminals do not like to work, and that work is a deterrent from crime. He makes a further suggestion, which the Minister of Justice might take into consideration, that the amount of money earned by prisoners might not, perhaps, be put into the general revenue of the Dominion, but might be used to relieve the families of convicts who have families who are left in distress by these men being left in prison. Imprisonment is often more a punishment for the families of convicts than for the convicts themselves who are sentenced. The man may be the father of a family of small children who are unable to support themselves, and, if he is sent to the penitentiary, the family are left either entirely dependent upon their own exertions or on the charity of their neighbors. I think it is an admirable idea that some of the money which the convict earns should be used to support his family outside of the penitentiary. It has been suggested to me since I spoke last, and I throw it out for the consideration of the Minister.

Mr. KIRK. I would ask the Minister to explain how it is that the cost of these convicts is so much greater in Manitoba and British Columbia than it is in Kingston? I see that in Kingston the cost per convict was \$203.38, while in Manitoba it was \$707.51, and in British Columbia, \$475.53. The daily cost in 1887-98 was 56 cts. in Kingston, and \$1.93 in Manitoba. That is enough to maintain them at a pretty good hotel. I notice, too, that the cost of maintenance in the Manitoba institution is increasing from year to year. In 1884-85, it was \$1.31; in 1885-86, \$1.40; 1886-87,

\$1.53; and last year, \$1.93. I have no doubt that the Minister will be able to give a satisfactory explanation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the figures which the hon. gentleman is quoting are the calculations of *per capita* cost for all prison purposes.

Mr. KIRK. Yes, as found on page 95 C, of the Auditor General's Report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That included the cost of salaries as well as the cost on maintenance, and the hon. gentleman will, of course, understand that the whole cost *per capita*, taking into consideration all classes of expenditure, ought to be very much less in an institution with a large population than with a small one. For instance, there is but one warden in either, and the salary of the warden, \$3,200, distributed *per capita* over a prison population of 500, is necessarily very much less than if distributed over 80 or 90, as in smaller penitentiaries. Another circumstance to be considered is the cost of provisions in the different places, which varies. Some kinds of provisions are much cheaper at Kingston than in Manitoba or British Columbia. We have also to give higher salaries in Manitoba and British Columbia than in Kingston, and that was remarkably the case until late years, when there does not seem to be as great a difference. The figures, however, as given in the Auditor General's Report, although accurate in the way they are made up, are not altogether reliable, for this reason: they are based on the whole expenditure for the year, and the expenditure for the year includes many things which have not been used during the year. Sometimes, for instance, considerable portions of stock are kept over for next year.

Mr. KIRK. It does not include the cost of building, however.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. The most satisfactory way to compare the *per capita* cost of convicts in each prison, I presume, would be to take the rations for each prison, because it is by the rations that the maintenance is fairly tested. If we take Kingston, the rations for last year cost \$20,346.20, and therefore the Auditor General has estimated—I forget the exact amount which he has estimated—but that amount includes \$359.93 of stock for rations on hand at the end of the fiscal year; at St. Vincent de Paul the expenditure was \$14,504.26 for rations; there were \$ .634 on hand at the end of the fiscal year, but the Auditor General's calculation is based on the whole expenditure. At Dorchester \$4,450.64 were expended for rations, and they had \$733.48 on hand. In Manitoba \$4,424.88 were expended, and \$299.89 were on hand; in British Columbia \$3,825.28 were expended and we had \$97.91 on hand. Therefore the *per capita* cost for rations was, in Kingston, \$36.14; St. Vincent de Paul, \$48.38; Dorchester, \$23.49; Manitoba, \$52.72; British Columbia, \$50.37.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you pass this item, I take the liberty of calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the case of a convict named Kyle, in the Kingston Penitentiary, who was convicted of forgery in the city of Toronto a few years ago, and who is still undergoing sentence. He was convicted under very peculiar circumstances, and whilst I do not wish for a moment to question the accuracy of the judge's opinion otherwise, of course, he would not have delivered the sentence he did—yet, speaking for myself, and, I think, for a good many others who gave a great deal of attention to the case when it was before the public, that there is a very great doubt in the minds of many people as to the moral guilt of the prisoner. The case is one of a peculiar kind, and I may mention one circumstance alone that, I think, ought to weigh with the Minister of Justice and the Government in dealing with this case. He was tried at the Assize Court, and some points were reserved. He was allowed out upon bail. The case

Mr. KIRK.

was argued in term, and judgment delivered against him, he still being out on bail. He appeared when called upon to receive his sentence, having been at liberty until the moment when he came up to receive the sentence of the law. At the time of the sentence, I remember having conversed with a large assembly of gentlemen in the city of Toronto, who were in every respect a representative body, representing the profession and the class of gentlemen assembled here to-day; and the general opinion of the assemblage was that he was not morally guilty, and the hope was expressed that the court would so view the case. The court did not so view the case. I, of course, am free to admit that the presiding judge is in the best possible position to advise the Government in the premises; but even judges may make mistakes, and, perhaps, after a jury has rendered a verdict, the presiding judge may not feel free to assume otherwise than that the verdict is correct, and leave it as a matter of executive clemency to determine what shall be done. In that way it may happen that a prisoner may receive a more severe sentence than, perhaps, the circumstances justify, or, perhaps, than the judge himself would have imposed were he the judge of the facts as well as having to carry out the imposition of the sentence. I venture to express the opinion in this particular case that the sentence was more severe than it would have been had the judge been the judge of the facts instead of there having been a jury to advise him. Therefore, speaking for myself, I take this opportunity to bring his case before the attention of the Government. I am perfectly satisfied that the suggestion, although coming from the quarter that it does, will not in any way prejudice the case of the prisoner. I have spoken of him as I would of any other person, and have no reason, except as having observed what has occurred, to have an opinion on the subject. As a mere observer and a citizen of Toronto, having no acquaintance with the prisoner one way or the other, but taking an interest in the case as it went along, and forming an opinion on it, I have ventured to express this opinion on the floor of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give all proper attention to the case which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. It was before me some months ago, but I forget the circumstances connected with it, and it has been brought to my notice lately by a very large petition from Toronto presented by one of the members for that city; but I have not yet examined it or had any report on it.

Mr. MULOCK. I was not aware of any movement in the matter.

Manitoba Penitentiary.....\$60,526

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to see an increase in this item. It appears to me that after all that was said last year and after the facts then disclosed, vigorous exertions should have been used to cut down the expenses on that penitentiary. About \$500 per head are demanded for each one of the 100 convicts, which is two and a-half times the charge in Kingston and most of the other penitentiaries. In looking over the Auditor General's Report I see that the charges, making all reasonable allowance for the difference in climate, appear to be very greatly in excess for the Manitoba Penitentiary. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this fact: In Dorchester Penitentiary, with 175 prisoners, the sum total demanded for meat, for instance, is about \$1,200, and the price of meat does not differ materially from the price of meat in Manitoba. In Manitoba, on the other hand, the price demanded is very nearly \$2,200, and the quantity apparently is at least double, if not treble, that required per head for the convicts in Dorchester Penitentiary; and so on. Looking through various items, I see a very considerable number of

charges that require an explanation which is not offered in the Auditor General's Report. I see some very curious minor items, which the hon. Minister can explain at his leisure. For instance, I notice Persian caps—two caps, \$24. Perhaps they were for the use of the warden or the principal officers, but \$12 per cap is rather an expensive charge for ordinary headgear. I notice curious entries here and there, such as this:—Army and Navy List for library, 16 copies, \$34.65. These are small items perhaps, but they are items showing very considerable carelessness in the expense. In regard to the supply of meat, I do not understand how 175 convicts in Dorchester can be well fed and receive sufficient rations for \$1,200, while 100 convicts in the Manitoba Penitentiary require \$2,200 to supply meat, and apparently twice or three times the quantity is required in Manitoba as compared with Dorchester.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to an entry in the Auditor General's Report on page 89 C, in which he refers to the accounts for light and fuel for the warden's house, which are not properly chargeable against the appropriation for Manitoba Penitentiary, and which amount he has transferred to the account of S. L. Bedson, pending the action of Parliament. I see on page 92 C of the report there is some correspondence with respect to this matter. The Auditor General in a letter says:

"By an amendment to the Penitentiary Act, that portion of section 27 which empowered the Governor in Council to make allowances of 'light and fuel' to penitentiary officials has been eliminated, and under section 8 of said amendment, it is expressly stated that free quarters, uniforms, and the privilege under certain conditions to use convict labor shall be the only perquisites that may be allowed to such officials."

I presume the matter is still unsettled by the Government, or the Auditor would not have made this remark in connection with this matter. Perhaps the Minister will explain the condition of matters to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the Persian lamb caps, they are part of the uniform which is allowed under the penitentiary regulations adopted by Order in Council for the staff officers, not for all the guards, but for the warden, the deputy warden, the surgeon and the steward. In regard to the matter of meat and rations of that kind to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) called my attention on concurrence last Session, I find, on looking into the matter, this to be the fact, which to some extent explains the apparently large quantity of meat that has been supplied to Manitoba Penitentiary as compared with the number of convicts. Of the meat which has been purchased for the penitentiary and which appears in the Auditor General's Report as supplied under contract, 6,624 lbs. have been furnished to officers of the penitentiary at contract price and have been paid for by them, the cost being \$434.46, and this sum has been paid in to the Receiver General, but does not appear as a deduction from the meat supplied to the penitentiary itself, so that accounts to a large extent for the large quantity of meat supplied there. As regards the items for fuel and light to which attention has been called, as explained by the Auditor General, that matter awaits the attention of Parliament, and the attention of the House will be called to it later on. The account arose under these circumstances: For many years past, in accordance with the practice which prevailed in the prisons of other countries, I think in almost all other countries, perquisites were allowed to the officers. They were allowed not only free house and free grounds and certain convict labor for their grounds, but also fuel and light and the keep of a certain number of animals, a horse and cow and so on. Under the Act of 1887 these allowances were cut off, and an attempt made to commute those perquisites in the case of officers engaged in the penitentiaries, it being, however, provided by the Act that the provision of the Act should not apply

to existing officers. An amount was fixed by the Department as compensation, and Parliament was asked to vote a sum to compensate the officers for such perquisites. In the case of the warden of the Manitoba Penitentiary, \$100 was the sum allowed as compensation for the deprivation of fuel, light, rations and matters of that kind which were cut off under the provisions of that Act. It transpired, as indeed we had reason to expect it would, that in some cases our estimate of the amount which should be allowed for commutation was inadequate, and from time to time since we have been obliged to ask Parliament, in the case of several officers, for small sums of money to be added to their salaries to make up the deficiency in the commutation. In this case it is claimed that the commutation was not fairly computed in the case of the warden at Manitoba. He has claimed from the first that the allowance of \$400 made to him was entirely inadequate to cover the perquisites taken away from him by the Act of 1887. Just about that time he had been provided with a very large house situated in a very exposed place, and requiring a great deal of fuel as well as a great expenditure for light. He has claimed that the allowance did not cover anything like the value of the fuel necessary to heat those premises, to say nothing of the other perquisites which he thought he should be allowed for; and I had to take notice of this claim, considering the size of the premises which he had to occupy as warden, and considering the requirements of the regulations as regards lights having to be kept up all the time in case of an emergency. I had to remember this fact, that the salary allowed the warden was not adequate to his keeping up these premises, and in fact the warden asked me that he should be allowed to vacate them if I would not allow what he thought to be a fair basis of commutation for his privileges. He applied for permission to vacate the house and to live in his office, and a room or two in the penitentiary building. If I had acceded to that I would have been denying him the investigation into his claim which he thought he was entitled to; I would likewise have incurred the risk of detriment to the premises which in a climate like that would deteriorate very quickly if unheated and not kept in order. Under those circumstances I asked the Auditor General, under the promise that I would bring the matter to the notice of Parliament, to transfer the charges to the account of Mr. Bedson and we have it in our power now to deduct that amount from his salary if Parliament should be unwilling to consider the claims which he has for the fuel and light that was furnished. I do not want, however, to be understood as committing myself at the present moment to a recommendation that Parliament should do so. I have promised the Auditor General that this matter would be brought to the notice of Parliament, and it either will be brought or the money will be paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It must have been a mistake then for the Government to erect such extensive premises for the warden of that penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not say that. I do not undertake to criticise what has been done in the past in that particular; all I say is, it was inconsistent with the scheme we adopted in 1887 of striking off all those perquisites. I may say in the same connection that the warden of Kingston claims that his perquisites were not sufficiently commuted. But I do not think that he has made out a case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What allowance was made him?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. \$400, I think.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite plain to any person going over the different items in connection with the Manitoba Penitentiary, that it is conducted on a very extravagant basis. No person can possibly examine into some of the items, without coming to the conclusion that the man in

charge of that penitentiary is totally unfit, in the country's interest, to conduct its affairs. When you come to look over the different items of the expenditure and to find the extravagance that is to be seen in every column, you must come to the conclusion that there really must be something very wrong. In the penitentiaries of British Columbia and Manitoba there are about an equal number of convicts. In British Columbia there are 74, and only 70 in Manitoba. We find that in Manitoba it costs \$707 a head to maintain the convicts, while in British Columbia it costs only \$475.53 a head, and surely the cost of living is much less in Manitoba than it is in British Columbia. It is quite clear that there is something radically wrong in connection with the management of the Manitoba Penitentiary. I am not prepared to say that the Minister of Justice is entirely responsible for the condition of things as we find them, for they possibly may have been in this state when he came into office, but I do say that some decided action should be taken in regard to reducing the several items of expenditure in this particular institution. We find that 15 cents a pound is paid for mutton, and for beef 6 cents per pound, which is ridiculous. Then again we also have four overcoats, \$48.50, and four capes, \$115. I would like to know what kind of capes these are; they must be a very expensive kind of article to cost \$115. Then, again, we have an item for a silk gown which cost \$48. I ask, in the name of common sense, what is the meaning of getting a silk gown for a penitentiary?

An hon. MEMBER. It is for the chaplain.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very strange that the country should be called upon to pay \$48 for a silk gown for the chaplain of a penitentiary. There are some other items which are also open to strong objections. I shall not touch on the item for medicine, but shall leave that to some of the hon. gentlemen who are medical men. I see we have liquor this year and that is not quite so much as last year, as it is only three gallons and three bottles of whiskey. Again we find an item: "Post mortem examination on the bay horse, John Notman, \$20." Just imagine this expenditure! \$20 for a post mortem examination on a horse! I suppose the horse died, but what was the use of getting a veterinary surgeon to make a post mortem examination to see what the horse died of? It is quite clear from those items that from the manner in which the gentleman in charge of that institution conducts the business, the sooner he is removed the better it will be in the interest of the country. He commenced on an extravagant scale and he persists in that extravagant scale, and seems bound to keep it up notwithstanding the reduction made two years ago. I see there is still a disputed item of some \$450 which the warden of that penitentiary claims should be allowed him for fuel. I believe there should be some investigation by an independent person into the affairs of this institution; I believe this person should go there under direction of Parliament and make a searching investigation into the manner in which all matters connected with that penitentiary are conducted, and that he should report to this House in order to place the people's representatives in possession of the entire facts. It is quite clear that something is wrong when we have to pay \$707 a year per head for the keep of the convicts of that penitentiary. There is no penitentiary in this Dominion where the expenses come to anything like that amount, and there must be something abominably wrong in connection with the whole institution. We cannot afford to keep an institution of that kind, in the abominably extravagant condition in which it is conducted, as is disclosed by the facts laid before us in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see that in the Kingston Penitentiary, where the daily average of convicts was 553, the expenditure for drugs and medicine amounted to \$371.41.

Mr. McMULLEN.

In Manitoba, where the daily average number of convicts was only seventy, the drugs and medicine cost \$611.99. It strikes me that there must be something wrong about this expenditure. Surely, it did not take double the amount of money to provide drugs and medicine for seventy convicts in Manitoba, that it did for 553 convicts in Kingston. I fancy, that if an examination was made into the details of this account, it would be found that it was not altogether drugs and medicine that comprised that amount.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Champagne.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, it may have been commoner than champagne, but I fancy that liquor of some sort is included in this item.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not one cent's worth.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, certainly the Manitoba climate cannot be what it is claimed to be all over the Dominion, one of the healthiest in the Dominion, if it costs that much more for drugs and medicine there than at Kingston. I do not know whether I would be in order just now to ask the Minister for an answer to the question I put the other night about the travelling expenses of the inspector, Mr. Moylan. I see he travelled 261 days and was paid \$1,773 70 for travelling expenses in addition to his salary. I cannot see why it should take 261 days to inspect five penitentiaries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to the travelling expenses of the inspector, the explanation is very simple. I rose the other night to explain, but somebody intercepted me, and afterwards the enquiry was not renewed, and I thought the hon. gentleman would bring it up later. The hon. gentleman's comment was, that it was unreasonable to suppose that he could be travelling so many days. The number of days he refers to are not the days of travel, but the days of necessary absence from Ottawa, and under the terms of his appointment he receives his moving expenses and a living allowance during the time he is necessarily absent. The duties which he has to discharge at Ottawa are simply advising the department, and it is not advisable that he should spend a great portion of his time here. His principal duties consist in going from one penitentiary to another; and, in many cases, it is necessary that he should remain at a penitentiary for a considerable time, sometimes superintending works which are going on, sometimes making investigations and receiving complaints from officers and convicts. He is bound to inform himself upon the working of every branch of these institutions, so that he shall be directly responsible if any mismanagement occurs which it would be in the power of the department here to check; and it is on that account that for more than two-thirds of the time he is necessarily absent from Ottawa. As regards the item for drugs, hospital supplies, &c, I may say to the hon. gentleman that if he really has a suspicion that this expense was for any other purpose than medicine and drugs, I hope he will cause the fullest investigation to be made, and there is nothing that I can do to assist him that I will not cheerfully do, and if one cent of it was for what the hon. member for Bothwell suggested—champagne or intoxicating liquor of any kind—the officer who is responsible shall be no longer in the public service if it be possible for me to put him out of it. All I can say is that every item of that charge is open to the fullest enquiry, and there is no wish on my part or on the part of any of my officers to screen it from public investigation. I have time and again explained, in connection with the accounts of this penitentiary, that we are exceptionally situated as regards the hospital there. We have a class of people there not found in any other part of Canada; I mean the Indians and people very little removed from Indians. It is true that a considerable portion of our prison population in British Columbia consists of Indians, but they are a different class, much more

hardy and do not suffer from confinement so much. At the present time we have, and I think during almost the whole of last year we have had, eighteen Indians in the Manitoba penitentiary, and everyone of those is a constant inmate of the hospital, and would not be in existence if he were not treated medically, and maintained on entirely different fare from that given to the other prisoners. This entails an outlay of this kind. I may say that within the last year we have opened a new hospital, which was inspected by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and we have had to furnish it throughout with drugs and medical appliances of every kind. I make an extract from the warden's report:

"In reference to the purchase of drugs, &c., for hospital, as well as in every other department, every precaution has been taken to economise. The gross amount expended for drugs was, for the year 1887-88, \$485.59. Of this amount, there remained as stock on hand, on 30th June, \$37 85, leaving the net expenditure \$447.74 for the year.

"This apparently large expenditure is caused, to a very great extent, by our having to re-furnish the new hospital, in the matter of equipment, convalescent rooms, kitchen furniture, dispensing and officers' rooms. When this unlooked-for expense is considered, the actual cost of hospital is comparatively small."

As regards what has been said about the general management of the prison and something being fearfully wrong and improper, I want to be perfectly candid with the committee. I want to avow it here, as I have done in the department and amongst the officers themselves, that I think the Manitoba Penitentiary is managed extravagantly. I have done what I could during the last year to curtail the expenditure, and I think in many directions my efforts have been successful. I have now enquiries on foot, and shall be able perhaps to give to the committee at a later stage reasons why the *per capita* cost of maintenance is much greater there than elsewhere. It is true some expenses incurred in the past can by strict watchfulness and economy be curtailed; but I do not think that in the management of that prison there is any greater fault than the want of economy, and I am convinced that as regards management and discipline, it is a model institution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to one item in which he will see a most extraordinary difference. We all know that the Manitoba climate is a cold climate, and a reasonable additional expenditure cannot be grudged on that account. I observe that the expenditure there reaches \$165 per year per convict for fuel, as against \$7.29 in Dorchester.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In Dorchester we are practically without any expenditure for fuel as it is got off our own land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At Kingston, \$19 is the expenditure, and at St. Vincent de Paul, \$22. Even allowing for the great difference in number and in climate, \$165 in Manitoba seems an extravagant amount. How can people keep themselves alive there, if the cost for each individual is to amount to \$165 for fuel?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That statement is not quite correct. I explained to the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) that the Auditor General bases his calculation on the expenditure at the end of the year. In Manitoba, there was left on hand on 30th June, 1888, 1,248 cords of poplar wood, \$4,180; 30 tons of soft coal, \$320; and 60 cords of other wood, \$300, so that we had a stock on hand, at the end of the fiscal year, worth \$4,700.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much at the commencement?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very little. It was explained by the warden that an opportunity presented itself of getting exceptional advantage for laying in fuel, and he availed himself of it to that extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that, because if there is a reduction of \$4,000, it is of great importance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the hon. gentleman any check in the case of an officer like Mr. Moylan, on the account he renders for travelling and living expenses? Supposing Mr. Moylan goes to British Columbia to inspect a prison there, and stays over at Banff Park on his return, is there any way in which his time can be checked. Does the head of the penitentiary visited report to the Government the number of days Mr. Moylan spent in inspecting it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Every time Mr. Moylan visits, a penitentiary, he has a minute book there in which he records any act of any importance which he does during the day. He enters in it when he arrives, when he departs, and what his work was. Those minutes are accessible at any time. They are not habitually sent to the department, but are sent whenever asked for, and, generally speaking, he makes a second report, which he has in his own department, and lays before me when there is anything important in it to attract my attention to.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that, as a matter of comparison at least, the management of Manitoba Penitentiary appears to be very extravagant. In corroboration of that view, let me call his attention to an item, small in itself, but which confirms his view. Take telegrams. Looking at page 89, we find that Kingston Penitentiary has an account for telegrams of \$26.45; St. Vincent de Paul, \$17.85; Dorchester, \$51.29; British Columbia, \$149.28; Manitoba, \$325.42.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is one of the items I had in view when I made the admission I did a few moments ago. I represented to the warden that I thought that item could be very considerably curtailed, and that too much of the correspondence of the penitentiary was carried on by telegram.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pleased to hear the hon. gentleman say he thinks the penitentiary has been extravagantly managed, and that he feels it to be his duty to endeavor to reduce the expense. Of course, the penitentiary in which each convict is represented as eating over 300 pounds of beef in a year shows extravagant management, and when you add to that the mutton and other meat consumed in the penitentiary, it will certainly appear to be a large quantity for each convict. One wonders, when they have such an excellent appetite, that there should be any expenditure in medicine at all. One would conclude that the institution ought rather to be managed on the plan of Dotheboys Hall, where some were given treacle and brimstone with great effect. I must say I have not as much confidence in the warden of this penitentiary as the hon. Minister has. I may say publicly what I said to some of his predecessors who held the position the hon. gentleman now holds, that it seems to me the institution requires a very strict inspection, more careful than it has hitherto received. I remember that, before the Government of which I was a member went out of office, we had called to our attention that this same warden had offered to give a contract to certain parties to supply the penitentiary with everything required if they would pay him a commission of 10 per cent. I mentioned that to one of the predecessors of the hon. gentleman in office, as I thought it was my duty to bring it under his attention in order that he might investigate that which we had not the opportunity of investigating before retiring. I do not know what the Government has done, but I am satisfied that if the management of that institution were thoroughly investigated the Government would not retain the present warden. He may have a good many estimable qualities that make him treat with consideration visitors to that country, but I am certain

that his retention in his present position is not in the public interest. I have had mentioned to me, on several occasions, matters I would not repeat here, but would have no objection repeating to the hon. Minister. It has always seemed to me the inspector could hardly have been very diligent in the discharge of his duties, or long ago the warden would have been removed. I do not think that extravagance alone is sufficient to account for the large expenditure in the institution. When the whole matter is thoroughly investigated the hon. gentleman will find that this item for medicine is not, perhaps, exactly as it has been represented to him. It seems to me that the institution ought to be thoroughly examined into from some independent source, and I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman who is now in charge of the Department of Justice will make that investigation, or cause it to be made, this item of expenditure for the penitentiary in Manitoba will be very materially reduced.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the price which has been paid for flour. I notice that in Manitoba the flour was bought for \$4 a barrel, in British Columbia for \$5.50 a barrel, in St. Vincent de Paul for \$5.95 a barrel, while in Dorchester it only cost \$5.20. I suppose that all these supplies are purchased by tender and that this account is for the year ending the 30th June, 1888. I have no hesitation in saying that \$5.95 a barrel for flour is altogether beyond what it was worth. We all know that flour during that year was very low, and I know myself it was delivered in Halifax at \$5 a barrel, and in Quebec and similar points as low as \$4.75 a barrel. Would the Minister say when this contract was made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The contracts are made from year to year, and cover a year's supply. They are made from the 1st July to the 30th June. They are made by tender.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then this would be made on the 1st July, 1887, and would expire on the 30th June, 1888?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That makes the case even worse, because in July, 1887, we had as low prices for flour as have been current for many years, and why this large amount of \$5.95 should have been paid in that year I cannot understand. There are 706 barrels paid for at \$5.95. I have no hesitation in saying that the flour could have been purchased for \$1 or \$1.25 less.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot refer to dates such as June or July. We take our contract for a year's supply, and the prices are based on the probable prices for the whole year, and not for any particular month. The tenders are called for in the most public way, and the contract is awarded to the lowest tenderer. If the hon. gentleman wants to see the papers, I will bring them down.

Mr. MULOCK. I think they should be brought down.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). As to the item which I see here for drugs, I would like to know if those are also supplied by tender, whether the Minister adopts the same principle in regard to the hospital branch as he does in regard to the other branches. It appears to me that the expenditure of \$611 for drugs for an average of some 71 inmates of the institution, even though there are fourteen Indians there, and they take a much larger quantity of medicine than other people, is a very large charge. I do not charge the warden with appropriating any portion of that fund for any other purposes than drugs, but, if we look over the items in the Auditor's Report, we find some very extraordinary charges. Besides expending \$611.99 for drugs and medicine, we find another item of \$43.32 for vessels to hold medicine. Then if you go further back, you will find 6,½

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

dozens of bottles. It is very difficult to say what these may be for unless they are the ordinary prescription bottles to put the medicine in. Then it is difficult to say what the other vessels for medicines are. It may be to furnish the hospital with bottles to place upon the shelf. These may be said to be small items which should not be discussed before the House, but, if the Minister is really desirous to ascertain whether that institution could be operated with a great deal less expense than it has been for a number of years, he should institute a proper investigation, and send his inspector or some one else there to detect where the leakage is. It is an evident waste of money, and whether Mr. Bedson is a good or bad warden, whether he does or does not entertain the people who go up there and treat them hospitably, that is nothing to his credit, because I should judge, from the amounts which are placed in the Public Accounts, that all that is at the public expense. I think it is high time that some careful oversight of these institutions should be made so that we may curtail expenses, and, if we find that the expenses are very much larger than they ought to be, and, as the Minister has stated, larger than he believed they ought to be, then it is his duty and the duty of the Government at once to place some other man in charge of that institution, and see if it cannot be conducted at less expense. You leave a man there whom you would not leave in your own business if you found he was running it more expensively than you thought he ought to run it. Is there not anyone in Manitoba or in the Dominion who could take the place of that warden and perform the services required? You could then ascertain whether the institution could be conducted with less expense than it is now or not. The Government is to blame, because they ought to have the courage of their convictions as they have been expressed by the Minister of Justice. They should remove this man and put another in his place, and the sooner they do that the more satisfaction it will give not only to the House, but also to the country, which must feel that these expenditures are unjustifiable on the part of this individual.

Mr. SPOULE. I think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is scarcely fair in his criticism, or at least he forgets the fact that this is the commencement of furnishing an establishment which means a considerable expense. For instance, the item that he mentioned, \$40 for bottles in which to keep these drugs, is not, in my opinion, a very large item, if he bought, as I presume he did, those ordinary labelled glass bottles and jars, and other vessels for the purpose of keeping these medicines properly for a long time, and all the other equipments usually found either in a drug store or in a doctor's office, where they are to be kept for a length of time. I think the item is not a large one at all. This is the first furnishing of the establishment, and it would be impossible to distribute the charge equally over several years, or it would be unfair to consider a charge that was made in the commencement as a fair charge that might be expected to be made every year. It is an exceptional one. Then, again, as to the drugs that are used. There is a great difference in the class of diseases found in one part of the country from those found in another part, and a great difference in the expensiveness of the drugs used for these various kinds of diseases. But outside of that, no doctor, I think, could better understand that fact than the hon. member for East Elgin, who must be acquainted with the medicines required to be kept for any length of time; but no one can judge the future so well as to be able to furnish a stated supply such as would be needed for any given number of months or years. Undoubtedly, also, part of this charge represents a stock on hand to be used in the future, although it appears in the item for this year, and that ought, perhaps, to be distributed over a number of years. Besides the supply needed to commence operations

is entirely different from that which would be required to keep it up from year to year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is laboring under a mistake, or he has forgotten the items for these charges in years gone by. He will find that even \$611, which is in the Auditor's accounts this year, is not as large as in previous years. What has become of the drugs that he says that he had on hand? He could make a close estimate in view of the diseases that were prevailing, of the quantity he would likely require. What did he do with the drugs he had on hand before? My hon. friend completely ignores the charges. If it was this year only that these charges were made for fitting up the hospital, then we could understand it; but what became of the supplies and requisites that existed before? We find every year the same large charges for this institution, and therefore the excuse offered does not hold. The hon. gentleman forgets the amounts that had been charged before, he tries to explain them away, but no reasonable person can accept his explanation. Then as to the diseases existing in this locality. I am not aware that the people are so prone to disease—they are generally looked upon as reasonably healthy people, and to say that the Indians require a larger amount of drugs and medicines than white people, is a reason that I cannot accept. I cannot understand what diseases were prevailing there that required such an expense for medicine as is represented here. For 71 individuals in the institution, a small number of these being sick, to expend upon drugs alone \$611 seems to me unreasonable, and I do not think that the hon. member for Grey or any other medical man in the House can explain away that item, or can believe that this institution needed that sum to expend in drugs or medicine annually.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to make one suggestion to the hon. Minister. It is very desirable that, in the Auditor General's Report, if there be such very large alterations or modifications to be made as he now states in the case of fuel, for instance, amounting to nearly \$5,000, in the interest of his own department, and to prevent unnecessary discussion, a note should always be appended in such cases, pointing out that instead of \$10,000 being required for fuel, only \$5,200 worth has been consumed, \$4,700 being on hand. I do not know where he got the figures, I suppose they were supplied by his department, but they were not exhibited in the Auditor General's Report to the members of this House, and the attention of the Auditor General should be called to the fact that the large apparent expenditure to which he alluded was not quite a correct statement of the case. I am glad to hear the Minister state that he is convinced that there is a great deal of extravagance in this institution. I would call his attention to one item under the head of library. There is a very extraordinary charge for 16 copies of the Army and Navy List, amounting to \$34. Now it is a matter of interest to the white portion, at any rate, of the prisoners, that their library should have some few reasonably entertaining works in it which are of considerable value in improving the people's minds, if they are open to improvement at all; but a charge of \$34 for copies of the Army and Navy List does appear to me most preposterous—unless the Minister of Militia designs to turn these into scouts, or otherwise utilise them for the service of the Militia Department.

Mr. TROW. I may say that I am acquainted with the warden of the Manitoba Penitentiary, although not from having been incarcerated there; and I consider him an efficient officer, thoroughly acquainted with his duties, keeping the place scrupulously clean, and having everything under his supervision. At the same time, I always considered him

a very extravagant man. I was there when that building was put up—his private residence—and thought it was in an out-of-way place, unnecessary and uncalled for. The addition was built expressly for his convenience, while he had every accommodation that a warden, and those under his charge, could desire. I would ask the Minister if the Government have participated in any of the proceeds from the sale of this large herd of buffalo that was sold recently, and had been kept on Government property, provided for from Government lands, and sold, probably, for enormous sums of money, quite recently to some American. I would like to know if there was any allowance made by the warden of the penitentiary to the Government, for the care and aid that had been given to these animals, food for which had been supplied from Government lands. There must have been a little fortune realised from the sale of these buffalo, and I would like to know if the Government participated in any of the profits of that sale.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have nothing to do with the buffalo, and have not participated in any of the profits, nor have they borne any portion of the expenses of keeping them and increasing them.

Mr. MULOCK. Did you get any allowance for the keeping?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; they were not kept on our lands, nor were they fed with our products. Mr. Bedson owns a tract of land near the penitentiary grounds, on which he kept them. The grounds which belong to the penitentiary and on which fodder can be procured, he has to account for every year, and he has to account for the produce every year. I forgot, when I was up before, to explain to the hon. member for South Oxford about the Army and Navy List. The library, for which these books were supplied, is an exceptional provision for Manitoba, under these circumstances: It is not a library for the prisoners at all; but, as he knows, the prison is on a reserve a long distance from any settlement, and it has within its borders the residences of all the officers, or nearly all. Our design is to make it the residence of all the officers. There is a small allowance for a library. It is a place of resort for the guards and keepers, and we have found it beneficial as affording them a place for agreeable and innocent recreation, and we have found it worth while to allow them the use of papers and magazines. A number of the officers, guards and keepers are ex-army men, and they have asked to be allowed to have the Army and Navy List. The 16 copies are not 16 copies of the same list, but they are the serial numbers of the Army List. I understand it is published monthly and these are 16 of the monthly parts. In answer to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) the drugs are not supplied by contract. The explanation which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gave is perfectly correct, and the outlay which was provided for in the expenditure of last year was largely caused by fitting up a hospital with those appliances. The hon. gentleman's answer is that the charges have been still greater than in former years. Admitting that, the hon. gentleman does not give us credit for any economy whatever, and for the fact that we got along with a smaller expenditure for drugs and still fitted up the new establishment. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I think, was not in the House when I made my explanation of a circumstance that would have relieved his apprehension that the feeding of the convicts was likely to cause a surfeit. I explained to the committee at an earlier stage that nearly 6,700 pounds of that meat which appears in the Auditor General's Report to have been furnished to the prison, was supplied to the officers and paid for by them, the amount being paid into the Receiver General's hands and not going immediately to the penitentiary account.



Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many officers are there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see the list in my report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the officers may be doing as badly as the convicts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will give them the right even in Manitoba to have wives and children, and they feed their wives and children on beef too. As regards the explanation which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said should have been embodied in the Auditor General's Report, I may state that, without an explanation of the statement, the Auditor General's statement is quite misleading, and no doubt from his zeal to lay proper accounts before this House he will avail himself of the opportunity, which my department will willingly furnish him, to state the stock in hand at the close of the fiscal year. If the Auditor General does not feel that that comes within the scope of his duties—and I have no control over him—I have arranged with my officials that there shall be an addendum to my report showing these details.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister expressed surprise that so much firewood was on hand, and I, therefore, assume he was not a party to the original purchase. I observe that Manitoba Penitentiary purchased 7,500 cords of firewood. Was that purchase made by tender, and, if so, was it previously authorised by the department? I observe that a reaper and binder were purchased for \$220. Was that one machine or two machines?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One machine.

Mr. MULOCK. In what year was it purchased?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. During 1887-88.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like the Minister to lay the voucher for that purchase on the Table, and also the tender for the firewood. I also observe that there were purchased three horses at a cost of \$700, or an average cost of \$233. Had the warden authority to purchase horses without the department's sanction?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister will lay the vouchers on the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The warden is not at liberty to make any such purchase without referring the matter to the department first. After enquiring as to the requisition consent was given that the warden should make the purchase. He was not limited as to the price, because it was impossible to tell the prices at which horses could be obtained there. I made enquiry in Winnipeg, when I was there some time ago, as to the reason for the prices that were paid. I was not only satisfied that we got ample value for the price, but I saw persons who made purchases from the same lot of horses which came in the same car and they gave equal prices for them, and they being perfectly credible persons assured me that it was a good purchase.

Mr. MULOCK. Horses in the same car are not always of the same value.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am aware of that.

British Columbia Penitentiary.....\$44,391

Mr. TROW. I observe an item: buggy, \$270, horse \$365. This item of \$635 is a most extraordinary figure to pay for a horse and buggy in British Columbia. It might probably be paid by some wealthy man in Victoria, but for penitentiary purposes it seems extraordinary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The buggy was purchased in Kingston and is for the use of the warden and the penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

tiary service. Such a buggy is allowed in all the Government penitentiaries.

Mr. KIRK. It must have been a buggy of better quality than those sent down to Prince Edward Island last year, and referred to by the hon. member for Leeds. Those could not have been worth \$250 each, or there would not have been much chance for selling them down there. I notice one or two other extraordinary items. There are 74 convicts in the institution, and I observe 164 hats were purchased for them last year, some of the hats costing \$4 each, and straw hats \$1.50. Surely it was an extraordinary quality of hat that cost the latter sum. I notice further that eggs cost 50 cents per dozen. This is an extraordinary price.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs when it would be convenient to have the Public Accounts Committee meet. I do not see the chairman here and he has been absent for some days. It is important that various papers, and so forth, should be brought down at a reasonable time. It would be late to send notices out now for tomorrow, but if it suits the convenience of the Government I think the committee ought to sit on Thursday.

Mr. FOSTER. The committee has met and organised, I believe.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all it has done.

Mr. BOWELL. I expect the chairman down. We intended to have a meeting on Thursday, but it was found that the room would be occupied and the committee has been called for Friday, the earliest time we could get the room for that purpose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 50) to amend the Act incorporating the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Marshall.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Lac Seul Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

#### COMMITTEE ON FRAUDULENT PRACTICES.

Mr. BROWN moved that five members constitute a quorum of the special committee appointed to enquire into fraudulent practices. He said: Though the members of the committee are very attentive to their duties, it happens occasionally that at the commencement of the sittings a sufficient number is not present, and it was thought better to reduce the number constituting a quorum, so that the work might not be delayed.

Mr. MULOCK. How many members are on that committee?

Mr. BROWN. Fifteen.

Mr. MULOCK. And it is proposed to limit the quorum to five. I do not think we can assent to that motion. The hon. gentleman has selected, I presume, fifteen members best qualified to deal with this important question, and yet not more than five can be found to give their attention to it. He will surely not make such a reflection on the other ten.

Mr. McMULLEN. A number of the members on that committee are on other important committees, and I quite endorse the action of the chairman in asking that the quorum be reduced to five. In that case a sufficient number to make a majority of the committee could attend, and the members could also attend to the other important committees at the same time.

Motion agreed to.

#### PROTECTION OF LABORERS.

Mr. PURCELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 53) to make provision for the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada. He said: The object of this Bill is to prevent workmen employed in railway construction from being defrauded. Many instances have occurred on the Intercolonial road and others in which the men who built these roads were cheated out of their wages, and it is high time something should be done to protect them. They ought to be given a lien on the charter. I know I shall be attacked in reference to this, but some provision should be made, when the charters are granted, to protect these men and prevent their being deprived of their pay. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who knows more in regard to that matter than I do, and have for many years. It may be said that, in Government contracts, there is a proviso which protects these men. That is true, but it is never put in force. I have seen many cases in which these men have had \$15 or \$25 or \$50 coming to them, but they would have to remain there after the sub-contractor had left, or it might be the third or fourth contractor, and then they might get \$5 for their claim, and the man who paid the \$5 might never get it back. These men were cheated out of their pay, while political influence was brought to bear so that these contractors should not be obliged to pay. It might take two years to do that, and what was the laboring man going to do in the meantime? He might have \$30 coming to him, and he would sell that out for \$5, and probably the man who paid the \$5 never got it back. This Bill does not interfere with the Local Governments. It is strictly a Dominion Act. I say that these men should get their pay, and that something should be done in the way of legislation to ensure their receiving payment for the work they do. It has been suggested by the best authorities that this Bill might be referred to a committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the explanations of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), and I am pleased to see that a man who was himself a workingman, and has risen from that position to a state of comparative affluence, has the courage to come here and to ask the House to protect the workmen from the iniquities of the capitalists, who get their share of the public moneys of the country, and the bonuses voted by Parliament. They come here and get a charter, and they make a raid on the public treasury for money to build their road, because they may happen to be on the Government side of the House. Then they sublet their contracts, and these sub-contractors employ the men, and it often happens—as it did in a notorious case last summer

—that the men do not get their pay. I trust that the representative of the laboring interest, the gentleman who has been returned here as the special representative of the laboring interest, will give the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) every support that he can in reference to this measure, which will secure to the workmen the proper security for the payment of the wages which they have honestly and hardily earned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships. He said: This Bill is largely founded upon the Bill which was introduced by my predecessor in office last Session, the chief difference being that this Bill does not contain those provisions which were in the former Bill regarding the detention of ships at the different ports. In this Bill, it is proposed to make the law more stringent in regard to the sending of unseaworthy ships to sea. The object of the Bill is, therefore, to make the present statute more closely resemble the provisions of the English Act from which that was taken. The provisions of this Bill in regard to the safety of ships is modelled more closely on the English Act, especially in regard to the amendments to the Merchant Shipping Act of 1876 and 1880. There is also taken from the Bill of last Session, which was not proceeded with, the provision of the English Act preventing the shifting of grain cargoes. There are one or two other provisions of minor importance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### MR. RUFUS STEPHENSON.

Mr. BRIEN asked, Whether Mr. Rufus Stephenson, late Inspector of Colonisation Societies, has been employed by the Government in any capacity since the 30th June last? If so, what were his duties? What was his salary? How much has he received, either as salary or travelling expenses, between the 30th June, 1883, and 1st day of February, 1889?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In November last Mr. Stephenson was asked to undertake the inspection of several colonies. The "Commercial," situated near Kinbrae; the "London Artisans" Colony, near Moosomin; and the Primitive Methodists, if time would permit of his visiting the latter. He was subsequently asked to inspect the "Church" Colony, near Churchbridge station, on the line of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. We have reports from him on all except the Methodist Colony. He is to be paid \$10 a day and travelling expenses. He has not received any salary between the above dates. \$500 was advanced to him on account of travelling expenses.

#### SAWDUST IN THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. COOK asked, Has the Government rescinded the Order in Council permitting the owners of lumber mills to throw sawdust and other refuse into the Ottawa River at the Chaudière Falls, and will such mill owners be permitted to throw sawdust and other refuse into the said river in future?

Mr. TUPPER. No Order in Council exists, permitting the owners of lumber mills to throw sawdust and other refuse as the hon. gentleman expresses it, into the Ottawa River at the Chaudière Falls. A proclamation was issued, based upon an Order in Council of the 17th April, 1885, exempting that part of the Ottawa River lying between the Chaudière Falls and McKay's Bay, from the operation of the "Act for the better protection of Navigable Streams

and Rivers," so far as regards sawdust only. The Government is at present awaiting the receipt of a report upon this whole subject, before deciding as to the future action to be taken in regard to it.

#### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, an amendment to the Controverted Elections Act, providing that the period allowed for contesting an election shall date from the day of the election or from some other uniform date for all the electoral districts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce such a measure this Session.

#### HENRY SMITH, CHATHAM, ONT.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether Henry Smith, of Chatham, Ont., has been in the employ of the Government, in any capacity, since the 30th June last? If so, in what capacity has he been employed, and what salary has been promised him; how much has been paid him for salary, and also travelling expenses, or for any other purpose from the said 30th day of June last to the 1st of February instant?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has not been in the employ of the Government since 30th June last.

#### LIGHTHOUSE IN THE RIVER ST. CLAIR.

Mr. MONCRIEFF asked, Is it the intention of the Government to erect one or more lighthouses on or near Stag Island, in the River St Clair?

Mr. TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to erect range lights in the village of Corunna, opposite Stag Island, to guide vessels clear of the shoals at the head of Stag Island, on the Corunna side, and those running off from the point above Corunna.

#### BONDING FOREIGN FISH.

Mr. EISENHAUER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make any change in the present system of bonding foreign fish? Has the Department of Customs received any petitions asking for a change in connection with the system of bonding foreign fish?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government is considering the question of changing the system of bonding foreign fish, which has prevailed since Confederation. Petitions of that character, which have been referred to, have been received.

#### IMPORTATION OF FRUITS AND SEEDS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BOYLE asked, 1. What is the value of our entire importations, from the United States, of green fruits, seeds, trees and other articles placed on the free list by an Order in Council dated 4th April, 1888, from such date until 1st January, 1889? 2. What amount of revenue would have been collected upon such importations if they had not been placed upon the free list? 3. What is the value of such importations from the United States for the corresponding period of the previous year, that is to say, from 4th April, 1887, to 1st January, 1888? 4. What is the value of our exports to the United States of these articles from 4th April, 1888, until 1st January, 1889, and what did they consist of?

Mr. BOWELL. 1. The value of our entire importations from the United States of green fruits, seeds, trees, and articles placed on the free list by Order in Council of the

Mr. TUPPER,

4th April, 1888, from that date to 1st January, 1889, is \$831,399. 2. The amount of revenue which would have been collected upon such importations if they had not been placed upon the free list, is \$219,636. 3. The value of such importations from the United States for the corresponding period of the previous year, that is to say, from the 4th April, 1887, to the 1st January, 1888, was \$493,153. 4. The value of our exports to the United States of those articles, from 4th April, 1888, until 1st January, 1889, is \$1,486,022, of which apples amounted to the sum of \$1,315,452; berries, \$80,000; seeds, &c., \$50,000; leaving \$40,570 for the smaller fruits.

#### JOHN COSGROVE, BUCKINGHAM, QUE.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Whether John Cosgrove, of Buckingham, P.Q., is still filling the office of Inspector of Weights and Measures, or any other position in the public service? If so, what is his salary, and when was he appointed? Are the Government aware that the aforesaid John Cosgrove was, not long ago, indicted before the Superior Court, at Aylmer, on a charge of obtaining money under false pretences? Are the Government aware that the said Cosgrove pleaded guilty to the indictment and suffered a term of imprisonment? Have the Government been informed that the said John Cosgrove has had his commission as a Justice of the Peace cancelled by the Provincial Government? If said Cosgrove is in the employ of the Government, is it the intention of the Government to retain him in his position?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. Mr. Cosgrove, of Buckingham, P.Q., is still filling the office of Assistant Inspector of Weights and Measures, not that of Inspector. 2. He was appointed February 6, 1886, at the minimum salary of \$500; it is now \$600. 3. The Government have no official information on these points. 4. A letter published by Judge Wurtele in the *Week*, of Toronto, in July last, relieves Mr. Cosgrove from the slightest suspicion of fraud or dishonesty. 5. The Government have no official information on this point. 6. Mr. Cosgrove will doubtless be continued in office so long as he continues to discharge his duty faithfully and willingly, as he has done since his appointment.

#### SALMON RIVERS OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. RINFRET, for Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec), asked, 1. Whether the Government is aware, that in consequence of the use of nets in the estuaries of the salmon rivers of the Province of Quebec, that fish must soon disappear from those rivers? 2. What are the rivers whose estuaries are now under lease, to whom do the leases belong, and when do they expire? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to renew the said leases when they expire; and would it not be better, in the interest of the public, to prohibit salmon fishing in the said estuaries for a few years?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government are not aware of the use of nets to an unreasonable extent in the estuaries of the salmon rivers of the Province of Quebec, and that in consequence of their use fish must soon disappear from those rivers. There is but one lease existing for any of the estuaries of the salmon rivers in the Province of Quebec, and that is the Matane River, which lease is held by Sir Alexander Galt for fly-fishing. This lease will expire in 1895. In regard to the last portion of the question, I may say that the Government have not decided formally as to any action they may take in regard to the estuaries' fishing in the future. Any action, however, in that direction will be taken with due regard to the salmon fisheries.

#### ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. RINFRET, for Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec), asked, 1. Whether a contract has been entered into with a view to

securing for Canada a line of rapid steamers to carry the mails by way of the St. Lawrence across the Atlantic ocean? 2. If so, with whom has such contract been made, for how many years, and for what annual subsidy? 3. When will the service commence, and what are to be the tonnage and speed of the steamers to be employed? 4. If no such contract has been made, is it their intention to award such contract, and when?

Mr. FOSTER. No contract has been entered into with a view to securing for Canada a line of rapid steamers to carry the mails, by way of the St. Lawrence, across the Atlantic ocean. The Government are now engaged in negotiations with that end in view.

#### OTTAWA EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, How much has the barn built at the experimental farm at Ottawa cost? Have any other outbuildings been put up? If any, at what cost? The number of residences built at the Ottawa experimental farm, and the cost of each?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to give notice of a motion covering the question, because the answer will be too long. If, however, the hon. gentleman will make the motion later on in the Session, it will, of course, be adopted by the Government, and the papers will be brought down immediately.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I desire that the question be changed to a notice of motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Make the motion now, without notice.

#### POST OFFICES.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Return showing the name of each post office built or under construction in Canada since the 31st December, 1878; the revenue and expenditure for salaries, forward and other allowances for rent, fuel and light of each office, for the year prior to the commencement of work on the respective offices; also showing the population of the place at which an office has been or is being built at the time the work was ordered to be done, and the cost of each office built, as well as the probable cost of those constructed.

He said: My object in asking for the papers called for in the motion is to see if I can ascertain from them the principles upon which the Government act in constructing the public buildings in the various constituencies in Canada. I have taken some little trouble to look over the blue-books, to see if I can ascertain what principle or rule the Government follow in building post offices at different places in the Dominion. I have been unable to deduce any general rule, or any general principle, upon which to form an opinion, and I think, therefore, it is necessary to bring down the papers, in order that we may, if possible, draw from them some definite conclusion in regard to this matter. I naturally assumed that public buildings would be constructed in the public interest, and as the public required them, and according to the population and revenue obtained at the respective places. Such, I find from my observations and enquiries, has not been the case. Possibly there is an explanation to give as to why this has been so, why places with less population and with less revenue than others have received large expenditures and valuable public buildings, while others possessing stronger reasons for having new public buildings have not received any consideration in that respect. I will call attention to a few instances that have come under my notice, in looking into this matter. I find that at Cayuga (in the county of Haldimand, a county of which hon. gentlemen have probably heard incidentally) a post office was built. The whole revenue is \$776.07. The salary received there

by the postmaster is \$400, and allowances, \$50. That I may assume to be a basis upon which the Government act in constructing public buildings. I believe the population of Cayuga to be about 800, but on that point I am open to correction. I assume that may be taken as a basis in ascertaining the principle and rule that is applied to other places. At Ayimer, where, I believe, a public building has been constructed, the post office income is \$1,345.70; salary of the postmaster, \$450, and allowances, \$168. At Montague Bridge, P.E.I.—for I desire to spread this statement over the different Provinces to ascertain whether the same rule applies to all—the income is \$682.65, the salary \$280, and \$100 allowances. At Georgetown, P.E.I. the income is \$657.93, the salary \$400 and the allowances \$140, and in St. Jérôme, P.Q., the income is \$1,248.36, salary \$450 and allowances \$180. I have not been able to ascertain accurately the population of those places last year, but they are no larger than the places which I now intend to bring before the notice of the Government in connection with the papers I am asking for. There are two places in the riding which I have the honor to represent, and there are also two places in the riding which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs represents, which are entitled to public buildings. In the village of Tweed the income for five quarters was \$1,329.75, the salary of the postmaster \$375, and the allowances \$25. In Madoc, in North Hastings, the income was \$2,218.44, the salary \$630 and the allowances \$180. In the village of Stirling, also in North Hastings, the income was \$1,521.59, the salary \$420, and the allowances \$72. In Deseronto, another town in the riding which I have the honor to represent, the income was \$3,864.74, the salary \$900, and the allowances \$140. The population of Tweed is about 800, of Madoc 2,000, of Stirling 1,000, and of Deseronto 3,500. I would like to know why these places have not been favored with public buildings, when the other places I have mentioned have received that consideration and recognition at the hands of the Government? I would like to know also, if I can find out, what peculiar claims these places have or had upon the Government, that are not possessed by the places to which I have referred? I hope and I believe that when this matter is brought to the attention of the Government they will decide to treat all alike, and if they can show any reason why those places should be treated better by getting public buildings than other places in Hastings, equally, if not better entitled to them, I would be glad to know. I may be mistaken slightly in the statistics I have given. The general figures I believe to be correct, as I have extracted them from the documents that have been returned to Parliament. We all like to see the county and the vicinity in which we live making reasonable progress, and it is an indication of the progress of the place, as well as an incentive to the people who live there, to push forward private enterprises, if they see the public are taking an interest in them. The erection of public buildings in any town or village gives, in my judgment, a great impetus to the enterprise of the people, and to the progress of the place. It certainly causes a large expenditure of money, and I think that all places in Canada should be treated alike by the Government. I do not propose to ask for extravagant expenditures in those places, nor that a large and magnificent building should be erected in each, but I hold that they should have public buildings in proportion to their size and importance, and sufficient for the accommodation of the public. I may add, in regard to Deseronto—without disparaging other places—that I do not know of any other place in the Dominion of Canada that has made, or that continues to make more material progress, or which is building up faster in proportion to its population. It is now an incorporated town; one of the greatest lumbering enterprises of the Dominion is situated there, and this establishment is carried on with the utmost skill and the greatest possible success, I am happy to say.

Railways have been built there which, to some extent, have been aided by the Government, and in addition to the prosperity indicated by the figures I have given, I may add that the revenue derived from customs in Deseronto alone is \$10,870. This is a strong additional reason why the claims of this place should be considered. I do not wish to be considered a fault finder, and my object is only to call the attention of the Government to these facts and to the advantages that have been given to other places not so well entitled to them when we consider the population and the income derived from the places I have mentioned. I wish to ascertain why we did not receive the same favors at the hands of the Government that other towns and other villages with less population, with less income and with less revenue from the customs have received, I have no doubt that when the Government ascertain these facts they will at once proceed to construct public buildings in the places I have mentioned. It may be said that some of the places to which I refer are county towns, but I find that towns and villages other than county towns have had public buildings erected for their benefit. Ingersoll and Clinton, for instance, and Montague Bridge, are not county towns. Without wearying the House with a discussion on this subject, I ask the Government to consider this matter and to put me in possession of the reasons why the wants of the people have not been supplied, and to inform me how soon the claims of the people will be met. I fully agree that the Government, in building up this country, ought to give public buildings to places entitled to them by reason of their population and the revenue they contribute to the public funds. I hope and trust that the Government will take this matter into consideration and give us public buildings at the places I have mentioned.

Mr. COOK. I notice by the Estimates this year that no appropriation is made for the post office in the town of Orillia. Some years ago, when the "Jamaica" car was travelling through the country, carrying the gentlemen who are sitting on the Treasury benches to-day—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Where is Orillia?

Mr. COOK. You will find out before I get through. You will make the discovery if you do not understand the geography of the country any better. But, of course, we understand that you are a lower Province man, and if you pay a little attention you will learn that Orillia is a town of 6,000 inhabitants which sends an intelligent representative to Parliament. You ought to know something about it. When the hon. the First Minister had the honor of visiting that town—and I consider it an honor—he took the opportunity of visiting its public buildings. The post office there is owned by a private gentleman. The Premier was kind enough to state that it was not sufficiently large for the town, that the town had to lease such accommodation, that it was necessary they should have a Government building for themselves, and that he would look into the matter, and would attend to the constructing of a post office building at that point. This was just before the election; it was an ante-election pledge. After the election the hon. gentleman forgot all about his promise, and the town council of Orillia, last year, passed a resolution appointing a deputation to visit the Government for the purpose of ascertaining whether they would not carry out their promise and put a sum in the Estimates for a post office. The gentleman appointed was my political opponent, Mr. Quinn. The council paid his expenses to come here to see whether the Government would accede to the request of the town. On his return he stated that he had the promise of the Government that the building should be constructed, and that a sum should be put in the Estimates for that purpose. But, up to this time, we have seen no indication of any intention on the part of the Government to carry out the pledge made by the Premier to the town in the first place, and afterwards by the Minister of

Mr. BURDETT.

Public Works to the deputation that waited upon him. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works particularly to this matter, because I believe he is a pretty fair man (although in mighty bad company), and wishes to do what is right, and would not intentionally deceive the gentleman who waited upon him. I wish to call his attention to the fact that that gentleman went back and stated to the town council in session that the Minister had absolutely promised that a sum of money should be put in the Estimates for the purpose of constructing that post office. That pledge, if made, has not been carried out, and I am anxious that my hon. friend should give me the reason. Orillia is a beautiful town of about 6,000 inhabitants, is splendidly lighted by electricity, and has waterworks and all the modern conveniences of a town of 20,000 inhabitants. That town deserves a public building. The Local Government have established some buildings in the neighborhood; they have an asylum for idiots, the only one of the kind in the Dominion, and I regret to say that it had to be enlarged.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Somebody has escaped.

Mr. COOK. Yes, some Tories have escaped. But, with all seriousness, I think the Government should attend to this matter. I really think it is a reflection on the Government that a town of the size and intelligence of the beautiful town of Orillia should be without a public building for a post office, when they spend \$8,000 or \$10,000 in erecting a post office at Cayuga for 800 people. Now, I am sure that the Minister of Public Works will take this matter into his very serious consideration, and will not allow one of his political friends to be duped in this way. I have no doubt he made the pledge, because I do not think the gentleman who waited upon him would utter an untruth, and I trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down they will show that the town of Orillia has not been overlooked.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad this matter has been brought up. In fact, I have myself a notice on the paper further down calculated to bring up the same discussion, but including buildings intended for the use of the Customs Department. It seems to be the proper thing in this discussion to point out how one's own locality is ill-treated in respect of the erection of these buildings, and I wish to say that there is a town in my own constituency very much better entitled to a post office than some which have been favored, and it has not one; I refer to the town of Ridgeway, a place of some thousands of population, I do not remember the exact figure, but, at all events, a much larger place than Cayuga or Amherstburg, and about the size of Stratroy, all of which have been favored. There is no doubt that if the Government enter upon a general system of erecting public buildings in small towns and villages, they ought to carry it out on the same lines everywhere, and erect public buildings in other places of equal importance to those which have them. I do not think much of the system myself; I do not think such small places as those that have been mentioned are entitled to public buildings; but when the Government have gone so far as to put a public building in a town like Cayuga, with only 800 population, they are stultifying themselves, and showing the reason that expenditure was incurred if they do not equally favor other places of equal size and importance. Now, I do not suppose that the Government are ready to admit that they erected that post office at Cayuga for the sole purpose of securing the election of Dr. Montague, especially since they did not succeed in securing his election; but they must either admit that or give similar favors to other towns. As my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) has pointed out, the construction of a post office in a town benefits the neighborhood, not only by the expenditure of the money which the building costs, but by giving the place a certain degree of importance, and inducing people to go there to

live and do business; so that it is doing a distinct favor to a place to put a public building there, and this favor should be granted equally, or else the intention to use the money voted for public buildings as a bribery fund must be frankly and fully admitted. The Government have only two alternatives. They must continue to construct public buildings in insignificant towns, in ridings represented by supporters of theirs, or where they hope to get supporters, and neglect large and important towns in Reform constituencies. They may continue to do that and admit by such continuance the reason of their conduct, or they may carry out the plan that they have entered upon of establishing a public building in every town and village equal in size and importance to those which have been already so favored. They must do one thing or the other; and unless they give public buildings to all other places of equal importance, they will have to confess the corrupt intent they had when they built post offices in such places as Cayuga. Not only is Cayuga a small place, but the revenue derived from the post office there is insignificant, the population being £00 people, and the revenue \$776.07. That is the revenue of a post office which has cost over \$ 0,000. In the town of Amherstburg, another place that has been favored with public buildings, the post office revenue was \$1,836. Amherstburg is a place of some notability, of course, but a place that has outlived its growth, that, as we would say in the west, has gone to seed, not increasing in population and wealth, and all sorts of business leaving it for the town of Windsor. Yet the Government have built this post office in the town of Amherstburg, for whatever purposes they had in their mind; I will not go further imputing motives than I have already gone. While these insignificant places have obtained post offices, the large and prosperous town of Bridgetown in my constituency, where last year there was a post office revenue of \$3,465—a revenue twice as large as that of Amherstburg and five times that of Cayuga—has been left without any such convenience. It is a neighborhood, as shown by the postal revenue, through which a great deal of postal matter passes, and where a great deal of postal accommodation is required. When my own motion comes up, I intend to show also that it deserves and requires additional accommodation for the office of the collector of customs, and that the two offices might very well be combined in one building, as has been done at St. Thomas and other places, and I intend to urge upon the Government the necessity and the propriety of doing justice to that town. I shall reserve any reference to the customs revenue and the customs building until I reach my own motion.

**Mr. LISTER.** Three years ago I moved for a return showing the post offices constructed by the Government since Confederation, the cost of each post office, the benefits derived from it, and the expenditure. I found, on looking over that return, that, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, the Government have constructed post offices and other public buildings in the most insignificant portions of those Provinces. I find that in the town from which the hon. the Minister of Finance comes, a post office was constructed shortly before the elections, although the town has but 300 or 400 inhabitants; and you cannot go over the list of towns in the other Provinces, notably the Province of Ontario, and notably in the places where post offices and other public buildings have been constructed or where it is proposed to erect public buildings, without being forced to the conclusion that the Government, no matter how honest they may profess to be, are guided by the intention of buying, so far as they can, the constituencies in which those buildings were constructed. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Burdett), if he lived in the west, we would call a little fresh, because, knowing the Government as well as he does, he must know that he cannot get a post office in Deseronto,

unless he turns round and supports the Government. He may console himself, however, with the fact that at the next election this side will have changed places with the other, and then we will have justice done to the town whose case the hon. gentleman has so ably put. There is Strathroy, an enterprising town of between 3,000 and 4,000 inhabitants. Previous to the last elections it was felt that Mr. Cameron ought to be defeated in that constituency, and the Government brought down, with lavish liberality, a vote for the construction of public buildings in the town of Strathroy; but I have yet to learn that that building has been constructed, or that the Government have even purchased the land on which to construct it. It seems that vote is intended to play Jack in the coming elections, as well as it did in the past. The same remark applies to West Middlesex (Mr. Roome). If the hon. member for that constituency can fool the people of West Middlesex in the way he has deceived them already, the electors of that county are more foolish than I give them credit for being. In Haldimand, which has so honorably returned its present member, which has resisted the blandishments of the Government, which has thrown back in their teeth the bribes they were offering to the people—the county in which, of all others, Tory money was spent with a lavish hand,—in that county we find, for the avowed purpose of purchasing the constituency, the Government erected a post office in the town of Cayuga. I do not object to that at all; if the people can get it, well and good; but it was built with the object of purchasing that constituency. When you come to consider the fact that the town has only 800 inhabitants, that its total revenue is but \$776, and its total expenditure for postmasters and other expenses \$490, leaving \$200 net revenue, and when you consider the fact that the Government has expended \$20,000 for the purpose of erecting a public building in that constituency, how can anyone believe that expenditure was not made for the purpose of bribing its independent electorate. Why was a post office promised to be built in Strathroy? Would the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) be here today were it not for that post office? He would not, and he will not be here at the next election, although he is a very decent man. He will be defeated. Then we find in Goderich, forming part of a constituency that was gerrymandered by the Government, a constituency for which, in spite of their gerrymandering, Mr. Cameron was elected; but just before the last elections the Government said: We will give Goderich a post office, and that will fix the thing all right. The Government promised Goderich a post office; they put a vote in the Estimates for that purpose; but I have yet to learn that a single brick has been put in the building, or that the excavation has been made, or the land purchased. Evidently the Government are going to make that card play also at the next election, but I tell them, although I do not profess to be a prophet, that at the next election Mr. Porter will be defeated in spite of the post office. If the Government are honest, why do they not go on and build those post offices?

**Mr. HESSON.** We have them.

**Mr. LISTER.** The hon. gentleman has a post office, and several sons in the public service, and he is well provided for. They have all their noses in the public crib, and, no doubt, draw all they can. My hon. friend is a good Conservative for revenue purposes. If the Government is honest in these votes for public buildings, why does not the Minister of Public Works go on with them? Everybody says he is an honest man; he looks honest. He is a man who looks as if he had an easy conscience. He is a good, strong, well-preserved man, and I believe he wants to do whatever is right, but there are other influences at work that will not permit him to do what is right. There are other influences

bearing on this which will not permit him to do what is right. If he wants to show the people that this is not a political election dodge, he ought to go to work and build these post offices. I suppose it is useless to talk very much about this matter, because it is evident what the intention of the Government is. There is no doubt a class of towns where these public buildings are necessary, where large revenues are collected from the customs house, the post office and other sources, and where these buildings ought to be erected, and where it would be true economy to erect them; and, if the Government would lay down the proposition that, so long as the revenue is sufficient to carry on these works, they would go on gradually and erect these public buildings in the places where they ought to be, fixing the limit of population or the limit of revenue which would entitle these places to have these buildings, they would do well; but, instead of that, it appears that the Government are absolutely regardless of these two important facts, and it seems that the only consideration they will take into account is as to whether the particular place which is to get a building will return a supporter of the Government by that means or not. You have given Strathroy a post office, and upon what principle? The total revenue was \$4,970, and the population was 3,000 odd. You have given Goderich a public building, upon what principle? Its population was between 4,000 and 5,000, and its revenue about \$5,000. If they are entitled to public buildings, how can you ignore the claims of Sarnia, with a population of nearly 7,000, and a post office revenue of \$8,817, besides being one of the ports of the Dominion which returned the largest amount of revenue from customs; a point where the mails are made up for the North-West; a point for the exchange of mails; and yet the Government feel it is consistent with that sense of propriety which actuates those hon. gentlemen that they can give public buildings to the smaller places throughout the country and ignore the larger places from which the revenue is returned. They build post offices and erect other buildings in places where the receipts can barely pay the expenses of the office, not taking into account the interest on the investment. Let the Government do what is right. Better late than never. Let the Government say that no town shall have a public building in the shape of a post office or a custom house unless it has a population of 10,000 or 5,000, or unless its receipts are \$10,000, \$15,000, or \$20,000; but let the Government stop this system, which is calculated, whether it is intended or not, to debauch the electorate of this country. It is in the interests of Canada and of the people of Canada that this system should be stopped. Let the whole matter be judged on its merits, and let the towns and cities whose revenue or whose population does not entitle them to these buildings be dealt with without reference to the gentlemen who happen to represent them. I do not charge the Government with not putting up these buildings because the places concerned are not represented by those who support them, but I say that the Government is open to that charge, because it is only on the verge of an election that we find these large amounts voted for such purposes. We find that promises are made to the people at that time which are not carried out and which never will be carried out. I hope my hon. friend will get his post office, but I object to the Government dangling it before the eyes of the electors until the next election. If he has any influence with the Government, he should work it up at once. Where the vote has been made, I think it is the duty of the Government to go on with the construction of the public building, and a rule should be laid down, where certain towns have a population or a revenue of a certain amount, that they should have public buildings, and that these public buildings should be erected so far as the public revenue will permit.

Mr. LISTER.

Mr. ROOME. The hon. gentleman has made assertions about Strathroy which are not true. He has stated that Strathroy has only 3,000 inhabitants. He knows that is not true. He knows that is false.

Mr. LISTER. I did not say so.

Mr. ROOME. The population of Strathroy is from 4,000 to 5,000. The hon. gentleman accused me of having been elected on the strength of the promise that that post office would be built. That is also false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ROOME. At the time I was selected as the candidate, there was no question of a post office being built. I succeeded in the election, but the hon. gentleman says I have no influence in the county.

Mr. LISTER. I did not say so.

Mr. ROOME. Perhaps I have no influence in the county. Unfortunately, I was unseated, and I went back for re-election, and I was re-elected by an increased majority; there was a majority for me outside of the town of Strathroy, and, therefore, the promise to build a post office in that town, if it had been made, could not have carried my election. I was first elected before anyone thought of a post office being built there, and I was elected, in the second place, by a majority outside of the town of Strathroy. A short time ago, when the question of a duty on coal oil came up, the hon. gentleman came out as a protectionist, because he knew that his chances of election were less than mine, and his majority has been coming down every year. I believe that my chances of re-election are as good if not better than his. He says that we are holding this over the voters in West Middlesex in view of another election. That is not so. I have had some difficulty in getting a suitable site for the post office. That difficulty has now been overcome, and I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works will erect a building which will be an ornament to the beautiful little town which we have in West Middlesex. I advocated the building of that post office because I thought it was right. I think it is the duty of the Government to erect public buildings in all the towns, whether in Middlesex or elsewhere, where the sum paid by the people towards the support of the Government is sufficient to pay the interest on the money required to provide the public buildings. With reference to the town of Sarnia, I have no objection to the Government building a post office there. Probably, after the next general election, my hon. friend will have a supporter from that county who will push his claims for that town, and the present member will be left at home.

Mr. PORTER. I am not at all concerned to defend the policy of the Government in reference to the erection of public buildings in the Dominion of Canada; the gentlemen on the Government benches are well qualified to defend themselves from any attack made upon them in that respect. I only rise to correct a misstatement of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). That gentleman was pleased to say that before the last election a post office was promised to the town of Goderich. I beg to assure that gentleman there was nothing of the sort. I can assure him that with reference to the erection of that building the gentlemen who asked for it and pressed the claims of that town upon the Government, were not personally concerned in it at all, they were not allied with my own party, and have never been at any time suspected of leaning towards the Conservative party; but they presented the claims of the town of Goderich so strongly and so forcibly before the Minister of Public Works, that he was obliged to admit that a public building in that town was necessary. When we know that the town of Goderich is a county town, beautifully situated on the shores of Lake Huron, containing customs

offices and inland revenue offices, and when we know that the Government have no public building in that town in which to carry on that work, I think we need not be at all surprised, nor need to attribute unworthy or improper motives to the Government because they made an appropriation for a building in that town. The town of Goderich itself, as the hon. gentleman has stated, gives a revenue of over \$5,000 a year; its population is nearly 5,000; it has not only a post office doing a very large business, but it is a distributing office, and I believe 14 offices are served from that town. So I think that it will be admitted at once that the Government have not at all overstepped the bounds of moderation or discretion in granting a post office to the town of Goderich. I have just another word to say. When the hon. gentleman talks of my re-election, he talks of something that he knows nothing about; and in taking that position and in making that announcement, he shows very clearly the nature of a character that the poet Moore once described—he is both “angur and bore.”

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I had very little sympathy with the accusation made on this side of the House, that the Government were erecting public buildings through the country purely for political reasons; but I am hardly convinced by the arguments of their supporters in defending them from such accusation. My hon. friend from Huron says that, after a statement was submitted to the Minister of Public Works showing the importance of the town of Goderich and the amount of receipts from the post office and customs, the Minister admitted that it was desirable that a public building should be erected in that town. I quite agree with him. I know the importance of the town, and I think that a town like Goderich or Strathroy, represented by my hon. friend for Middlesex, ought to have public buildings. But I believe that there should be some principle guiding the Government in the erection of public buildings throughout the country. I think the town of Woodstock, in the county which I have the honor to represent, is certainly entitled to consideration, if the statement be true that the Government, in the erection of public buildings, are guided by the amount of receipts that the people contribute to the Treasury. I desire to take this opportunity of pointing out to the Government that there is no other town in the Dominion of Canada which has a claim upon them for the erection of a public building equal to that of the town of Woodstock. I would also remark that if public buildings were only erected for political purposes it would be a waste of money to erect them in the county I represent, because it would make no difference to the people, politically, if the Government were to erect six public buildings in that county. Now, Sir, I do not complain of the Government having erected public buildings in the smaller towns referred to by other speakers, but I do claim that the town of Woodstock contributes a larger amount of revenue to the public Treasury than any of these towns that have been mentioned. Take, for instance, St. Catharines, Stratford, St. Thomas, and other places which have large and creditable public buildings; the town of Woodstock contributes a larger amount of revenue than any of these places. Now, Sir, if these places, on submitting their case to the Minister of Public Works, can convince him that they are entitled to some consideration, I think he cannot refuse the claims of Woodstock, when I point out to him the figures showing the importance of that town. The revenue from the post office in the town of Woodstock last year was \$13,760, more than was received from Stratford, St. Catharines or St. Thomas. The total revenue received from customs at Woodstock last year was \$66,000. I was pleased with the remarks of my hon. friend from Huron, when he said that the principle to be followed in the erection of public buildings should be the amount of revenue that would pay interest

upon the money expended. In the case of Woodstock I can make a much stronger claim than that. The revenue for a single year would not only pay the interest, but it would more than pay the whole amount required for erecting the public buildings which are really necessary for the purposes of the Government in that town. I think it is certainly strange that a large and prosperous commercial and manufacturing town like Woodstock receives no consideration from the Government in regard to the erection of public buildings, and I take this opportunity of placing these facts before the House and the Government. I desire to know whether such a principle as has been referred to is followed by them in the erection of public buildings? If the revenues received from customs and post offices are the guide in this matter, then the members of this House and the country will be able to judge of the claims of Woodstock; and if, as in the case stated by the hon. member for Huron, the Government can be convinced by representations, then I think Woodstock stands some chance, because I see that the municipal council and the board of trade of that important manufacturing and commercial centre of western Ontario, have been taking the matter up, and intend to memorialise the Government and lay the figures before them.

Mr. HESSON. I am quite in accord with the tone of the remarks of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I live in an adjoining municipality, and I know he has simply stated what is the absolute fact with respect to the growth of the town, and although it is true that it has not always been represented by a supporter of the Government, my hon. friend has made such appeal to the Minister and to the Government that it cannot be fairly overlooked in the event of the Government carrying out the policy, they some time ago adopted, of erecting public buildings in important and growing towns. With regard to the city I represent, it is true we have a public building there, and I think we obtained it none too soon. We have the very best evidence of that in the fact of the very extraordinary growth of the city, a growth not only in population and in wealth, but also in revenue. The hon. gentleman spoke of revenue not being properly the basis on which the Government undertook these works. Well, it may not be the whole basis; it may be possible that the influence of gentlemen surrounding them and the pressure brought to bear on them have some effect in many of the cases, but, nevertheless, so far as the revenue collected in Stratford is concerned, they have ample justification in the fact that the receipts have largely increased since the accommodation was afforded there. Something like \$120,000 is collected in the Government building, which has been found to be of prime importance for the post office, for the post office inspector of the division, and for other public purposes. I can say for Woodstock, that I quite fall in with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, because he has made them, as he always makes them, in the most kindly, straightforward and impartial manner; but I cannot, I am sorry to say, speak in the same terms of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who spoke in the most unfriendly and unkind manner, and who most improperly and indecently dragged in extraneous matter which has nothing to do with the question before the House. I happened, as is my custom, to throw a little remark across the House and I happened to raise my head, and he thereupon referred to me as having two sons in the public service. I am not ashamed that I have two sons in the public service earning honestly their pay; they are a credit to me and perform useful service to the Government. I am satisfied that the officers who report upon their duties are able to report well in regard to them, and they are very inefficiently paid for the services they render. But the hon. gentleman is very uncourteous



and very uncouth in making such a remark, and it is simply on a piece with the hon. gentleman's usual character in this House. He attacks the Government and makes insinuations regarding their motives such as should not be uttered by honest and respectable men. I dare say that he knows what the action of his party will be if they attain seats on this side of the House; indeed, I understood him to say that they would know how to manage these things when they came into power. The hon. gentleman is probably the last who should rise in this House and pose as one of the purest and most conscientious of men, because we have not forgotten the position he took in a matter in which he was interested, when the question of the duty on oil was under consideration. He then found it necessary to make a strong speech against the policy of his own party, and take a position which accorded with his own selfish interests and his own selfish views.

Mr. LISTER I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. gentleman were courteous to the members of the Government, and members of the House, he would succeed, not only in obtaining as much fair play as other hon. gentlemen, but in securing the respect and kindly feeling of all hon. members as well. I do not wish that hon. gentleman to suppose for one moment that I would be ungenerous enough to say that his town was not entitled to a post office. I have another, and a very large and prosperous town in my own county, for which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made a claim some little time ago, that is, the town of Listowel. I feel that towns of that size and prosperity should be recognised in this progressive day. If the Government have money at their disposal, they should, in all cases where the public interests demand, erect public buildings; but the hon. gentleman will not accomplish much for his county while he is so uncourteous to the Government, and hurls most uncourteous remarks against members on this side of the House and leaders of the Government. That is not the way he is going to succeed; at all events, he will not get the support of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to aid him in accomplishing what he wants in that direction. On the other hand, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) spoke in such a kind and sympathetic way as to entitle him to the full confidence of the House, and in pressing his request, he did so, not in an unkind manner, but rather as a matter of fair play on the part of the Government, and he hoped that they would consider these questions outside of political influences. That hon. gentleman had the decency to put the matter in that way, but the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) took just the other course, and brought forward all sorts of illustrations, and imputed all sorts of reasons for the Government's action.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he has two sons in the public service and he is not ashamed of them, in fact he is proud of them, and he says they are discharging their duties well in the public interest and are doing essentially a public service. If the hon. gentleman entertains that feeling with respect to the matter, I do not see why he should be so indignant with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) for mentioning it. Why, if the hon. gentleman's mention of the matter of these two sons being in the public service was a discourteous and unfriendly and an offensive act, surely the hon. gentleman's real feeling with regard to the matter could hardly be what he has expressed. Why, many of us would never have known the fact.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman imported it into the debate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman himself imported it into the debate.

Mr. HESSON.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman rather offensively interrupted my hon. friend when he was speaking, and my hon. friend answered that interruption. Now, the hon. gentleman who has told us he has two sons in the public service, declares it was offensive on the part of my hon. friend to give him an opportunity of mentioning this fact for the gratification of the House. Except for this opportunity offered to the hon. gentleman to inform the House in regard to this matter, many of us might have remained ignorant in regard to it. We might never have known what important services these young gentlemen perform in the interest of the country, and how much obligation we are under to him and them for their services, if the hon. gentleman had not given the House the information he has furnished. That being the case, I do not think the hon. gentleman has anything of which to complain. On the contrary, he should be highly pleased with the opportunity my hon. friend gave him to make the statement. I do not take altogether the view of this public building matter which has been expressed by the hon. gentleman. I say the conduct of the Government has been so uniformly one way, there has been such an absence of all exceptions from that uniform action of the Government, as to leave no doubt in the minds of hon. members as to the policy they pursue and the motives which have led to that policy. We were informed by the Minister of Customs, last year, that the Government were building post offices and erecting other buildings with a view to strengthening the hands of their friends in constituencies that return members to support them. That was the declaration made by the Minister of Customs last year, and the hon. gentleman undertook to justify it by stating that it was the universal practice of every Government. I think that was a mistake, and I do not think there was any foundation for that statement. I think, when we look at what was done by the predecessors of the Government in office, we will find that no such rule was adopted, but that the rule which my hon. friends on the other side have said, to-day, would be a good rule, was followed—that of erecting public buildings in the larger centres of the population when the revenue derived from the post office or other sources justified such an expenditure. That was the rule which was adopted and invariably pursued by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was at the head of public affairs in this country. When we look at the expenditure of public moneys on these different public buildings, we will see that there is no regard paid to any such rule by the present Administration. We find the Minister of Public Works engaged in the erection of public buildings in places where the revenue will not pay the interest upon the cost of the work. There are numerous instances of that sort which were considered here last year, and one case where, I think, if I remember rightly, in the constituency of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) important public buildings were erected in a place where the revenue was less than \$500 and where the population was less than 1,000. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who has spoke on that side, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter), have said that it was right and proper that the Government should be informed with regard to these matters. Does any one for a moment suppose that the Minister of Public Works or any of his colleagues are ignorant with regard to the population of the town of Woodstock, of the amount of revenue derived from the post office of that town, or of the amount of moneys that are being collected in the form of excise and customs duties in that town? Does any one suppose that any member of the Government does not know what has been the revenue from Ingersoll and from Wallaceburg and other places in the western portion of this Province. Is it necessary that a deputation should come from those localities to wait upon the Minister to give him that information which he can

find in the blue-books of the department over which he presides, or in the blue-books of the departments of his colleagues. There can be no doubt with regard to the matter. The hon. gentleman is not ignorant, for if he were he would be totally unfit to occupy the position which he holds. But he prostitutes the public position which he holds to the promotion of the interests of his party. The proper rule to adopt is to look at the population and then to look at the revenues derived from the place, and see whether the revenues warranted such an expenditure, before the public buildings are erected. The rule should be uniform. This House itself should lay down the rule by which the action of the Government shall be regulated and by which that action should be restrained, but, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows right well that we have expenditure of public moneys in cases which are notoriously insignificant, and we have important places where those public buildings are really requisite, left without them. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) stated to the House that the question of a post office at Strathroy was not discussed at the last general election, and, if I understood him rightly, that it was not discussed even at the bye-election held since. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot have visited Strathroy, and he cannot have known what was said and done there. Does the hon. gentleman not know that at the last general election at the town of Strathroy the question of the post office was discussed, and does he not know that a majority of something like fifty was changed into a minority for the Opposition candidate, in consequence of the promise and expectation of a post office being erected there. If he does not know that, I will venture to say that he is almost the only elector in that constituency who has not such information. The hon. gentleman says he was not elected by the vote in Strathroy, but, Sir, he was preserved from defeat by Strathroy. The hon. gentleman knows that if the vote of Strathroy had been at the last election what it was in the election in which he was defeated he would not have been here. The hon. gentleman knows that in the election before the last that he had a majority outside of Strathroy, but he was defeated because the town of Strathroy went against him. Now the town of Strathroy went in his favor, and what worked this revolution? Was it the National Policy, which had been discussed over and over again for years and years, or was it that the hon. gentleman had become a citizen of Strathroy, for he still resides at Newbury?

Mr. LISTER. He promised to become a citizen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think that promise exercised very much influence, because, although some parties would be anxious to secure so popular a gentleman as the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) in Strathroy, after all, I do not think it governed their political action very much. The promise of the post office was a wholly different thing; it converted a majority of Reform votes into a majority of supporters of my hon. friend, and he is here to-day in consequence of these great expectations that were excited. How long that may be kept alive by the promise of the post office, I cannot say. I know there was a great deal of difficulty about the site, and that not all the supporters of the Government quite agreed as to where that post office should be erected. The hon. gentleman has told us that he (not the Minister), but "he" had a good deal of difficulty in determining where the post office should be located. I suppose he has determined that now. I suppose the Minister of Public Works has delegated to him that important duty, and that he accepts the conclusion at which my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) has arrived. All this goes to show how much the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are abusing their public position. Those gentlemen are the trustees of the public at

large, the moneys which they control are the moneys of the people; they are not the moneys of the Conservative party; they are not the moneys of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches. No. These gentlemen are trustees for the public, and they do not discharge that trust properly when they undertake to punish a part of the public for returning members who are not supporters of the Administration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We never do that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says they never do that, but the Minister of Customs, last year, said they did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You misunderstood him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not misunderstand him at all, and if the right hon. gentleman has any doubt about the accuracy of my statement, I shall send to the library for *Hansard* and read the statement made by his colleague. How is it there is no post office in the town of Woodstock? How is it there is none in the town of Ingersoll?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good time coming.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is it there is nothing done in the town of Peterboro'? How is it that there has been nothing done in the town of Sarnia? How is it that there has been nothing done in the town of Wallaceburg? There are other places which I might name, but I need not go over the whole list, because if I did I might as well send for the directory. I only mention those places which have during the past ten years returned opponents of the Administration. There is not a place which has returned a supporter of the Administration, unless it has an overwhelming majority of Government supporters, that has not had a public building erected out of the public moneys of Canada.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Perth, Smith's Falls, Carleton Place.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the hon. gentleman complaining?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). No, I am just mentioning those places which have not post offices.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. gentleman knows that is a county which you could not drive away from the support of the Administration. I said, any place of which there was any doubt. Why, Sir, there could be no doubt as to those places; the hon. gentleman could not be here if there was any doubt. Then, I might name the county of Carleton as a constituency devoted to the hon. Prime Minister. But look at any one of those constituencies which have returned opponents of the Administration. Has the hon. gentleman laid down a rule that when the postal or customs revenue exceeds a certain amount, he shall erect a public building there? No, Sir, there has been no such rule to direct his conduct, and the Administration have taken possession of the public treasury, and have used the public moneys to promote their party interests. I say there has been a gross abuse of the powers the hon. gentlemen possessed. They have had committed to them an important public trust, and they have violated that trust in every particular. They have disregarded the public interest, and have looked solely to the interest of their party; and it is because they have done that, that we find a large portion of the public money used in the erection of buildings which are altogether unnecessary, and the erection of which has not been justified by the public necessities or by the amount of revenue collected.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I wish to say a few words before this motion is carried. I find in the last annual report of the Minister of Public Works an item of \$53.75 for repairs to the post office at Lunenburg last

year, and I rather think that it must be a mistake, because the hon. Minister well knows that there is no post office there. A site was purchased there two years ago, but no public building was erected upon it, and it is still lying idle, and is really of considerable disadvantage to the town. If the Government had not purchased that site, it probably would be very soon now offered for public sale, because its owner has since died, and there would be competition for its purchase. It is in the centre of the town, and stores or other buildings would be erected upon it if the lots could be obtained by persons desiring them; but it is lying idle and paying no taxes. Now, I think the Government have admitted the necessity of a public building in the town of Lunenburg by purchasing a site, and therefore I think it is quite unnecessary for me to say anything to show the importance of the place or the necessity of such a building. Whether the Government purchased the site only for political purposes, as some of my friends on this side of the House say was their object, I do not know. If they did, their action did not take very well; and if they are now punishing the people of Lunenburg for not returning their man, that will not take either. The people of Lunenburg are not made of that kind of stuff. But, apart from that, I wish to urge the necessity of this building being erected. The customs business, the postal business, and other public business is being attended to in Lunenburg in private buildings; but the Government must be thoroughly convinced of the great progress and increase of business that have taken place in that town, and I would therefore urge that they make provision for this building in the Supplementary Estimates which have yet to be brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, whatever the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gets credit for, it cannot reasonably be for his constituency. The first portion of his speech was taken up with abuse of the Government for putting up public buildings in constituencies where some influence might be exercised over the electors to induce them to return Government supporters to this House; another portion was taken up in the endeavor to prove that buildings were put up only in constituencies which returned supporters of the Government; and in the last portion the hon. gentleman was blaming the Government for not erecting buildings in constituencies represented by opponents. If the first part of his speech is right, the last part is wrong. If the Government are to be condemned for putting up buildings in constituencies which had not hitherto returned supporters, why condemn them for putting up buildings in constituencies which had sent supporters? The hon. gentleman asks, can you name a town which returned a supporter of the Government where these public buildings have not been put up? I can name the town of Owen Sound, the town of Meaford in East Grey, and the town of Collingwood.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Who represented Owen Sound in the last Parliament?

Mr. SPROULE. It was represented by a supporter of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; Mr. Allan was not a supporter of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. An opponent of the Government. Well, if the intention of the Government, in erecting buildings, has been to induce the electors to change their views and vote for the Government, you would naturally expect to find the Government building a post office there; but they did not do so, although that is a town which to-day has over 8,000 population. Then, I may take the town of Collingwood, and the same argument would apply with equal force there. But I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. It is not the size of the town or its population which determines

Mr. EISENHAUER.

the erection of a building, but whether the Government have suitable provision for carrying on the business in that town, without too great an expense to the country. In some of those towns there are private buildings available at low rents, and that makes it possible for the Government to use those buildings and not incur the expense of erecting new buildings for the purpose. But in other towns where leased buildings are not available, and where the insecurity is such that other buildings are necessary, then the Government are compelled to incur these expenses. I think that is one of the principles which govern them in erecting these buildings. But I arose more particularly to draw the attention of the House to the fact that if the arguments in the first part of the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell were correct, the arguments in the last part were wrong, and if the arguments in the last part were correct, then the arguments in the first part were wrong, because the two parts are diametrically opposed to each other, and cannot be reconciled by any fair principle of reasoning.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the attention of the House to a place where the receipts of the post office were only \$1,269.76. That place is St. Jérôme, in Terrebonne, the constituency of the hon. the Secretary of State. Now, I suppose there is no place in this Dominion where there is less reason for erecting a public building, but simply because the Secretary of State wanted to do a kindness to his own constituency, he secured the ear of the Minister of Public Works, and the erection of a post office was proceeded with in that village, where there was nothing at all to warrant the expenditure of money for that purpose. The Government were only paying an annual rent of \$60 for the use of a building. The salary of the postmaster was \$480; and yet in a miserable, insignificant place such as that, simply because it is in the constituency of the Secretary of State, the Government have granted money to construct a post office which will cost the country \$20,000; and this despite the fact that there are over 100 places throughout the Dominion with more than double the receipts which have no post offices. I must say I am rather surprised that hon. gentlemen who support the Government are willing to swallow such doses as this, and which was nothing but a barefaced political job. I quite agree with the remarks that have fallen from a number of hon. gentlemen with regard to the necessity of laying down a rule by which the erection of public buildings in the different trade centres throughout the Dominion should be followed. My impression is that once a place grows to the extent of having a population of 4,000 or 5,000 or 3,000 and an annual revenue exceeding a fixed sum, the Government should be called upon and be by law obliged to erect a public building for the purposes of a post office in that place, but so long as the Government are permitted to act as they have acted in the past, so long will their course be dictated by political patronage, without regard to the wants and the means of the constituencies. I am rather surprised that the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) should have sat quietly in his seat when this motion for the erection of a post office in St. Jérôme was proposed, in view of the fact that in his constituency there are two enterprising towns, the towns of Meaford and Collingwood, each with a postal revenue of \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, which have no such public buildings. I am surprised that while these towns were passed over, he should have sanctioned, without protest, the expenditure of money for a post office in the small village of St. Jérôme. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) made some remarks with regard to my mentioning the town of Listowel. Well, that is a very prosperous trade centre. The post office receipts there last year were nearly \$4,000, and I cannot understand why my hon. friend should have silently sanctioned a grant for the building of a post office in St. Jérôme, with its miserable

annual receipts of \$1,269, when he knew there was a town in his own riding with annual receipts of \$4,000, which was better entitled to a post office. Hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently quite prepared to keep their mouths forever closed at the bidding of their leaders, but when they can present an argument likely to answer a political purpose they are all ready to speak.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as my knowledge goes, the inferences that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) draws from the fact that I sat quietly in my seat are entirely wrong. I have taken some little trouble to look into the matter, and the conclusion I come to is this: Good, suitable buildings were available in all these places at a small cost. The rent paid for them would not meet the interest on the outlay which would have to be incurred in erecting buildings. Therefore I thought the Government acted wisely in using these buildings, when they could get suitable ones without any trouble, and for a smaller rental than the interest would come to on the cost of erecting new post offices and custom houses.

Mr. WATSON. I have no doubt the hon. the Minister of Public Works is making notes of all the custom houses and post offices that are required throughout the Dominion, and the chances are that in a short time all towns with fair receipts from post offices will be provided with suitable and handsome buildings. I happen to have a town of considerable importance in my constituency, the town of Portage la Prairie, the people of which have applied to the Government for a post office, and have offered a free site on which to erect it. Portage la Prairie has a revenue exceeded by few towns in Ontario, the receipts being something in the neighborhood of \$5,000. It is the terminus of the Manitoba and North-West Railway, and a building erected there for the purposes of a custom house and post office would be a very great convenience. At present the custom house is situated in one end of the freight shed of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at a considerable distance from the post office, which occasions considerable inconvenience to people who receive parcels from the United States through the customs. I would urge upon the hon. the Minister of Public Works to make a note of that particular town, and when he has a little surplus, supply us with the building of which we are greatly in need.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very much pleased that hon. gentlemen opposite have given the Government, and myself in particular, so much valuable information about the different towns in their respective counties. I will certainly treasure up this information, and I hope some day to be in a position to do the needful. But hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that everything cannot be done in a day. London was not built in a day, and all these public buildings cannot be erected in one day or year. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) drew my special attention to the town of Orillia, and stated that a deputation from that town had visited me and that I had received it very well. That is perfectly true, and also that I had promised to submit the matter to my colleagues in order that the item might be put in the Estimates. Well, the hon. gentleman was kind enough to pay me some compliments for which I am very thankful; but, on the other hand, I must say that I fulfilled my promise to the letter. I laid the matter before my colleagues, as I do every year, all the requisitions for public buildings or other works. All these matters were submitted to the Council, including the petition of the town of Orillia; but I am sorry to say that when the Estimates came before the Council a great many items were not to be found, and the grant to Orillia was one of the missing. So far as I am concerned, I did what I could, but I am responsible with my colleagues for the circumstance that Orillia did not come out. I hope that something more will be done some day to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen

all round. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) was kind enough to allude to the different items put in the Estimates during the last two years for public buildings, and he expressed the wish that we should go on with these buildings, but he was not sure that his wish would be fulfilled. The intention of the Government is to expend such a portion of the votes passed by Parliament as may be required as we go on year after year, but sometimes we may find that the revenues of the country are not so abundant as to warrant the expenditure of these sums, and therefore we delay somewhat the expenditure of that money. Nevertheless, my intention, with the consent of my colleagues, is that we should proceed with the erection of these buildings as fast as possible. Hon. gentlemen have spoken of different buildings in different towns, and have stated that some of these towns had a larger population, or a larger revenue from the post office, than others where buildings had been erected. That is perfectly possible, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen gave proper figures; but they must see that we have not only to look to the revenue from post office or from customs, or to the population of a town, but that we have also to see whether a town, though there may not yet be a public building erected there, has sufficient accommodation which may be used for a year or two, or three, or four, or five years more, because that accommodation is sufficient for the time being. I admit that in some cases it is not so, and I have no doubt that, the attention of the Government having been called to a number of these towns by hon. members on both sides of the House, these cases will be considered by the Government and will not fail to receive their best decision. On the other hand, there are some cases where contracts have been made with the postmaster, and sometimes he has erected a building of his own for which we pay rent. It would be very cruel to him to destroy the prospects which he had in view when he erected the building. However, hon. gentlemen may be assured that all these matters will not be lost sight of. There may be rules to be followed, but it is very difficult to say that if you have a population of so much or a revenue of so much, you must have a public building. Hon. gentlemen will see that in many cases that rule would not work properly in the interests of the Dominion. I will not review all the remarks of hon. gentlemen, but I will ask the mover of this motion to amend it by substituting for the words 31st December, 1878, the words 1st July, 1874. With that amendment, I have no objection to the adoption of the motion.

Mr. TROW. I have been somewhat encouraged by the statements of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. It was not my intention to rise on this occasion, but the encouragement I have received from the statement of the Minister, that he will take all these applications into consideration and will erect these buildings in different places, leaves me no excuse to give a silent vote. There is evidently a system of log-rolling adopted in this matter by members on both sides of the House. My extreme modesty has kept me back from asking any special favors from any Government, even when the Mackenzie Government was in power, and no hon. gentleman on the other side or on this side can say that I ever asked for any special favor. However, there is a little town in my riding which is called St. Mary's. It is beautifully located. The Minister of Agriculture knows the situation well. The material for the construction of public buildings there is unsurpassed. We are prepared to give a magnificent site, and furnish the stone, and do all we can in order to have a post office in that town. I think we are entitled to it. Our revenue from the post office is on the verge of \$5,000, but this matter has never been brought to the attention of the Government or talked of. I have not brought it up myself before, but I hope the Minister, after the con-

session he has made, will not forget the important town of St. Mary's.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps the Minister will have the returns from Confederation. That would be valuable, from a historical point of view.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to make the date the 1st July, 1867.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### NORTH-WEST REBELLION—9TH BATTALION.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg the indulgence of the House for the remarks I may make in introducing the motion of which I have given notice. My object is to put before the House and the country the full history of the events which took place in the campaign in the North-West, concerning more particularly the west wing of the army, comprising the 9th Battalion, the 65th, and one regiment from Winnipeg. I want the official documents to be laid before the public, so that everybody will have his just share, either of praise or of blame. It has been asserted that the services of the 9th Battalion were not asked, and that I alone had offered his services to go to the North-West. Under ordinary circumstances I could see no harm on the part of a soldier, or an officer, offering his services to his country, but in the peculiar circumstances under which the rebellion broke out, I think it was not to be presumed, it would be almost extraordinary if I had offered my services to go and fight in the North-West. Well, I have with me a document, of which I am sure the Government somewhere have a copy, which proves that I did not offer my services. I could not refuse to go, being a soldier, and war having begun, I could not refuse my services. I could have remained here in the House, entrenching myself behind my parliamentary privileges; but that course would not have been worthy of the position I occupy in the battalion. You remember, Mr. Speaker, the excitement that prevailed all over the country on receiving the news from the North-West, the massacre of white men there, and the great fear that prevailed of a general destruction of our fellow-countrymen in the North-West. Then my officers assembled at Quebec and wired to me in the following terms :

"To Col. AMYOT.

"Officers of the 9th assembled here, request me to enquire from you if there is any probability of being called out.

"T. ROY,

"Lt.-Col. Commanding."

Well, I crossed the floor and showed the telegram to the Minister of Militia. He then told me that he wanted some French battalions to join the army, as he desired to prove that our French nationality, forming a part of the Dominion of Canada, was to be found, in the moment of danger, beside the rest of the population; he wanted to prove that the French element were as loyal and patriotic as the rest of the Canadian people, and he told me that it was most probable that he would call upon us, and that we should keep ourselves ready. I immediately wired to my senior major, Lt.-Col. Roy :

"To Lt.-Col. T. ROY.

"Probably called out. Do you prefer called now, to be in readiness, or only on the eve of starting?"

"G. AMYOT."

Then, the next day I left Ottawa, having received orders to go to the front, and, arriving at Quebec, I ascertained a fact to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia. I found that the battalion had none of the equipments which were necessary in order to go to the front—no boots, no stockings, no camp kettles, in fact, none of those things necessary for a soldier. I must say that the

Mr. TROW.

department, in view of the absence of these requisites, did its very best to secure them. Telegrams were exchanged between Col. Panet, Col. Roy and myself. The following telegram was sent :

"OTTAWA, 31st March, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. THOS. ROY.

"Yes, purchase boots for battalion at \$2 50. Have accounts sent to me.

"C. E. PANET."

Then, on the same day to myself :

"OTTAWA, 1st April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT.

"Purchase boots for battalion at \$2.50. Credit sent to-day to Lampson to pay them, and also pay of battalion for one week in advance. Get your pay-sheets ready.

"C. E. PANET."

I may say at once that Mr. Panet is the Deputy Minister of Militia who, during the whole campaign, had done his utmost to assist the force. His activity was indefatigable. He is an old and experienced officer, and a great credit to the Canadian Militia. Then the following telegrams were exchanged :

"OTTAWA, 1st April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT, Quebec,

"Orders have been sent to Duchesnay to give you all you want. If anything more wanted apply through him and notify me if any delay.

"C. E. PANET."

"OTTAWA, 1st April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,

"Have telegraphed to buy your boots. Duchesnay has been directed to see that you get articles required.

"C. E. PANET."

"OTTAWA, 1st April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT, Quebec.

"Let me know when you will be ready to start. I am anxious that you should be ahead of Montreal regiment. Answer.

"A. P. CARON."

"OTTAWA, 2nd April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,

"Do not delay for supplies. Whatever is deficient will be forwarded to you.

"A. P. CARON."

You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that we had been ordered out, I think, on the 31st March, and this was the 2nd April. Then :

"OTTAWA, 2nd April, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT,

"Revolvers are not furnished by Government. You should hurry to leave. Trains are all right.

"A. P. CARON."

"OTTAWA, 2nd April, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT, Quebec.

Delois going with you as Surgeon, he is authorized to purchase what is required to fill medicine chest. Instruments will be forwarded from here. I am anxious that you should show how rapidly a Quebec regiment can move. Hurry up.

"A. P. CARON."

Then we left on the 2nd April, having been ordered out on the 31st March.

"OTTAWA, 3rd April, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,

On coming train, Calumet. Will have trousers and everything you asked for ready at station for you.

"C. E. PANET."

Mr. Speaker, here is : first, the proof that we did not offer our services, but that we were called out, and we did not refuse them; secondly, it appears by these telegrams, that the troops were not yet provided with the necessary outfit, and I think that the Minister of Militia will benefit by that experience, and will see that for the future the troops are provided with what they need when they start for the front. The medicine chest we could only obtain when at Calgary. We managed, though, to procure here and there what we needed, but that is not the way that things should be managed in the regular service. I do not attach any blame to the Minister for that; he followed the

custom prevailing for many years in Canada. But we should benefit by the experience, and in case of emergency, the troops should not be found in such a state again. On the 3rd of April, I received a telegram from the Minister of Militia, in the following terms. It was in French, and I translate it:

"I congratulate you upon the quickness with which you and your battalion have answered to the call, and prepared your departure for the North-West.

"A. P. CARON."

Then on the 9th of April I received another telegram from the Deputy Minister of Militia, in the following terms:

"OTTAWA, 9th April, 1885.

"Lt.-Col. AMYOT,

"Minister and I am glad to hear you have done so well. News from west better. General telegraphs everything going on well.

"C. E. PANET."

I will not speak here of the journey from Ottawa, I may say from Carleton Place, to Winnipeg; at least I will not go into details, but I think I may affirm that every man of the battalion proved himself most worthy of his corps, and endured all the hardships and miseries with the greatest patience, and proved himself an honor to the force. When we arrived at Calgary I received the following telegram:—

"WINNIPEG, 12th April, 1885.

"Colonel AMYOT,

On special.

The General orders all troops to remain here awaiting orders. You will go into camp.

"W. H. JACKSON, Lt.-Col."

I immediately answered by telegram:

"Telegram received. We are proceeding."

On arriving at Winnipeg, we went into camp. I must say that the location selected was not an exceedingly good one; on the contrary, it was in a swamp, and my soldiers literally had to sleep in the water.

#### RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the cost of the barn built at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa; whether any other buildings have been put up; if any, at what cost; the number of residences built at the Ottawa Experimental Farm, and the cost of each.

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

#### After Recess.

#### ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 16,

Mr. TROW. I think there should be running powers over this line given to other companies. This company, under this Bill, will have a monopoly of the whole coal business of the country, and for coal which costs them about \$1 per ton at the mine, they charge, when laid down in Calgary, \$3 per ton, while it could not have cost the company \$3. I repeat that other companies should have running powers over the line, and that we should not allow this great monopoly to make such exorbitant charges to the people of the country who require the coal. I should like to have some explanation on this point, and should like to hear from the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, whether he is prepared to allow some amendment to be incorporated in the Bill, by which other railway companies would have running powers over the line, in order to prevent those exorbitant charges to be made for coal, which is absolutely necessary to the people there, as there is no timber available.

Mr. SHANLY. I never heard any accusation of extravagant charges being made by the company. The line belongs to this coal mining company, and they will be simply running over their own line. They do not connect with Calgary by their own line, at all events.

Mr. TROW. You are obtaining a connection with Montana, and you want to unite with the Canadian Pacific at Dunmore.

Mr. SHANLY. We are asking power to go to the frontier in order to secure the southern market.

Mr. TROW. Is it reasonable that coal produced at the mouth of the mine, and costing there probably something less than \$1 a ton, should be charged \$3.50 per ton after it has been carried a few miles to Calgary?

Mr. SHANLY. It is 200 miles to Calgary, not a few miles from the mine, and I believe the coal costs a good deal more than \$1 at the mine's mouth. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he states—wherever he got his information he certainly got it incorrectly—that it costs only \$1 a ton at the mouth of the mine.

Mr. TROW. No matter what it costs, the company carry similar coal 700 miles to Winnipeg and sell it at the same price as when they carry it 200 miles. They have a monopoly of the whole coal business of that country.

Mr. SHANLY. An hon. gentleman who knows the North-West well informs me that it is 300 miles from Dunmore to Calgary. So that it is nearly 500 miles from the mine to Calgary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would consent to amend the Bill by providing that the charges should not be more than a fixed maximum price per ton per mile.

Mr. SHANLY. The Government have the power to fix those charges. An application could be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to fix rates. If the tariff was extravagant the appeal would lie.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The tariff is to be fixed by the Governor in Council. I understand that the line is to be operated by the company which owns the mines. If that be the case, there is no reason why a foreign company should have the right to run over the railway. These matters are all regulated by the provisions of the Railway Act, which enables us to regulate the tariff of rates.

Mr. BARRON. I think to compel people to go to the Government for relief against overcharges is not a satisfactory remedy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the position exactly; they have no right to enforce a tariff, or to reform one, without coming to the Railway Committee first.

Mr. BARRON. If the Railway Committee settle the charges, all I can say is that in the neighborhood in which I live they must fix very high charges, because there is great complaint in my part of the country that the railways charge excessive amounts to individuals. Those individuals, one by one, cannot complain to the Government. It is too much trouble and too much expense on any one person, and I think that there should be some special clause in this Act providing against a monopoly such as my hon. friend behind me seems to think exists.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have had an opportunity of visiting the coal mines of the Alberta Coal Mining Company, and of passing over the railway they have built from Dunmore to Lethbridge. Any gentleman who has visited that locality and has given attention to the large amount of money that that company has expended in the construction of that road, which runs through a country that is almost totally uninhabited, and which has no trade except

what is derived from the carriage of coal, any one who looks at the large amount of capital that has been expended in developing the coal mines at Lethbridge, and who has knowledge of all the circumstances in connection with the opening of those coal mines and the difficulties the gentlemen engaged in that enterprise have had to encounter, would not deny them the privilege of obtaining a larger market such as they are likely to get under the operation of this Bill now before the committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And of the desirability of extending our business relations with the United States.

Mr. SHANLY. Quite true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite true.

Mr. SHANLY. I would say that the great effect of this road has been to destroy the coal monopoly in Winnipeg and all along the line. It has not only done that, but it has gone a long way towards solving the problem of settling the North-West. It supplies fuel all along the Canadian Pacific Railway, and is held, and properly held by the settlers in the North-West, to be the greatest boon that could be possibly conferred upon them. We should remember that this boon is conferred upon the people there by gentlemen who found their own capital, who asked no assistance whatever from us, and who are doing their own work.

Mr. EDGAR. When this Bill came before the Railway Committee I thought it was the best solution for the evils existing in the North-West when the monopoly clauses were in force there. This railway is one of the first fruits of the removal of the monopoly clauses, and of allowing the North-West to make connection with the other side of the line. In that respect I think it is a great boon to the country and that it will enable the people of that whole section to have the closest commercial relations that the law will allow with the United States. I congratulate the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that they have so warmly supported this measure. In some respects it would be better if, perhaps, we could arrange that other railways which might hereafter exist should have running powers over this road, but I think that is a small matter compared with the great triumph the people of the North-West have achieved in being able to connect with the American railway system and to develop their country as this Bill will allow them to do.

Mr. TISDALE. I am surprised that there should be any objection at all from gentlemen on the opposite side of the House to a Bill like this, especially when we heard it stated in the Railway Committee that men had the capital ready to build it in that unsettled region. Let me tell them that in the Territories of Montana and Wyoming, the authorities, instead of trying to tie up railways and restrict them, actually go the length of giving them powers to make additional charges over the regular railway charges in the United States. Those Territories give the railway companies power to charge five cents a mile, as compared with two or three cents a mile, which is the highest charge allowed in some of the States for passengers, and they have also adopted the idea that the railways in these comparatively unsettled Territories should have additional facilities and powers in regulating their freight traffic. If there was ever a case in which a railway should be encouraged by this Parliament, this is one. At present we have no railroads to develop the traffic in that district, and there is only one railroad in the whole section—the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here is a project by gentlemen who have actually the capital themselves to carry it through. They have a market in Montana, where the people want the coal; and I guarantee that in Montana Territory they would be given the power to charge six cents a mile if they wanted it, and to charge anything they could get upon freight.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

There are few people in that district at present, and how are the railways to live except by the freight traffic? I only wonder that the company succeeded in raising the capital. It is all very well in this part of the country, or in the older States of the Union, or the older Provinces here, to restrict the railroads, for there is no doubt that they need watching; but surely up there where there are no railroads, and where gentlemen have been found with capital to build this line, and have also found the people of Montana ready to take the products of the coal mines, they should have all the fair encouragement possible from this Parliament. This Bill was thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee yesterday morning, and there was no objection whatever to it. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) went thoroughly into the details, and we all agreed, under the special circumstances of the case, and the fact that it was going to open up a coal trade and to develop the coal mines, that the object of the Bill should be encouraged. As some gentlemen remarked it will have the effect of counteracting any monopoly in coal—if there is a monopoly—in the North-West. If you hamper that bill you may destroy the project altogether. You know the difficulty of getting capitalists in the old country to take up a project like this—for we have to go to the old country to get our capital—and we know how jealous they are of restrictions of that sort. If you cripple this enterprise you will probably cause the abandoning of it altogether. This is an exceptional case, and if there ever was an instance in which a railroad should go untrammelled of restrictions it is the present one. For my part I can say that, even if the company asked extra powers of charging, I would support it under the circumstances. This line is opening up a traffic between the great Territories of the United States and our North-West. They need the products that we have, and we need some of theirs. Surely the gentlemen who oppose have not fully considered the circumstances surrounding it, and if they had heard the explanations we had in the Railway Committee yesterday they would not take such a course. I hope there will be no further objection raised to an enterprise of this character.

Mr. TROW. I think this company has been very well encouraged already. The fact of the matter is that Sir A. T. Galt and his servants were paid by this House for the explorations of these coal lands, and this in the first place was quite improper. It would be further improper for us to allow this company to block up that entire territory. Can any one of the gentlemen who support this Bill tell me the extent of territory they control under their charter? They have the whole district from Medicine Hat to the boundary, and under this Bill they can block out every other enterprise. All we ask is that running powers should be given to other companies to carry the coal from their mines. They can mine their own coal and get the profit of the proceeds, but let other companies have the privilege, if they have the enterprise, to carry coal to Winnipeg, and the poor settlers all along the road for a thousand miles can be supplied at a reasonable rate. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) stating that the matter was thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee, because it was not. As a member of that committee I can say that there are half a dozen professional men on the front benches of the Railway Committee who always have a monopoly of the discussion. In every Bill of that kind that comes before the committee a half dozen men on the front benches seem to wish to monopolise the whole discussion and if any one on the back benches says a word they apparently resent it. I tell you there has been not a free discussion on this Bill in the Railway Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the object the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has in view is already guarded. I understand that this railway will con-

next with the Canadian Pacific Railway about 100 miles from Calgary, and the hon. gentleman's object is undoubtedly to prevent excessive rates being charged for the delivery of coal from the mines at points along the Canadian Pacific Railway. He desires to attain that object by providing for running powers over this railway. There is, as he well knows, no railway in competition with it now; there is no railway company in existence which can desire to run over its lines; and the hon. gentleman seeks to prevent a monopoly for all time to come in the way of running powers. He will see, if he turns to the Railway Act of last Session, that all those subjects are dealt with by that Act in such a way that this Bill, without any provision at all on the subject, is made subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee in respect to those matters. First, tolls and rates for the transportation of passengers and freight; next, the adjustment of such tolls and rates between companies; next, running powers or haulage; and then traffic arrangements. The object of the Railway Act of last Session was to prevent the necessity of incorporating such provisions in every Bill brought forward.

Mr. TROW. If the General Railway Act protects the public from imposition, I am perfectly satisfied; but I think the Government should enforce that Act and not allow this company to take 100 per cent. profit from the inhabitants of Calgary for carrying coal over their line.

Mr. SHANLY. I am surprised that the hon. member for South Perth, who has been so much in the North-West, and understands its geography as well, perhaps, as any member in this House and better than most of us, should not know that this Lethbridge Coal Mine Company does not deliver coal in Calgary or in Winnipeg. It has only a short road connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and cannot control the freight charges to Calgary or Winnipeg. The Bill merely asks power for the existing company to extend its line to go to the United States frontier, to connect with roads in Montana, and to do to the south what hitherto it has been doing to the north, sending coal to its junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company asks to be allowed to expend their own money in supplying the country with coal, and if there is any grievance as to freights, you must, as the hon. Minister of Justice has said, fall back on the Railway Act or attack the larger corporations, and not try to prevent this short branch line from extending its business and expending its own money in its efforts to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I sympathise very much with the views of the hon. member for South Perth, and I agree with the general principle he has laid down, that whenever this House gives a charter to any corporation, it should provide that the public interests shall be properly served and protected. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, has stated that this is provided for in the General Railway Act passed last Session. If that is so, that obviates the difficulty; but this House has a perfect right, in granting a charter—because in doing so it is granting privileges—and has a perfect right to dictate what those privileges shall be, and under what conditions they shall be granted. Therefore, the hon. member for South Perth is perfectly right in calling attention to the interests of the people of the North-West in connection with their supply of coal. But I must say, that I think this is a Bill which we ought to pass. These people have gone into that country and spent their money, and no doubt when they went there it was a speculation that might turn out profitably or not, as the country might settle up and the mines develop, or might not, to their satisfaction. We have already granted a charter authorising this company to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and while I agree with my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Shanly), that they cannot control in their entirety the rates to Calgary or Winnipeg, they

have certainly the power to control them to a certain extent. But we have granted a charter to this corporation, and they are now asking simply authority to extend their line to the boundary so as to open up a new market to the south; and I do not think we should stand in the way of that enterprise, however desirable it is to protect the public interest, and I agree that we should always do so. But we have to take into account the character and remoteness and every circumstance surrounding the enterprise, and we should deal with it in such a way as will enable the company to carry out an enterprise which to say the least of it many of us thought of a very doubtful character a few years ago. Therefore, however much I sympathise with the hon. member for Perth, I think this House ought to pass the Bill.

Mr. TROW. I have no objection to its passing with certain restrictions. The hon. member for South Grenville says that this road will carry no coal to Calgary or Winnipeg; but the company makes a bargain with John Brown, of Winnipeg, or John Smith, of Calgary, and in making their contracts they make a profit on the carriage of the coal.

Mr. SHANLY. Does my hon. friend hold that it is wrong to make a profit?

Mr. TROW. Not 100 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another important element in granting this charter which should not be lost sight of. The present railway which, as I understand, is about 100 miles long, is a narrow gauge railway, so that the cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot run over it. This necessitates a transshipment of every ton of coal brought to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The present Bill contemplates the widening of that gauge so as to enable the cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any railway, to go to the mines and take the coal from there direct. We know the disadvantage of narrow gauge railways, and if there were no other consideration than that, I think hon. members would see the necessity of passing this Bill, because it will bring about a reduction in the cost of coal from \$1 to 50 cents per ton. In addition to that, I understand that these gentlemen have already contracted for the sale of a very large quantity of coal south of the boundary line; and since that railway has been completed they can take the coal south of the line, where there is a market ready for it, and obtain speedy returns. They have shown a great deal of enterprise in originating that project, and are showing additional courage and enterprise to-day in widening the gauge of that 100 miles of road, and making it the standard road that all others can run over.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems to me there is a difficulty lying far back, and one that will render virtually useless any condition this House may impose in the railway charter. If I understand the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) correctly, he stated at the outset that every foot of coal lands in that locality belonged to this railway company who is asking for a charter under this Bill. In the name of common sense, I would ask what is the use of giving any other railway company running powers into that territory when there is not a single pound of coal which they can get hold of. Any condition of that kind which we can impose will not affect the price of coal one single *iota*. The one hope which the people of Calgary, and the other places mentioned have of a reduction in the price of coal, lies in the opening up of competing coal mines in other quarters. I agree with the hon. member for Northumberland that this company has a monopoly of that territory with which we cannot interfere. They have shown great pluck and perseverance in opening up the railway to their mines, and have now a prospect of a



market to the other side, and the least this House can do is to give them an extension of their charter.

**Mr. DALY.** Coming from the Province of Manitoba, I may be permitted to say something in reference to this question, although I do so with considerable hesitation, as, I understand, from previous discussions, that there are hon. gentlemen from the other Provinces here who know more about our affairs than we do ourselves. The most important feature in connection with this Bill is this, that the present gauge of the railway is a narrow gauge, and owing to the fact that some two years ago there were very severe snow storms between Lethbridge and Dunmore, the company were not able to fulfil their contracts in Manitoba to supply the towns there with coal. Therefore, in order to keep up the supply, they had to build large sheds at Dunmore on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in consequence of this fact and of the line being a narrow gauge one, the people of Manitoba are to-day paying 50 cents to \$1 per ton more than they would if the line were a broad gauge road. I hope sincerely therefore that no party effort will be put forward to defeat this measure. I did not hear the whole of the speech of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). I understand that what he wants is to give the people, who are getting the coal out of the mines, as cheap rates as possible. In Manitoba almost the only bituminous coal used there is the coal from the mine commonly known as the Galt mine, and we are paying for this coal 50 cents to \$1 per ton more than we would if the road were a broad instead of a narrow gauge one. I trust, therefore, that this bill will be allowed to pass, in order that a reduction in the price of coal may be obtained.

Committee rose and reported.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** When shall this Bill be read the third time?

**Mr. MITCHELL.** We have got into the practice the last two or three Sessions of giving second and third readings of Bills on the same day, and it is only fair we should now begin by adhering to the Rule the House has adopted of not reading a Bill the second and the third time on the same day.

**Mr. SPROULE** When a Bill is reported without any amendment, it may be read the third time immediately after the second reading.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** Third reading to-morrow.

#### KOOTENAY AND ATHABASCA RAILWAY CO.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 15) respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.— (Mr. Mara.)

(In the Committee.)

**Mr. EDGAR.** Before the first clause is adopted, I think an amendment should be inserted. The Committee will observe that by the first clause the railway company charter is absolutely repealed, and then the Bill goes on to create a new company under the same name. Well, we have never, that I can recollect in railway legislation, annihilated one corporation and created another in its place without carrying forward to the new corporation the liabilities of the old one. I am sure that the hon. the Minister of Justice will recognise that this is invariably the custom, and I think we should put in a section at the end of clause one to that effect.

**Mr. MARA.** When I tell the hon. gentleman there are no liabilities, the House will agree it is not necessary such a clause should be inserted.

**Mr. EDGAR.** The very fact that the hon. gentleman says there are no liabilities shows the amendment cannot do  
**Mr. ARMSTRONG.**

any harm to the new company, and the Minister of Justice must admit that it would be establishing a very dangerous precedent to allow legislation of this kind to pass without amendment. I move in amendment to this clause that the following words be added:—

Provided that all the liabilities of the company incorporated by the Act hereby repealed shall become the liabilities of the company hereby incorporated, and any action pending against the company repealed may be continued against the company hereby incorporated.

**Mr. MARA.** The hon. gentleman is quite right when he states that when there is no liability, the clause suggested can do no harm. In one sense it cannot. It can do no harm in the Dominion of Canada. But this company is not in the position of the former one, its bonds have not been floated, and you are asking us to insert a clause which will create doubt and suspicion as to its standing. Even if there were any doubt of the statement I have made, and I have made it on the assurances given me by the company, the last Act will convince the House that the former company had no right to incur corporate debts or liabilities. The Act now being repealed gave the company no such power. You will find by clause 22 that the Act could not come into force until proclaimed by the Governor in Council. But the Governor never by Order in Council brought the Act into force, and therefore it is merely waste paper. There are really no corporate liabilities, and when the hon. gentleman sees that, I think he will withdraw his motion.

**Mr. EDGAR.** If the company never had a corporate existence, and if the hon. the Minister of Justice will vouch for that, the circumstances will be quite different. But if the company had any corporate existence at all, and we never heard before it had not, then undoubtedly it should have a protecting clause of this kind in.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** There is no doubt but that what the hon. gentleman has just said is perfectly true. This House ought not to pass a Bill such as this, where there is a possibility of liabilities having existed. I can quite see, from what the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill states, that, if this House can be assured that there are no corporate liabilities, it will facilitate their financial transactions. If they have any such liabilities, that will cause difficulties at the outset, and that should be provided for in such a way that the legislation should not be of a hasty character, and should not do a positive injustice.

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** I quite agree with the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that no charter should be repealed without ample provision being made for carrying forward the existing liabilities of the company. I find, however, that this Act simply enabled the Governor in Council to give the charter to the company by proclamation, and, unless that proclamation was made, the charter had no effect. They now propose to repeal that Act, and give the company a parliamentary charter.

**Mr. EDGAR.** Does the Minister of Justice think it is clear that the charter is a dead letter, that the original company have no power to incur liabilities?

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** Yes, they never had a charter at all. The Act says that it shall not come into force until it is proclaimed by the Governor in Council.

**Mr. BARRON.** I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that, though the Act was never proclaimed by the Governor in Council, the promoters might have incurred liabilities. Though they could not in their corporate condition admit any claim, they might have incurred claims as promoters.

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** Not as a company.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** Are the present corporators the same as the original promoters?

**Mr. MARA.** All but two,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The company never having had any existence, it could not have any liabilities, and we have no system in this country by which a company can be made responsible for the liabilities incurred by the promoters.

Amendment withdrawn.

Committee rose and reported.

### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

### CENTRAL COUNTIES RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. EDWARDS moved second reading of Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Central Counties Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. That Bill is only printed in one language.

Mr. MITCHELL. You have allowed two other Bills to go through which are only printed in one language.

Mr. SPROULE. Those were printed in English, and we could read them, but this is printed in French, and we cannot read it.

Mr. BERGIN. I object to this Bill being read until it is printed in both languages.

### MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. COLBY moved second reading of Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). There is a very serious objection to this Bill, and I doubt whether it is in the jurisdiction of this House. The railway in question was incorporated originally by a Bill passed by the Legislature of Quebec, and the line in question is entirely within the limits of the Province of Quebec. It is true that at the frontier the line is connected with the Pasumpsic River Railway, but the line itself is entirely within the Province of Quebec. The hon. member will recollect that the old charter was granted by the Legislature of Quebec somewhere about 1869-70, and I do not see how this Parliament can amend that Act.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. member is quite in error with regard to the incorporation of this railway. It was incorporated either two or three years ago by the Dominion of Canada, and was declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. He must be thinking of some other road of a similar name.

Mr. LANGELIER. The name is exactly similar to the name of a railway which was incorporated in 1869-70 by the Legislature of Quebec. I am positive of that; it will be found on the statutes of Quebec.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. member is equally in error in that particular. The name is not identical. The former name was the Massawippi Valley Railway; this is a road to connect with the Massawippi Valley Railway, and it is called the Massawippi Junction Railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not admit, nor do I think there is any decision to warrant, the conclusion that because this Parliament declares a railway to be for the general advantage of Canada, therefore it is exclusively within the jurisdiction of this House. I do not think that it requires a great deal of consideration of section 92 of the British North America Act to see that our right to legislate upon the subject of railways arises simply from our declaration that they are for the general advantage of Canada. That sub-section must be read to mean that the public works that are undertaken to be constructed under it are of the same class and character as those in the two preceding sub-sections. Now, it requires very little consideration of the two previous sub-sections to see that we have no right to undertake to incorporate a railway or any other public work, or undertake to control it, unless it extends beyond the limits of the Province, or is in some way necessary to carry on the trade or commerce of Canada with a foreign country. Sub-sections *a* and *b* show that it is only works of this sort that are supposed to be dealt with; then under sub-section *c* it is declared that although the work may be wholly situated within the Province, it may nevertheless be a work for the general advantage of Canada. Certainly a canal connecting Lake Ontario with Lake Huron would be a work of that character; it would be wholly situated within the Province of Ontario, nevertheless it would establish a continuous line of navigation extending beyond the limits of the Province, and so a railway, although wholly situated within a Province, may be a connecting link which, when completed, will make a public work extending beyond the limits of the Province, and which, though a portion of it was constructed, would yet come within sub-sections *a* or *b*. I understand that at the time the British North America Act was under consideration, this sub-section was suggested by the proposal to construct a canal to connect the Bay of Fundy with the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It was said that such a work would be beyond the financial power of the Province of Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, and that it would be a work wholly within the limits of a Province, and for the construction of which no provision would be made at the expense of the Dominion, and then sub-section *c* was inserted for the purpose of covering a provision exactly of that sort. Now, I am of opinion that the legislation that we have had in this direction has been usurped legislation, that we have gone upon wrong lines ever since 1883, when, by a general measure, we undertook to declare that almost every railway that was constructed, or that by any possibility could be constructed within the Dominion of Canada, was for the general advantage of Canada. Because we have made that declaration we assume that it settles the question, that we have no right to enquire into the reasonableness of the proposition. I am of opinion, speaking as a member of this House, that this is an erroneous interpretation of the Act, and that we are simply creating difficulties for the future by undertaking to legislate on a series of measures which are properly within the purview of a Province. It does seem to me that what has been said by the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill, shows that it ought to be relegated to the Province.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that the Bill be read the second time and referred to a committee, on the understanding that the usual rule shall prevail, that the House is not at all committed to the Bill by that course. It does not appear on the face of the Bill that it is beyond our powers. It is a Bill to amend a statute of this Parliament. I understand there exists a fact which would remove the hon. gentleman's objection entirely, namely, that the Bill proposes to confer upon this company power to connect it with a foreign company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled "An Act respecting cruelty to animals." He said: When I introduced this Bill I gave a brief explanation of it, and promised to enlarge on the second reading, which I now do. The Bill is to make such further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, as is not already provided for by law. The greatest care has been taken in the preparation of this Bill. I desire to offer an explanation which will perhaps relieve the minds of some hon. members of a misapprehension. The Bill which was first introduced last Session, and which was prepared under the sanction and the assistance of the various humane societies in Canada contained clauses that were supposed to be covered by the existing laws. These were eliminated and the Bill reprinted, and it is on the reprinted Bill that I shall now address the House. Some hon. gentlemen have been forming their opinions in relation to this Bill with reference to certain clauses in the first Bill introduced, such as clipping horses and docking their tails; such clauses, however, are not in the present Bill. The main object of the present measure is to prevent trap shooting of pigeons and small birds, cock-fighting, dog fighting and baiting or anything of that debasing character, and to punish not only, as the old law provided, the man who kept a cocking main, but also all and sundry who shall be gathered at that cock fight or dog-fight and be parties to the disgraceful proceedings, and not allow them to go scott free while punishing the man only who owned the cocking main. The object is to punish all and sundry who are connected with so called sport. The object of the Bill, as I have said, is simply to enlarge the power to punish those who are guilty of cruelty to dumb animals. The measure, I beg leave to say, is of great public concern. Petitions in its favor have been sent by the humane societies of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton, representing many thousands of good and kind hearted people, men and women, in all those large cities, and I have to-day received a telegram from Hamilton stating that a very large petition is on its way to this House in favor of the passage of this Bill. I believe every true hearted sportsman in Canada will support this Bill. I know some objections will be pressed against this measure by one or two hon. gentlemen, and which objections emanating from some of the gun clubs of Canada; but I venture the assertion that if the members of gun clubs individually were consulted they would say that the object of these trap shooting tournaments could be attained as well by shooting at clay pigeons. The idea of calling such a meeting a tournament is a misapplication of the word. We were taught that in a tournament a man met another man worthy of his steel, but in these debasing sports a man stands within comparatively a short distance of a defenceless bird let out of a trap, and shoots it in the most cruel manner. I venture to say that not an hon. gentleman, not even those who will oppose this Bill, would take his child to witness one of these shooting matches and think that by doing so he was educating his child to give encouragement to a manly sport. He knows it would have a bad influence, and he would take care not to take his child there. Not many years have elapsed, sixty I think, since humane societies were first established in England and they have since spread all over the country. The object of such a society is to protect those who cannot protect themselves. A dumb animal is as sensitive to pain as any hon. gentleman here, and every dumb animal is sensitive to fear just as man is, and as these animals tend to make our lives happy so we as humane people should do all we can to treat

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

them with humanity? The St. Hubert's Gun Club in Ottawa is perhaps the most important and influential club in Canada, and is composed of men with as much humanity as any body of men in this country. I venture to make this assertion, and if I am wrong, I challenge contradiction, that if the members of that club were asked the object they had in view in holding their sports, they would say it was for the purposes of marksmanship, and very few of those gentlemen would fail to declare that they could obtain the same sport from shooting at clay pigeons as in shooting at live birds, that the sport was as good or even better; and that they are perfectly willing to support a measure of this kind and obtain all the practice they want at shooting clay pigeons, which are now provided and made in this vicinity. I have a higher authority still. One of the best authorities on this continent is Captain Bogardus, and he says:

"I have had as much experience as any man of my age at game and pigeons, perhaps as much as any man living, and I know by my own shooting that when a man, shooting according to my rules at balls thrown from my traps, can break two-thirds of the latter, he can shoot birds in the field whether he has been accustomed to shoot on the wing or not. I know several gentlemen who have been following my instructions in glass ball shooting and have become real crack shots. They say they have learned more last summer about shooting on the wing than they ever knew before."

That is the opinion of the highest authority in the United States. I have here the evidence taken before a committee in Massachusetts, and it is scarcely necessary to read it to this House to show that the trap shooting of pigeons and small birds is cruel and barbarous, not consistent with the genius of the times, and that all over the world it is being discountenanced. The Queen, who lives in the hearts of her people, has discountenanced trap shooting in the most determined manner. She has not only discountenanced it, but she has refused invitations on behalf of any of the royal family to be present at the great shooting matches in England, and the Princess of Wales has also discountenanced the practice and will not attend any of such meetings. Let me read to the House a statement to show the position which Her Majesty the Queen has taken. Her Majesty in an address in July, 1887, on the anniversary of the Royal Humane Society of which she is not only the patron but of which she has been a generous and influential member for over 20 years, uttered these memorable words, words which should be written in letters of gold and should be taught in every school in the land. She said:

"No civilisation is complete which does not include the dumb and defenceless of God's creatures within the sphere of charity and mercy."

These are the words of the Queen of Great Britain, and I am sure there is not a mother there or here who does not entertain the sentiment so uttered, and who does not believe that the worst training their children could receive would be to take them to those cruel sports of which I am now speaking. I know that a majority of the hon. gentlemen of this House have a sympathy with this measure and I am satisfied that when it comes to receive the vote of this Parliament—if it should come to a vote—that it will receive a generous support. I do not propose to come before this House without data, and substantial facts in support of the Bill. I hold in my hand letters from men who before the clay pigeon was introduced were members of organisations and clubs where the live birds were shot, but now when a more humane method—and a method which can give them all the opportunities they require for marksmanship, is provided, they declare that the true sportsman, who is a humane man, gives a chance to the bird and the animal in the open field and is not like the man who seeks to box poor defenceless birds and shoot them from a trap. Those birds are sometimes brought from great distances and during the journey they are often cruelly treated. The poor innocent creatures are then let out from the traps and shot down. Those true

sportsmen, in letters which I will read to you now, state that they have abandoned their connection with clubs which refused to adopt the clay pigeon and who continue to shoot at live birds. Here is a letter which I will read from a man who from his remarks is a true sportsman :

" OTTAWA, 27th March, 1888.

" MY DEAR SIR,—Having quite accidentally heard that you were decidedly against the very barbarous pastime of trap shooting of land pigeons, I venture to express my views as a sportsman, and I sincerely hope that the time is not far distant when shooting pigeons from a trap will be classed as an act of cruelty and be punished severely. No matter what place the match takes place in, it disgraces it and the people who take part in the game. In the first place the birds are kept in a small box, crowded and suffocating and are often kept there for days; they are then taken from their prison and placed in the trap, and when released are often so weak from their cruel imprisonment that they can hardly leave the trap, and when not killed outright go off with small pellets of shot driven home nearly to the vitals, sometimes minus both legs and have to keep on the wing until completely tired out, they fall on the snow a quivering, fluttering, bleeding, mild-eyed specimen of God's handiwork. The often urged excuse that it gives the sportsman good practice, enabling him to kill game birds more accurately, is false. As if a sportsman accustoms himself to pigeon shooting, it spoils him for duck and snipe shooting as their flight is so dissimilar, besides the new flying targets are now considered by all true sportsmen to be much better objects to shoot at for practice, as they go quicker, and they, of course, compel the gunner to take a more rapid aim.

" The targets I have referred to are clay pigeons, Peoria black birds and glass balls. I have shot a great many matches at pigeons, I am ashamed to say, but thank Providence I have killed my last tame pigeon, as I do certainly consider it a most disgraceful thing for any sportsman to do. Since giving up pigeon shooting I have shot a good many matches at artificial flying targets, and I find them a great deal better practice than live pigeons, sparrows or snowbirds. I sincerely hope that the to me dear old name of sportsman, will soon fall from the shoulders of these live bird shooters and be replaced by the much more suitable one of sports, as I claim the butchery of any tame animal or bird as far beneath the aim of a true sportsman.

" Believe me, sincerely yours,

" GEO. B. McDERMOT,

" Fishery Overseer and Indian Agent,

" Port Perry, Ont.

" ADAM BROWN, Esq., M. P.,

" House of Commons, Ottawa."

This gentleman refers to butchery as beneath the aim of a true sportsman. Let me read to you the evidence of Mr. Matthews, of Winthrop, Mass., in his testimony given before the House of Representatives :

" One morning, after a pigeon-shoot, I found three pigeons on the coving of my stable, right on the eaves. During the next night they died and dropped down. I examined them. One had a leg broken and had two shots through the body. Another had a leg broken and had one eye put out. After one of their shoots, four birds came to my place in just the same way. I live a mile away, in an air-line, from the shooting grounds.

" When the Winthrop Club was started I was one of the members, and belonged to it three years. I got sick of it and left it. Then, about one bird out of eight would get away.

" Q. You said you got sick of it?

" A. Yes, sir.

" Q. On what account?

" A. Well, because I did not like the treatment of the birds. I thought it was not right.

" Q. From your experience, during three years, what is your opinion about the humanity of the thing?

" A. I think it is cruel.

" Q. In what particular point does the cruelty consist?

" A. In the first place, of their catching these birds with the snares, and of boxing them, and keeping them the way they are kept for three or four days. I think there is cruelty in taking and confining any animal in a spot, and for a man to take a loaded gun, and stand and pull away a trap for the bird to come out, and then shoot at him where he cannot have any chance to help himself. But if a man is out after wild game, then the bird has got a chance to take care of himself.

" Q. Is this pigeon shooting cruel above the shooting of wild game?

" A. It is; because the bird is caged and housed. He is convicted to be shot, the same as a man is convicted to be put upon the gallows to be hung. He does not have a chance to take care of himself.

" This practice of pigeon shooting has a bad influence on boys. Where boys are offered fifteen or twenty cents apiece for birds, if you have some very nice pigeons on your place you will find the boys snaring them to get this fifteen cents."

I hold in my possession letters from different parts of the country to show that independent of the cruelty of the practice, it has made many a thief of young boys, who steal the pigeons and sell them for the shooting matches. Sometimes pigeons very valuable to the pigeon fancier are stolen

and sold for ten or fifteen cents, as the case may be. Tempting those boys to commit a robbery and to enter on a life of crime is an evil which we, as legislators for our country, should endeavor to stop. Before the last pigeon match near the city of Hamilton, not a long time ago, a lady living in Hamilton writes to inform me that a number of boys were in the habit of going around and snaring pigeons and selling them to those who were engaged in the shooting matches, I will read you an extract from a letter from Mr. Caston, of Toronto, who says :

" Among other arguments against it is one you appear to have overlooked, is that the amount of juvenile stealing that it causes and this is a feature that deserves the most serious consideration. Dozens of gentlemen have had to give up keeping pigeons for the simple reason that they are cleared out time and again by boys who would be afraid to take anything else. The police don't take much notice of bird stealing and they find a ready sale at the sporting saloons and no question asked. I have found fancy pigeons at these places by the dozen bought for twenty-five cents a pair, worth from five to ten dollars. So long as they can fly they do for the traps and start thieves on their course of crime.

Trap shooting has not a single redeeming feature about it. They will tell you that they kill the birds; nothing of the sort. In many cases they cripple them and they fall out of bounds and linger for a day or so. Other times boys will chase the poor fluttering things pelting them with stones. Then there is all sorts of tricking to make them lively, such of putting out their eyes."

It has occurred, and occurred frequently, that in those trap-shooting matches the eyes of the pigeons have been put out to effect the purpose of those engaged in the sport. The St. Hubert Gun Club of this city practices largely with the clay pigeons. They have experience of both methods of shooting and they prefer clay pigeon shooting to butchering the live birds. I have a letter from a gentleman in Boston who took a deep interest in the passage of the Massachusetts law. He says :

" It passed the House of Representatives by a large majority, and the Senate by a vote of about two to one. In its favor I carried to the Legislature the petition of about four hundred clergymen of all denominations, and various others. I think it has never been violated but once. In that case by my orders the parties were promptly arrested, convicted and heavily fined."

The law in the State of Massachusetts, which passed the legislature by a vote of two to one, reads as follows :

" Any person who shall keep or use any live pigeon, fowl, or other bird for the purpose of a target, or to be shot at, either for amusement or as a test of skill in marksmanship; and any person who shall shoot at any bird as aforesaid, or be a party to any such shooting of any fowl or bird; and any person who shall rent any building, shed, room, yard field or premises, or shall knowingly suffer or permit the use of any building, shed, room, yard, field or premises, for the purpose of shooting any fowl or bird as aforesaid, shall be punished by fine not exceeding fifty dollars, or by imprisonment in gaol not exceeding thirty days, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Nothing herein contained shall apply to the shooting of any wild game in its wild state."

This law has been productive of an immense deal of good in that state. In quoting to you the public opinion in respect to this barbarous practice, I have mentioned the name of our beloved Queen, who has supported every movement tending to put down such practices. Let me quote to you the action taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury when the Bill was before the British Parliament as reported by the *Times* :

" Pigeon shooting, Lord Aberdare says, is a brutalising practice, and we entirely agree with him. The performers and their irregular outside scouts may be already brutalised. It is likely enough that they are, and that for them to engage in pigeon shooting is simply to act after their kind. But as the Archbishop of Canterbury says, each fresh performance of the sort makes them worse than they were before, and more and more indifferent to the suffering which it delights them to witness or to inflict. The matter is one on which the public conscience becomes more and more sensitive."

By the highest as well as the humblest in England, where this sport has had its full swing, the most marked condemnation is now given to it. The societies which have been formed for the prevention of cruelty to animals do not seek to persecute any one. They admire true sport, and the true sportsman is humane to the lower animals; but the man who strives to take the life of an animal in any other way is not a true sportsman. Wherever these societies have

been formed in this country and in England, they warn those who have been doing wrong before they seek to convict them. In the city of Hamilton our inspector, when he discovers any cruelty to an animal, warns the person guilty of that cruelty, and if the act is again committed the guilty person is summoned and brought before the magistrate, and if a conviction is obtained he is fined. There can be no doubt of this, and every hon. gentleman in this House will admit it, that the merciful man is merciful to his beast. Is there a man here who will stand by and see any one act cruelly to a horse? A horse is as sensitive as any one of us, and you can get more out of him by kindness than by cruelty. There is no doubt that the sentiment pervading every breast and every heart is that justice shall be done to the dumb animals. No man would take a child to see a pigeon shooting, a dog fight, a cock fight, or any of those brutal exhibitions which are mis-called sports. No man who has any regard for the education of his child would take him to witness any such exhibition. There is nothing in this Bill that will not bear the light of day. I challenge any man to find a word in it which does not receive his conscientious sanction.

Mr. LISTER. It provides for over driving a hen.

Mr. BROWN. It is only an old woman who would make that objection. As I have said, the sentiment in the motherland is strongly in favor of this movement, so strongly that it is being carried into the schools. Young societies have been formed, and kindness to animals has been made a subject of education. In London a children's society has been formed, and in order to attract children, it is very appropriately named "The Dickey-bird Society"; 37,000 children have joined it, and its sole object is to educate children from their earliest days to be kind to birds and beasts of all kinds. It is as easy to teach a child to be merciful to a dumb animal as it is to teach it anything, and I am satisfied that the societies formed in England will be of great good to that country. Now, I have stated in a very few words the object of the Bill, and there are many arguments I could advance in support of it. Some of the greatest men of our day have sanctioned the principle of kindness to animals. There is a story told of that eminent man, President Lincoln, that when he was on a very important mission through the country, he ordered the driver to stop; he got out of the vehicle, went to the hedge at the side of the road, and there found a little fluttering bird which had dropped out of its nest, and he picked it up and put it in its nest again. When he came back to the carriage his friend asked him: "Why did you pay such attention to a little thing like that?" "All that I can say for a reason, is that it makes me feel better." Every man who does a kind act is made to feel better. To come back again to the question of shooting matches, I desire to make a quotation and the words are those of perhaps one of the most eminent men that ever adorned the roll of Scotland's great men, Dr. Chalmers. He said, in speaking of the suffering of animals and the cruelty of man:

"These sufferings are really felt. The beasts of the field are so constructed as to give forth all the natural expression of it. These poor animals just look and tremble and give forth the very indications of suffering that we do; theirs is the distinct cry of pain. Theirs is the unequivocal physiognomy of pain. They put on the same aspect of terror on the demonstration of the menaced blow. They exhibit the same distortions of agony after the infliction of it. The bruise, or the burn, or the fracture, or the deep incision, or the fierce encounter with one of equal or superior strength just affects them similarly to ourselves. Their blood circulates as ours, they sicken, they grow feeble with age and finally they die just as we do. The brute animals have all the same sensations of pain as human beings and consequently endure as much pain when their body is hurt; but in their case the cruelty of torment is greater, because they have no mind to bear them up against their sufferings."

Men and women of Canada in every part of the country are sustaining with their sympathy this attempt to cover

Mr. BROWN.

ground that was not covered when the present law for the prevention of cruelty to animals was passed. In the estimation of those who framed that measure, everything was apparently provided for, but in the pursuit of cruel sports some were discovered not provided for. I ask every hon. gentleman to read over this Bill by which I desire to provide what is not already provided for, and I contend there is not a clause in it which will not commend itself to every good, kind-hearted man in the land. It is not sufficient to punish the owner of the house where a cock fight takes place, or to punish the man in whose yard a dog fight has taken place, but we should punish the whole crew and everyone connected with the disgraceful proceeding if they can be caught. These are matters provided for in this Bill, which I am sure will meet with the best consideration of the House. I may be asked, well, what is the harm in shooting a pigeon? I answer, None whatever. Give the bird fairplay. But do not coop it up in a trap, confine it in a cowardly way, and then shoot at it when it has no chance to escape. An animal of any description is as sensible to fear as man. I would like to ask any hon. gentleman what he thinks about that so-called sport of fastening a turkey to a barrel, then tying its legs together, and then peppering away at it when it has no chance to escape. The sport I have mentioned is nothing but wanton cruelty, and I seek to put a stop to wanton cruelty because it is demoralising. There is such a thing as a suffering that has to be endured, but that suffering is of a character which is right and proper. All I ask of this House is that they will give their support to a measure for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and by this Bill I am merely seeking to cover ground not already covered. I am satisfied that from one end of the country to the other there will be rejoicing should this measure, which is calculated to advance the interests of humanity and give a lesson to the rising generation, be passed and a stop put forever to all the brutalising and debasing so called amusements we have described in the way of trap-shooting and cock-fighting.

Mr. TISDALE. I beg to move that the Bill intituled: "An Act to make further provision to prevent cruelty to animals, and to amend chap. 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada" be not now read the second time, but be read this day six months. In making that motion, I desire to say, that I am not one of those who are in favor of cruelty to animals. I desire to say that, within proper bounds, I am a supporter and believer in the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, but I must decidedly object to other people laying down principles, and then trying to clothe with other names things that do not come under those names. That is substantially the reason why I move this resolution. A great many mischievous principles are introduced in this Bill, and attempts are made to put those who believe in calling things their right names in a false position. The speech of the hon. gentleman must satisfy many here that I am not unfairly stating the case. If we could find by the hon. gentleman's Bill what he aims at, I should be very glad, because in his speech he has told us things that are very different from the Bill. He said that his Bill was for the prevention of cruelty to animals in matters not provided for. Then he said further it was to prevent cock-fighting and dog-fighting and things of that kind; but in the new part of the Bill there is not a word concerning those subjects. The hon. gentleman read a number of letters and quotations about cruelty to animals. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who is in favor of cruelty to animals, but what I want to find out is what he wishes to provide for in his Bill, for in reading it I do not find anything that will prevent the cruelty he objects to. I venture to assert one or two propositions in connection with this measure. It either provides nothing material but what the law already

covers, or these new features that are in it are injurious and mischievous, except the one with regard to shooting pigeons out of traps. If that is true, and I will satisfy you it is, why, if the hon. gentleman wants to abolish pigeon shooting out of traps, does he not bring in a Bill to that effect, so that we may know where it stands? When those whom he represents venture to say that killing a bird or pigeon with a gun is cruel, or when the hon. gentleman ventures to say so, we will know what we have to meet. Possibly the hon. gentleman is a vegetarian. The society is an excellent society, but there are many principles which are excellent in themselves which may lead to very mischievous consequences, and in legislation particularly we cannot afford to have our time taken up unless in regard to something which is material. The hon. gentleman's remarks taught us what will be the effect if we allow this sort of Bills to pass. He admitted that he had a Bill in reference to the clipping of horses and other matters, but he said that had been carefully considered, and those provisions had been eliminated. I object to be called a man cruel to animals because a set of men, undoubtedly with good hearts, but often with a great deal of ignorance in regard to the treatment of animals, set themselves up as humanitarians, and make everyone else out to be the contrary. If we pass this Bill now, we will have a Bill next Session to stop the clipping of horses. Dr. Hodgins says that a horse died in Boston within three years after being clipped. That statement is made in one of the articles of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Here is what an experienced man says upon that?

"This kind-hearted man must talk of what he knows, and he knows much of many things, but there is no need to say that on the subject of 'horse' he is not well informed, for Mr. Adam Brown, and all of us must have seen horses that have survived clipping for three, thirteen or even twenty-three years."

I mention that because the hon. gentleman admitted that that was what they were after, although they had eliminated it. Anyone who understands a horse or a dog or any other animal will use his experience and knowledge he has taught him. Men who have used and men who understand animals, and particularly sportsmen who are proper sportsmen, will do more, and will do it with more injury to themselves for animals, and will take more care of them, and will suffer for them more than these gentlemen who try to handle animals without knowledge. Evidently the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill has not mastered the law on the subject, because, if he had, he would not have made all the statements he has made. The first clause is simply an extended interpretation of the present law for the prevention of cruelty to animals. The first three sub-sections of section 2 are precisely the words of the present law, and are put in apparently in order to enlarge the appearance of the Bill. Then the hon. gentleman puts in other clauses which I think are very objectionable. I will read the clauses so that the House may see the effect:

"Everyone who wantonly, cruelly or unnecessarily beats, binds, ill-treats, abuses, overdrives or tortures any cattle, poultry, dog, domestic animal or bird; or while driving any cattle or other animal is, by negligence or ill-usage in the driving thereof, the means whereby any mischief, damage or injury is done by any such cattle or other animal; or in any manner encourages, aids or assists at the fighting or baiting of any bull, bear, badger, dog, cock or other kind of animal, whether of domestic or wild nature—"

That is the present law. The following are new clauses:—

"or having the charge or custody of any animal, unnecessarily fails to provide the same with proper food, drink, shelter and protection from the weather; or being the owner, driver or person having the charge or custody of any animal, wantonly and unnecessarily leaves disabled or abandons such animal; or wantonly and unnecessarily carries or causes to be carried, in or upon any vehicle, or otherwise, any animal in a cruel or inhuman manner."

I object to the whole of those clauses for two reasons. In the first place, it would be almost impossible, particularly in view of the subsequent sections of this Act, for any owner

of animals to take them to market or to use them in any way without being at the mercy of any passer-by to say whether they are cruelly used or not. Any one who has studied animals in the kennel or in the field or in the stable knows better than these men who are endeavoring, I was going to say in this mawkish sentimental way, to interfere with practical men. I say that farmers and sportsmen, gentlemen and poor men have never been cruel in handling these animals. It is uncalled for in regard to the members of this House or the people of this country for that society to attempt to pass any such law as that. But there is another clause in the present law which this Bill would seriously interfere with. There is a stringent clause in reference to the transportation of animals by railways and ships, and this Bill would interfere with that to such an extent that we would have to reconsider the whole provision. I skip the main provision of the hon. gentleman's Bill in reference to pigeon shooting for the present, but I find this clause in his Bill:

"Any person may interfere to prevent the perpetration of any act of cruelty done in his presence to any animal, and any person who interferes with or obstructs or resists any person so engaged shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor, or to both."

The present law is that any owner or peace officer, where any person commits an act of cruelty to animals, may take the offender before a justice of the peace without a warrant. That is a very strong provision and surely that is as far as anyone should desire to go. The hon. gentleman, however, has put in a clause here at the instigation of those people which would establish what I call club law. Suppose I am driving a horse along the street, and am chastising him, and my hon. friend, who is boiling over with indignation at the cruelty practised to animals, takes me by the neck and insists upon my going to the station. If I resist, he may take a club, and, if anyone comes to assist me, he would, according to this, be equally guilty with me. Surely we have not come to that stage in this country that such a provision as that is necessary. Surely it is enough to provide that a man may arrest another without a warrant. Surely these gentlemen mistake the temper of the members of this House, they mistake the temper of the people of this country when they come and ask to have such a law passed. I never shot a bird out of a trap and probably never will; but I do object to men coming, under the guise of preventing cruelty, and saying that a man who does so commits a crime. The Almighty made the beasts to be eaten—certain of them—and the man who cruelly kills one, unless he is a mischievous animal, I am the first to condemn; but when we kill them in the most expert way possible, some one comes and tries to prevent it. The next clause reads:

"Any person may lawfully destroy or cause to be destroyed any animal found to be abandoned, or not properly cared for, when, in the judgment of two justices of the peace, called by him to view the same in his presence, it appears to be injured, disabled or diseased past recovery."

We never heard of a single case in this country where an animal was not destroyed if it was suffering; although there may be occasional cases. Here a man is allowed to destroy the animal when a couple of justices decide that he may. I tell you that when you get so much law on so many points, you get into a dangerous place, where freedom is worse, almost, than no law at all. Now let us look at the other clause, and I think it is one which calls for the close scrutiny of the Minister of Justice. I will read the main clause:

"Every person who keeps or uses any live animal or bird for the purpose of being used as a target, or to be shot at, either for amusement or as a test of skill in marksmanship or for any like purpose—or shoots at such animal or bird—or is present as a party, umpire or judge at any such shooting at any animal or bird—or keeps, or knowingly rents any building, shed, room, yard, field or premises, or knowingly permits the

use of any building, shed, room, yard, field or premises, for the purpose of shooting at any animal or bird as aforesaid; shall, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor, or to both."

Now, if the hon. gentleman would look at the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario, and from their being in the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario without any disallowance I take it for granted that all the other Provinces have the same rights, and if they have those rights we, of course, do not want to interfere with them, unless we are called upon to do so. In that Act there is a stronger provision for these tender hearted gentlemen in regard to birds that are not food. I am very glad that there is such a law. I will read extracts from it:

"Nothing in this Act contained shall be held to affect the Act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals, or to apply to any imported cage birds or other domesticated bird or birds, generally known as cage birds, or to any bird or birds commonly known as poultry."

Game birds and domestic birds are excepted. Then the second section:

"It shall not be lawful to shoot, destroy, wound or injure, or to attempt to shoot, destroy, kill, wound or injure any bird whatsoever, save and except eagles, falcons, owls, wild pigeons, black birds, king fishers, crows, jays, English sparrows, and the birds specially mentioned in the Act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals."

There is a further clause that you shall not destroy the eggs of birds or interfere with their nests; so no bird can be put in a trap, as my hon. friend wants the law to be, nor can it be even shot at; therefore no law at all is necessary except to come down to the one thing, one bare thing, to abolish pigeon shooting out of traps, which these gentlemen have not the straightforwardness to come into the House and ask for. Now, let us see where this statute comes from. That statute that I have just read comes from the State of Rhode Island. If it is a good law I do not object to that; but I would say that of all the States in the Union Rhode Island is the most notorious for passing laws and not obeying them; so the place that it comes from is not a guarantee that they are very serious about it there. The hon. gentleman has improved his Act since last Session. Last Session he had a clause which imposed a penalty of \$25; this year the smaller act has got to bear the larger penalty, now it is \$50 and three months imprisonment, if the justice sees fit. The hon. member quoted from letters, and I will read one from Mr. Patteson, of Toronto, Postmaster there, a well known authority on animals and birds of all sorts. He says:

"Mr. Brown is bringing in a Bill. But is he not being made an unsuspecting agent for the spurious sensibility of certain officious humanitarians, who, under cover of preventing cruelty to animals, are merely arrogating to themselves a monopoly in bowels of compassion? Gallant and sensitive men are being led by professional exaggerators to believe that there is a vast amount of preventible cruelty going on which it is their duty to stop, and to a society for its prevention such men are easily led to give their names and influence. So far, so good. But agitators are apt to run their fads into the ground. For the life of me I can see no practical reason for ceasing to shoot pigeons from a trap. The Legislature that is now called upon to protect pigeons from the ruthless slaughter of gun clubs is the same body, or akin to the same body, that protects game during many months of the year from destruction, in order that sportsmen may have game to kill, hit or miss, during the other months. Quail and partridges make excellent pie, so also do pigeons. They are all born to be killed for food, and shooting them from a trap is no more cruel than shooting them from any other rise. Indeed, there is far greater chance for the wounded pigeon to be put out of its misery than for the wounded game bird. Moreover, shooting is an art that Canadians will be the better for learning, and Mr. Brown will excuse me for telling him that clay pigeons are as miserable a substitute for blue rocks as a rocking horse would be for a spirited hunter to pupils in another department of sport."

In regard to the cruelty to animals, he says:

"I have devoted my life to animals, finding them far more grateful for kindness than bipeds, and never treacherous where uniformly well treated."

He says again:

"Put a plate of meat and bones on the floor. Bite the tail ends off three six-weeks-old puppies, and I'll bet a dollar all three make for the  
Mr. TISDALE.

plate and begin wrangling without giving a thought to their latter ends."

Now one quotation more:

"The Toronto Humane Society are trying, among other things, to stop shooting sparrows. Practical men—farmers, gardeners and others—are seeking means of getting rid of them, finding them to be a destructive pest. In my opinion, gun clubs and shooters are doing good work in the interests of the country by making use of sparrows, by supplying one means of thinning out birds that are rapidly becoming an intolerable nuisance. It is reasonable to suppose that if the Toronto Humane Society existed in New South Wales and New Zealand they would oppose the destruction of rabbits, although the Governments there offer £35,000 to anyone who will invent an effective means of exterminating them."

"In regard to pigeon-shooting, there has been in your columns a very sensible letter from Mr. T. O. Patteson. I would like to add on this subject that the sale of pigeons for trap-shooting affords a considerable amount of money to a great many people, which could not be obtained in any other way. It would not pay to keep pigeons for all they are worth as poultry. Then, as pigeons increase rapidly and are largely free commoners, taking possession of barns, lofts, church spires and such places, and feeding in the grain fields whenever they can, they would in a few years, if not kept down by trap-shooting, become a very serious annoyance both in town and country."

"I hope the well-meant but ill-advised aims of the Toronto society will meet the fate they deserve. If the society would confine itself to legitimate objects they would have enough to do, and a far larger share of public support."

Now the hon. gentleman went to England for authority. I will go there for one moment, and let us see what they did there. Precisely the same sort of a Bill came up there as we have here, a Bill under the auspices of a similar excellent society. I will read you one or two extracts from the debate in the House of Lords, because the speakers express their sentiments much better than I can express mine upon the same subject. The hon. gentleman read from Lord Aberdare. I will read from the Earl Fortescue:

"He never remembered a more remarkable speech made by an ex-Cabinet Minister—indeed an ex-Home Secretary—than the one which had just been delivered."

That is rather a long extract to read now. Here is another one to the same effect. The Earl of Redesdale said:

"He should oppose the Bill upon the ground that it came before the House asking for something under false pretences. He denied altogether that his noble friend (Lord Balfour) had shown there was necessarily any cruelty in pigeon shooting. He contended that there was no cruelty in shooting at a bird for the purpose of killing it, and that the noble lord had failed to show that there was necessarily more cruelty in letting a bird out of a trap and shooting at it, than there was in partridge or pheasant shooting."

"What was cruelty? The noble lord had not ventured to determine the question in this matter. Was it shooting at birds with intent to kill? If this was the meaning of the word, then everyone practices it who went into a turnip field to shoot partridges or into a cover to shoot pheasants."

I understood the hon. mover to say that it was not the shooting that was cruel, but it was the confinement in the traps. If that is true, the same may be said of market women who take domestic fowls to market. They put them in coops and keep them all day without food, and then if they sell them they wring their necks. If the hon. gentleman had ever seen them wring their necks he would bring in a Bill to prevent market women doing so, and we would have to eat our chickens alive. Another matter that struck me in connection with the hon. gentleman's argument and one which afforded me amusement was that there are sometimes thefts of pigeons by boys. If this is an argument then we must go without anything which may be stolen, because somebody might steal it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This would be crushing an infant industry.

Mr. TISDALE. This is the balance of the Earl of Redesdale's remarks in the House of Lords:

"The noble lord said the Bill was for the purpose of putting down pigeon shooting. Then, why was it not so called? He (the Earl of Redesdale) would tell their lordships why it was not, and that was because the noble lord had not the courage to call it so, and also because he knew very well that he would be much more likely to get support from their lordships for the measure by calling it 'Cruelty to Animals Act Amendment Act.' The Bill, however, had nothing whatever to do

with cruelty to animals. It was somewhat remarkable that it should have taken thirty or forty years to find out that pigeon shooting was cruelty. If the noble lord, or the society he represented, required further powers to detect cruelty if it was perpetrated, let a Bill be introduced for the purpose. Such a measure, however, should be called by its proper name, as he (the Earl of Redesdale) objected altogether to a Bill being called by a name which could not properly belong to it. There was nothing objectionable in a man showing his skill in the use of a gun or any other instrument, and the shooting at a bird with intent to kill it was as necessary to test skill in the use of a fowling piece as was shooting at a target with a rifle or long bow. There was a class of persons in this country who objected to all kind of field sports, and who regarded hunting or shooting of any kind as cruelty. He (the Earl of Redesdale) called shooting sport, and legitimate sport. He thought there was no ground for the Bill, and therefore he moved its rejection."

The Bill was rejected in that year, 1884, by 78 to 30. So the highest legislative body in England, by a vote equal to almost three to one, rejected the Bill. I will tell the hon. gentleman what they did, and I am perfectly willing to do and anxious to do it if the hon. gentleman will show any cruelty is practiced. If he will show that the birds are badly used while they are taken to the place to be shot, that their eyes are put out, as he has alleged, then this House should do, as the English House has done, pass a very severe measure to punish that offence, and the very members who rejected the Bill under its false name passed a measure to punish anyone who used birds cruelly in taking them to shooting places, or while there, or in handling them at the trap. That is a proper thing to do. Some gentlemen, however, want to stop shooting because they consider it is a kind of sport, and they object to that entirely. If my hon. friend will bring in such a Bill as I have indicated, I will be one of the first to support it; but I do not believe in legislation such as is now proposed, because if it is adopted we shall have Bills of this character introduced year after year until by-and-by they will seek to prevent our killing mosquitoes, which if they are in large bands make loud music and are very troublesome when you are trout-fishing. Hon. gentlemen might as well declare that it is cruel to destroy life of any kind. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to take that position, but he appears to maintain that a man who shoots an animal for food is cruel, and I know no death that is more merciful.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to say a few words only with regard to this matter. I understood the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to assert that most of the provisions of the Bill are already contained substantially in our laws. He seemed to advance the opinion that the chief feature of the Bill, the only feature of the Bill in fact not already embodied in our law, is that with respect to the shooting of pigeons, holding pigeons in traps and shooting them. It is a question upon which members may differ as to whether this brutal, debasing sport is one that should be encouraged or one that should be condemned. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has held it to be a very humane and proper sport. My opinion is essentially different. It is exactly the opposite of that, and the Bill, if it has no other provision that is new, except the one in regard to trap shooting, is one that commends itself to my judgment and will receive my support. It may be true, as the hon. gentleman has asserted, that the penalties are too severe. The Bill is open to the consideration of the House, and may receive such amendments as the House may deem proper to adopt. If the penalties are too severe, they may be lessened; if there is any portion of the Bill or any characteristic of the Bill that does not commend itself to the judgment of the House, let the House in Committee change the features of the Bill, but the essential feature of this Bill, the feature to which the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has raised objection, is one that commends the Bill to my support and is that portion which provides that trap-

shooting shall be rendered illegal. The clause reads as follows:—

"Keeps or uses any live animal or bird for the purpose of being used as a target, or to be shot at, either for amusement or as a test of skill in marksmanship, or for any like purpose,—or shoots at such animal or bird,—or is present as a party, umpire or judge at any such shooting at any animal or bird,—or keeps, or knowingly rents any building, shed, room, yard, field or premises, or knowingly permits the use of any building, shed, room, yard, field or premises, for the purpose of shooting at any animal or bird as aforesaid."

The question resolves itself exactly into this position: shall we approve of this cruel, brutal sport of taking birds and pigeons and confining them in traps and throwing them up for men to shoot, without the birds having any opportunity to escape, a sport which I hold is low and debasing in its tendency and which is condemned by the better sentiment of this country, by all humane societies and by all humane men and women. It would be a disgrace to this House to reject this Bill, to carry a motion for a six months hoist upon the essential feature of the Bill, which is the feature the hon. gentleman has challenged. I will support the Bill with the understanding that it be referred to a Committee, and that such provisions as may not be approved will be altered or modified.

Mr. CASEY. I find myself compelled to oppose the second reading of the Bill, not at all on account of the provisions against cruelty to animals contained in it, but on account of certain other provisions which I consider form part of the Bill, the provision as to convictions, and so on. Taking the Bill as a whole, I consider its principle is of a nature contrary to public justice in the country. Although I am as much interested in preventing cruelty to animals as the promoter of the Bill, I cannot vote for the second reading without committing myself to the principle of certain clauses to which I object. For this reason I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the Bill is concerned I think that portion relating to trap shooting should be adopted and passed into law, but so far as the rest of the Bill is concerned I think it is imperfectly and inartistically drawn. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he drew it, because he seems to have devoted himself very much to the investigation of the laws in England and in this country, and to draw the conclusion that this Bill, as proposed, covers all the cases. I have said the Bill is inartistically drawn, and I will call attention to a few of the provisions to satisfy hon. members as to that point. For that reason and as a supporter of my hon. friend's resolution, I would advise him to drop this Bill and to introduce a new measure, taking the time between this and the next session to consider all the provisions that ought to be enacted in a Bill of this kind. I need only call the attention of this House to one or two sections of this measure to show how imperfect it is. My hon. friend provides by this Bill that if anyone—

"Wantonly, cruelly or unnecessarily beats, binds, ill-treats, abuses, overdrives or tortures any cattle, poultry, dog, domestic animal or bird"—

shall be punished. Now, an old woman driving her geese home at night might be prosecuted under the provisions of this Act by some neighbor who thought she was driving them too fast. Imagine my hon. friend driving home one of his chickens, and that one of his friends, who might be politically opposed to him, should consider that he had committed a violation of this Act and prosecute him. One can imagine the hon. gentleman in the police court at Hamilton answering a charge of this kind, after the speech he has made here to-night. Let me call the attention of the House to subsection b. Why, short-tailed dogs are a thing of the past. Anybody that bites or cuts off a dog's tail is liable to be prosecuted now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What about sheep?



Mr. LISTER. We know the farmers of the country have to cut sheep's tails, and for very good reasons, and if the farmers are doing anything of this kind they are liable to punishment under the provisions of this Act. My hon. friend must remember that if we want good meat we must have steers in the country, and what is to become of us if an Act of this kind passes into law?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. I am sure that my hon. friend has never considered those grave questions. I fear that there are great difficulties in the way of this Bill, and that it would be unsafe for the people whom we represent in this House to make them liable to any such pains and penalties as are provided in this Act. If those provisions pass into law my hon. friend will be looked upon as a monster and a terror by the community at large, and surely after the speech we have heard no such character ought to be attached to him. We need only look at his face to see that he is bubbling all over with good nature. Another provision of the Bill, says:

"Shall, on summary conviction, before two justices of the peace, be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$50, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor, or to both."

There is no such thing provided for as calling in a veterinary surgeon. If two magistrates think my animal should be destroyed all they have to do is to make an order for its destruction and I have no redress. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to put such power as that into the hands of two magistrates. Suppose I was driving with the hon. gentleman and that my horse should become fractious and I should use a whip that he thinks is too heavy, or that I should strike the horse a little too hard, I would be liable to be punished under the provisions of that Act.

An hon. MEMBER. And fined \$50 and imprisoned.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, fined fifty dollars and three months imprisonment at hard labor. We know there is hardly any hard labor now, because my hon. friend the Minister of Justice tells us that hard labor is pretty near over and that the prisoners only have to break stones.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And they get tobacco.

Mr. LISTER. In view of these facts I would ask my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) in all seriousness to withdraw this Act. Did you draw this Bill out yourself?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Address the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the hon. gentleman Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman drew out this Bill himself. I see that he shakes his head as if to mean yes.

Mr. BROWN. Who shook his head? Was it I?

Mr. LISTER. I understood that you nodded your head in assent.

Mr. BROWN. Oh no, I will give no answer to that.

Mr. LISTER. Then it was not the hon. gentleman who drew out the Act, and I would advise that it should be taken back to the gentleman who drew it out to have those objectionable clauses expunged. Let the hon. gentleman stick to his Act as far as the birds are concerned, although in this there are great difficulties. An old woman, for instance who takes her chicken to market in a cage is likely to be fined for having it boxed up. For several reasons I should like to support this Act but I am afraid I will have to vote against it in its present form.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not presume that the hon. gentleman is in jest, although he has that appearance. The hon. gentleman has said that for the reasons he expressed he was afraid he could not support the Bill and I shall attempt to remove the objections he has advanced,

Mr. LISTER.

with confidence that he is serious and wishes to support the principle of the Bill. The hon. gentleman finds fault with the Bill because it goes too far in punishing anyone who—

"Wantonly, cruelly or unnecessarily beats, binds, ill-treats, abuses, overdrives or tortures any cattle, poultry, dog, domestic animal or bird."

The hon. gentleman has depicted the misfortune that might happen to an old woman driving home her geese, and who might come under the provision of the Bill of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown). Let me remove that difficulty from that hon. gentleman's path by reminding him that these are exactly the words of the present law and that the hon. gentleman from Hamilton in all these clauses of the Bill has simply taken almost word for word the language of chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes. The old woman driving home her geese will be subject to no greater pains or penalties than she is subject to under the present law. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) wishes to add some sub-sections by way of introducing new principles into the law of cruelty to animals, and for convenience in drafting he has pursued the course of re-enacting the present law and inserting his new sub-sections so that the changes which he proposes in the Act will be seen at a glance and without the necessity of comparing two statutes. It may be that the hon. gentleman has departed in two or three particulars from the strict language of the Act concerning cruelty to animals, but so far as I have examined the Bill, I find that he is re-enacting the same law with the addition of two provisions: first of all, that it is expedient to make a penal offence of using live animals as a target. That is the first principle as I take it of the hon. gentleman's Bill. In this country when we have already gone so far as to make penal the offence of even over-driving an animal, of beating or binding him, is it not consistent legislation to say that we shall also go so far as to say that that animal which we have protected from beating and overwork shall not be shot at as a living target? That is the first principle of the Bill. The second principle of the Bill is that any person who witnesses any act of cruelty like this may interfere. The hon. gentleman who spoke so well in opposition to the Bill, said that under its provisions any person might interfere with a person doing as he liked with his own property. At present if a person sees an act of cruelty done in his presence he has not the right to interfere; he has not the protection of this Bill to interfere and the person who stops him from interfering is not subject to the penalties provided under this Bill. My hon. friend behind me asks, who is to decide whether it is an act of cruelty done in his presence. Precisely the same authority as decides all questions as to cruelty under the present law. If an animal is being beaten, unduly bound, overdriven or tortured, it is the police authorities who have the administration of the whole law upon this matter; and, subject to the adjudication of that authority, my hon. friend simply proposes to add to the law, that if a private person sees an animal improperly or cruelly maltreated they may interfere without subjecting themselves to damages, or to be turned off the premises as interfering in matters beyond their business. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, likewise referred to the last sub-section, and said that under it any one might step in and lawfully destroy his property. That is not so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said on the order of two magistrates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not even on the order of two magistrates, unless the animal is one which has been abandoned or is not properly cared for. It is by no means an uncommon circumstance for an animal which has reached that age when it is worthless, to be turned out into the roads or commons to die or to be killed as the case may be; and in the present law there is nothing to enable any

person to take that animal and put an end to its suffering. What my hon. friend proposes is a speedy way of doing so. First of all, the animal having been abandoned, two justices of the peace are to be called in to decide whether its existence shall be put an end to.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether under section 4, a party who fails to furnish proper protection to an animal might not have that animal destroyed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think he would not. We are, however, dealing with the second reading of this Bill now. I am not discussing the question whether the clauses are too strict or not. I am merely endeavoring to show that some of the objections raised against it are equally applicable to the existing law; and that in asking the House to decide on the principle of this Bill, the introducer is calling our attention to these simple features—the using of living animals as a target, and the propriety of establishing the principle that any private individual may interfere to prevent cruelty, and that an animal which has been abandoned or is useless may be put an end to. But as regards the objection that the Act may be abused and an animal may be treated as abandoned if it is not properly housed, I must remind the hon. gentleman that the present law, and every law of every kind to prevent immorality or cruelty is subject to a like objection. It is impossible to enact a statute to put down any kind of vice or cruelty that does not contain provisions which may be carried to an extreme extent by fanatical or injudicious people; notwithstanding which, we find that these statutes are useful for the purpose of protecting innocent people and animals from abuse. In practice such statutes are not really abused, because they are administered by people of ordinary common sense in the country who understand pretty well how their provisions are intended to work, and how they can be made of benefit to the public without being made instruments of evil.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not intend to speak on this subject further than to say that I will support the Bill; and in this connection I desire to refer to a practical illustration which I had a short time ago of the necessity for the provision contained in the last clause. About two months ago a horse in the neighborhood in which I live was wandering about in the fields. After the snow came, the animal could obtain nothing upon which to live. I had it brought into a yard and fed. I then applied to the Ottawa Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to ascertain if there was any legal way by which an abandoned animal might be killed. I received an answer that there was no such provision. Now, the last clause of this Bill seems to make provision for a case of this kind, and I am very glad to see it. I also approve of the Bill on general principles.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Tisdale).

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Amyot,	Fiset,	Masson,
Audet,	Gauthier,	Mitchell,
Beausoleil,	Geoffrion,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Godbout,	Neveu,
Bernier,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourassa,	Guay,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Ives,	Rinfret,
Cargill,	Joncas,	Riopel,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Halifax),	Rykert,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Labrosse,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Shanly,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Small,
Chouinard,	Langelier (Quebec),	Taylor,
Cimon,	La Rivière,	Thérien,
Cook,	Lépine,	Tisdale,
Corby,	Lister,	Trow,
Coulombe,	Livingston,	Turcot,
Denison,	McCarthy,	Tyrwhitt,
Dessaint,	McQuillan,	Vanasse,

Doyon,  
Dupont,  
Edgar,  
Ferguson (Welland),  
McIntyre,  
McMillan (Huron),  
McMillan, (Vaudreuil),  
Marshall,  
Wallace,  
Wilmot, and  
Wilson (Elgin).—71.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dickinson,	McKay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Edwards,	McKeen,
Barron,	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Boisvert,	Ellis,	Madill,
Bowell,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Meigs,
Bowman,	Fisher,	Mills (Annapolis),
Boyle,	Freeman,	Monorieff,
Brien,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Brown,	Gordon,	Platt,
Cameron,	Gullet,	Porter,
Campbell,	Henson,	Ross,
Carling,	Hickey,	Rosand,
Carpenter,	Holton,	Scriver,
Charlton,	Hudspeth,	Semple,
Cochrane,	Innes,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Jamieson,	Smith (Ontario),
Colter,	Jones (Digby),	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Kenny,	Stevenson,
Daly,	Kirk,	Temple,
Davies,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Davin,	Lovitt,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Waldie,
Dewdney,	McDougald (Pictou),	Watson and
Dickey,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wilson (Lennox).—72.

Mr. TROW. According to the Rules of the House I understand that any hon. gentleman who leaves his seat loses his vote. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) has left his seat, and his vote should be struck off.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that such a rule exists.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, Mr. Speaker, it has always been the rule that an hon. member leaving his seat before the result of the division is declared loses his vote. It has been decided more than once in my experience in Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. If he leaves the Chamber, not his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the amendment passed in the negative.

Mr. TISDALE. I rise to a question of Order. I think at all events Mr. Brown is killed on the wing.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p. m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved:

That this House do now concur in the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 55) respecting Rules of Court in relation to Criminal matters.—(Sir John Thompson.)

## FREE LIST EXTENSION (COMBINATIONS) BILL.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) to provide for placing on the free list articles of merchandise the production of which may be controlled by trusts or combinations. He said: I hope that there exists in this House, because I am sure that there exists in the country, an earnest desire to attack and destroy the evils which are arising to the community at large from combinations to raise prices, whether those combinations are to restrict the production of certain articles, or are of other descriptions. The object of all these combinations is, of course, to prevent fair and open competition in the Canadian market, and, in order to prevent competition in the Canadian market, it is, I think, certainly in nine cases out of ten, essential that the combines should have the control of the Canadian markets, and, in order to have control of the Canadian markets, they must shut out competition from abroad, from England or from foreign countries, in those particular articles in respect to which the combination has been formed. It is perfectly clear to my mind that, in order to prevent this monopoly and to give the competition which the combines seek to prevent, we must throw open the barrier which prevents competition from abroad, and must take off import duties which prevent that competition in those articles. That is the object of the Bill which I am introducing. I propose that, whenever an import duty is imposed by law on any commodities which are manufactured in Canada to an amount exceeding \$200,000, and over 80 per cent. of the aggregate value of the amount manufactured or produced in Canada shall be manufactured or produced by persons in a combine, then, in that case, these articles shall be admitted into Canada free of duty. In order to determine whether any particular articles are the subject of a combine, the Bill proposes that it shall be the duty of the Treasury Board, when information is received by the Minister of Finance of the existence of such agreement, to make an investigation into it, and it provides that the Treasury Board shall have the same powers to enforce the attendance of witnesses as a Court of Record has in civil cases. It is then provided that, if upon such investigation, it shall appear that the commodity is the subject of a combine, the Governor General shall, by proclamation, order such merchandise to be imported into Canada free of import duty. It is, however, provided that, whenever such combination in respect of these articles shall cease, then, upon the report of the Treasury Board to that effect, the Governor shall give notice by proclamation, and then the original duty upon those articles shall come into force again. The committee which was appointed last Session, and presented its report, certainly only touched upon the fringe of this question of combinations. I suppose they were prevented by the limited time at their disposal, from going into a great many of the combinations which are known to exist in the country. But enough was shown by that report, which I have considered very attentively, to convince that committee that there were evils existing here which required legislative remedy, and the chairman of that committee has already introduced into this House, a Bill providing what he considers appropriate remedies to overcome that evil. His Bill introduces pains and penalties. I do not propose in this Bill, to make offences criminal, but, as the combinations are formed to extort money out of the community, I propose to apply a financial remedy, and to prevent their being able to extort that money any longer. I am not prepared to say that there are not some articles produced in this country which may be the subject of combines, and which are not affected by our tariff. There are a few of such, undoubtedly. Monopolies may exist from other causes than a high tariff, but very few do exist in this country, and therefore, so far as my Bill will not cover cases of that kind, and, perhaps, even in reference to those cases which

the Bill will cover, it is proper to introduce stringent legislation in the direction proposed by the chairman of the committee of last Session. I, for one, will do everything in my power to assist in perfecting that measure, and I depend upon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) to assist me in perfecting this measure. There must be a great many members of this House who have an honest belief that the high protective tariff does not rob the people, but I think those members will not go so far as to say that combinations do not rob the people, and I think they will see that it is in their interests to support the proposition I make in order to avoid the evils which are arising in the way I have described.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to the introduction of the Bill, but, notwithstanding the explanation of the hon. gentleman, we would like to see the Bill itself before pronouncing on its merits. I would warn the hon. gentleman, however, that perhaps he may find that, this being a matter of trade, it should be introduced by resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## EXTENSION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY TO QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) asked, 1. The total amount paid on the sum of \$1,500,000 voted in 1885 by the Dominion Parliament for the extension to Quebec of the Canadian Pacific Railway. 2. To whom were the several payments made on account of the said sum? 3. For what object were such payments made, and what has been obtained in return therefor?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The total amount paid is \$1,500,000. 2. \$970,000 to the Bank of Montreal for bonds of the North Shore Railway Company, purchased at 87½, now held by the Government, and \$530,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. 3. The object for which these payments were made was the object as set forth in the Act 48-49 Vic., cap. 58.

## COMMUNICATION ON THE NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, What steps, if any, the Government have taken to establish communication between Indiantown and the Blackville station of the Northern and North-Western Railway, over the railway subsidised by the Government, and for months completed, but which up to this time has not been utilised?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The section of road between Indiantown and Blackville was built by the Northern and Western Railway Company under a Dominion grant subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, and is owned by them. The president of the Northern and Western Railway is perfectly aware that the Intercolonial Railway are perfectly ready to receive from and deliver to them freight and passengers at Indiantown, the terminus of the Indiantown branch of the Intercolonial Railway.

## A. R. McDONALD, SUPERINTENDENT ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether the Government, or the Minister of Railways, has received any petition, letter or document, signed by the train hands on the Intercolonial, asking that Mr. A. R. McDonald, superintendent of that section of the Intercolonial lying between Quebec and St. Flavie, be also appointed superintendent over that section between St. Flavie and Campbellton? If such is the case, when was it forwarded? By how many employes was this petition or letter signed?

What answer did the Government make to it, and does it intend to grant the prayer of the said petition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Railways has received petition signed by the train hands on the Intercolonial Railway asking that Mr. A. R. McDonald's district be extended from St. Flavie to Campbellton. It was forwarded on the 5th May, 1887. It was signed by 1,722 employes, many of whom have never had any connection whatever with the operation of the section between St. Flavie and Campbellton. The matter was investigated, and the facts placed before the Minister, who decided that no change was necessary, and no answer was made to the petition.

#### MAIL CARRIER AT BRUSSELS, ONT.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, 1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails from the post office to the railway station in the village of Brussels, county of Huron? 2. The name of each contractor, if there is more than one? 3. In whose favor are the Government cheques made out, and by whom endorsed? 4. What salary is paid the contractor, or contractors, for the work?

Mr. HAGGART. The firm that has the contract for carrying the mails from the post office to the railway station in the village of Brussels, county of Huron, is R. & S. Beaty. 2. The names of the parties to the firm are Robert and Samuel Beaty. 3. The Government cheques are made out in favor of R. & S. Beaty. I cannot tell who endorses them, as the cheques are at present in the hands of the Auditor General. 4. There is no salary paid to the contractor. The contract price for carrying the mail is \$150.

#### LIQUOR LICENSES IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Is the Government aware whether any license or licenses have been issued for the sale of intoxicating liquors within the limits of the Rocky Mountain Park? If so, under what authority and by virtue of what statute were such license or licenses issued?

Mr. DEWDNEY. On the 12th of July of this year, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories reported to the Department of the Interior that he had issued a license to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at Banff, for the sale of liquors. It is presumed that this permit was issued under authority of section 92, cap. 50, of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

#### PRIVILEGE—RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. TROW. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to bring before your notice and that of the House a little episode that occurred last evening when the vote was being recorded on the Bill of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown).

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it a question of privilege?

Mr. TROW. It is a question of privilege. That hon. gentleman, when the vote was recorded, was so elated with his apparent success, that he acted as on the wing. He moved to and fro in this Chamber. My object, Mr. Speaker, in drawing your attention to the matter at the present moment, is to offer a few remarks with regard to your ruling. We have always been under the impression that it is necessary that members should be silent while the votes are being recorded. I know that the First Minister is invariably so exact in his calculations that, in order to ascertain whether all his followers have recorded their votes, he jots down a record of the vote as it is taken. I have noticed that is his invariable rule. I have sometimes

attempted to adopt that course on account of the position I hold in my party, but in consequence of the noise frequently made by hon. members, in consequence of an hon. gentleman moving from his seat, I sometimes find myself almost unable to do so, and the hue and cry of hon. members is sufficient to disturb the whole House. I merely bring this matter to your notice, Mr. Speaker, in order that proceedings of that nature may be stopped. I was fully under the impression that any hon. gentleman who moved from his seat after the "yeas" and "nays" had been asked for and the order been given to call in the members and until the vote was finally declared, lost his vote. In 1881, I challenged the vote of an hon. member who sat in the rear of this House, and who at the time was standing off the platform. The next day he brought up the question and sought to have his vote recorded. The Speaker of that day, Mr. Speaker Blanchet, struck the vote off the division list. The next day he appealed to the Speaker, and the Speaker's ruling was as follows:—

"Putting the question is from the time I ask the House yea or nay till the time I declare the motion carried or lost. The name of the hon. member was recorded, but he went out of the House, according to his own statement, before the question was finally declared. The members will recognize the wisdom of that rule; and in fact it would be impossible to receive the vote if every hon. gentleman was allowed to leave his seat, for in this country the vote is taken by what we call *assis et lebe*, by which every member must be in his seat when the vote is taken. If every hon. member were allowed to leave his seat, a great confusion would be created, and it would be impossible to correctly register the names of the members. In this case I am very sorry that I cannot comply with the request of the hon. member for Vancouver. I am bound to comply with the Rules of the House."

I can also quote a better authority than Mr. Speaker Blanchet, an authority whose work is considered, not only in this House, but at Washington and in England, the best authority on record—Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure. On page 388 the author says:

"Members should not leave their seats before the question is finally declared. In 1881 a member's vote was struck off on account of his leaving his place before the question was so declared."

I move, therefore, that the vote of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) be erased from the record, in compliance with the rules, and as an example to hon. gentlemen to remain in their seats till the vote is recorded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be safe to leave the case in the hands of Mr. Speaker without any discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The decision given by Mr. Blanchet could not apply to the present case. Rule 17, quoted in that decision, reads as follows:—

"When the Speaker is putting a question, no member shall walk out of or across the House, or make any noise or disturbance; and when a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him, except to order, nor pass between him and the Chair; and no member may pass between the Chair and table, nor between the Chair and the mace, when the mace has been taken off the table by the Sergeant."

This rule is enacted simply for the preservation of decorum and order in the House. Hon. members will notice that there is no penalty attached to a violation of this rule. All I could do in the event of a member infringing it would be to call him to order, and if he continued to disturb the House, I could name him and then it would rest with the House to deal with him according to the gravity of the offence. In order to deprive a member of his right to vote there must be a clear disposition of the law, and certainly I would not undertake to reject the vote of a member on that rule. I, therefore, consider that my decision of last night was correct, and I declare the present motion of the hon. member for South Perth out of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the First Minister remembers the vote referred to by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), when Mr. Banister went out of the House on all fours. He had left his seat, and on leaving his seat he went outside of the jurisdiction of the Speaker altogether.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, now that the attention of hon. members has been called to this matter, and the necessity for maintaining decorum, and for members remaining in their seats until the votes are recorded has been enforced, I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion, as it might break the heart of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), but will withdraw it.

Mr. TROW. I withdraw the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is out of order ; there is nothing to withdraw.

#### REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals.—  
(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

#### WRECKING LAWS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I hope it will receive a little more favorable consideration from the House than it met with last year. This is a subject which, I think, demands and requires at the hands of hon. members very careful consideration. This Bill affects a large number of people, a large monied interest, and it is also a Bill which is of a quasi-international character and is one founded on humanity, and for all these reasons it requires and receives careful consideration. The object of the Bill is to permit foreign vessels to enter Canadian waters and assist vessels wrecked, stranded or in distress, and to bring in wrecking apparatus for the purpose of assisting them. The Bill is called for owing to the fact that there stands upon the statute-book of the United States a Bill passed by Congress eleven years ago, which was re-enacted last year in slightly different terms, but to the same effect, granting similar privileges to Canadian vessels in American waters, but it is not to come into force until a proclamation has been issued by the President of the United States when he is satisfied that the Canadian Government have granted similar privileges to American vessels in Canadian waters. Owing to the fact that the House last year saw fit in its wisdom to reject the Bill I had the honor to have in charge, the President of the United States in his annual message to Congress, referred to the fact, and stated:

"It is much to be desired that some agreement should be reached with Her Majesty's Government by which the damages to life and property on the great lakes may be alleviated, by removing or humanely regulating the obstacles to reciprocal assistance to wrecked or stranded vessels. The Act of 19th June, 1878, which offers to Canadian vessels free access to our inland waters in aid of wrecked or disabled vessels, has not yet become effective through concurrent action by Canada."

That at once draws attention to the fact that if this subject is considered worthy of a reference by the chief magistrate of the great Republic lying alongside of us, it is some reflection on this House that we have not given it such consideration, nor met the efforts of the President of the United States in his efforts to settle this matter. I hold that this House and this Government should give this matter every attention, and I believe that this Bill which I have brought in will satisfy the wants of the case. I believe further, that it is in the interests of Canada that this Bill should become law. In 1876 a regulation was issued by the then Minister of Customs, Mr. Burpee, to the effect that foreign vessels have no right to come into Canadian waters to render assistance to Canadian vessels, and the whole difficulty and objection is founded upon that regulation issued by Mr. Burpee. After this date a long correspondence took place between the two Governments, and a great many cases were alluded to where it was found that property had been lost owing to the fact that the nearest and most available tugs could not render assistance, because they

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

belong to a different nationality to the country in whose waters the wreck was. It is contended that no serious case of this kind has ever been brought to the attention of the Minister of Customs, without his giving permission to American vessels to come to the aid of vessels stranded in Canadian waters, whereas the American Government refused to allow Canadian vessels to go to the assistance of vessels in American waters. That is just the case that I wish to make out, and it is a strong argument in favor of this Bill. Our wreckers say that assistance has been obtained from American tugs, because of statements made to Ottawa, and that permission has been given for United States tugs to come to Canadian waters. We have before us, in a letter, which I believe has been sent to every member of this House, facts detailing the circumstances of a case in which this permission was given, last year, to the detriment of Canadian wreckers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred, last Session, to certain cases where refusals had been given by the American Government to allow Canadian vessels to go to the assistance of vessels in American waters. I then told him that this was perfectly true, but that in all cases where wrecks had taken place in Canadian waters, permission had been given to the American vessels to come in here. This permission is against the interests of our wreckers, who have invested their money in valuable plant and machinery, but it is in accordance with the kind and humane heart of the Minister of Customs. We find that, last year, when a vessel was stranded in a harbor on Lake Huron—a safe, land-locked harbor, where no immediate danger was apprehended—after the vessel had fallen into the hands of the insurance companies, who were negotiating with the owner of pumps and wrecking apparatus in Canada to go to her assistance, an instance of this kind occurred. The insurance company had almost made the bargain with a Canadian wrecker, but they telegraphed here to the Minister of Customs for permission to get in a foreign wrecking apparatus from Sault Ste. Marie, and he answered: "Yes, you can get one pump in, if there is no pump available in Canada." The insurance company at once told this Canadian with whom they had been making the bargain: "We don't want you, we are going to get a pump and tugs from Sault Ste. Marie." This Canadian wrecker communicated with the Minister of Customs and told him that the permission to bring in this pump was given under false pretences, that wrecking apparatus was available in Canada, and he asked that the tug, when brought to Canadian waters, should be seized. No attention, however, was paid to his telegram. That American wrecking apparatus came to this Canadian harbor, raised the vessel, and took the job and the profits out of the hands of the Canadian wreckers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where was this vessel?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. At Tober Murray harbor. I will read the following in relation to the circumstances from the letter of Mr. Wm. Leslie:—

"On that date, Oct. 5, I wired your department at Ottawa, as follows:—'Why grant permit for American wreckers to go to Isaac May, sank in Tober Murray harbor, when our plant under offer for same job. Answer.' To which I received the following reply:—'No permission given but for use of one pump, provided none could be obtained in Canada."

(Signed) "J. JOHNSON."

"I then wired your department, saying that as the Andrew J. Smith had then come in to do the job under misrepresentation, I hoped that your department would instruct your officers at Collingwood and Owen Sound to seize the tug and outfit when they came in with the May and hold them pending enquiry, and I also wrote you on the same subject, but have not since been favored with a reply, and nothing was done in the matter."

This letter is from a gentleman who has invested \$30,000, during the past few years, in furnishing a complete wrecking apparatus and outfit for work upon the great inland waters. It is a proud thing for Canadians to know that this wrecking apparatus is the most perfect on the whole chain

of inland lakes; its pumping capacity is greater than any to be found on the American side, and the whole apparatus is more valuable, more complete and can do more work than any American plant. The gentlemen who own this apparatus, as well as others engaged in the same business, are now pressing that this Bill should become law.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where are they located?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They are located along the chain of lakes. They are going to have their headquarters at Kingston and Windsor and the wrecking plant will be on the upper lakes.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are not there now?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They were at Windsor or Sarnia last year, because they could not get a job, owing to the fact that these American wreckers were allowed to come into Canadian waters. I know that the Americans guard their privileges in this respect, and until we accept their offer of reciprocity in the matter, I think they are quite right. They say: We have on our statute-book an offer that if you will give us reciprocity on this matter, we will give you the right to come into our waters, but until that is done, you cannot do any work in American waters. There is another large firm owning pumps and wrecking apparatus, composed of Captain Donnelly and son, and the Calvin Company, who have an interest in this matter. All these wreckers are in favor of the passing of this Bill. They are not afraid to compete with the Americans in any waters. But more than that, Sir, I do not think there are more than one or two who claim that they own wrecking apparatus, and who have any objection to the passage of this Bill. The tugs and apparatus are generally most inferior. What other classes are in favor of this Bill? The wholeshipping interest of the entire chain of inland lakes. I venture to say, that the owner of every ship or vessel on those lakes is in favor of it. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. A. M. Smith, of Toronto, who has a very large interest in our inland shipping, in which he says:

"The provisions of this measure are in the interests of the general community, inasmuch as they must tend to lessening the loss of property by disasters on the lakes, by enabling vessels in distress to avail themselves of the most readily obtained and most efficient appliances for assisting them. In many cases that have come within my own personal experience thousands of dollars' worth of property has been imperilled, and frequently totally lost, by delays due to the absence of such international privileges. Canadian vessel owners, underwriters, and wrecking men, except, perhaps, some with very inferior appliances, will all, I am sure, regard the passage of this Bill as a boon, and I trust that it may meet with acceptance on both sides of the House."

The Canadian Marine Association, at its meeting in Toronto, where was represented every shipping interest in the Canadian inland waters, passed the following resolution:—

"Resolved, that it is advisable that this association take action with reference to assisting in bringing before the Government the necessity of allowing the Bill for reciprocity in wrecking, which will again be brought before the Dominion House by the Hon. George Kirkpatrick, and that any deputation which may go from this association to Ottawa shall press upon the Government the necessity of this matter, and that the boards of trade of Toronto, Hamilton and Kingston be asked to cooperate."

The boards of trade of Toronto, Hamilton and Kingston all petitioned in favor of this Bill last year. The board of trade of Montreal did not consider it specifically, because it was not brought before them at the time of their meeting, but the most influential men of Montreal also petitioned in favor of it. Here is a letter which has been put into my hand, from Mr. Milloy, manager of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, in which he says of this Bill:

"I think it is a good thing. The reason that the *Spartan* was taken to Detroit—this steamer was wrecked on some of the upper lakes a few years ago—was that she was in charge of American tugs, and they could not go to a Canadian port with her, otherwise they would be seized. If we had a law like that proposed by Mr. Kirkpatrick, she would have been repaired in Canada, and the duty on the repairs coming into Canada would have been saved. I hope the Bill will carry."

So we lost the job of repairing that vessel for the want of a law of this kind; and if such a law is desired by shipowners and wreckers, why should we not grant it? The answer made heretofore and in correspondence with Washington has been that we are giving away more than we receive, that the greater number of these wrecks occur in Canadian waters, and, therefore, the Americans want to get into our waters without giving anything in return; and it is said that if they also give us the right of towage and coasting, we will consider the matter. With regard to the first proposition, I say it is not true that the greater number of those wrecks occur in Canadian waters. That may have been the case twenty years ago, when small sailing vessels were generally employed on the inland lakes, and the winds may have blown them on to the Canadian shores. But now, when large steam vessels are engaged in the carrying trade, they do not come so frequently into Canadian waters, and the losses occur principally in American waters. I hold in my hand a return of wrecks in inland waters for the year 1887—I have not the return for 1888—and this return shows that out of 73 total wrecks which occurred in 1887, only 11 were in Canadian waters, and out of 100 partial wrecks, only 12 were in Canadian waters.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole lake line?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, from Lake Michigan down to the River St. Lawrence. That shows that owing to the change in the class of vessels now navigating the inland waters, the wrecks that occur are chiefly in American waters, and therefore, if reciprocity in wrecking is granted, the chief gainers will be Canadians. Now, when we consider the great amount of tonnage on those waters, and the great value which this advantage would give to our wreckers, I think this Parliament should, without hesitation, give it to them. But it is contended that we can secure some other advantage if we hold out a little longer. I do not believe that is possible. The Congress of the United States have offered us, in the cause of humanity and progress, reciprocity in wrecking; and if we say that we will not accept that unless they also give us reciprocity in the coasting trade and in towage, we may lose the reciprocity offered to us. What does reciprocity in the coasting trade amount to? There is no comparison. We have about 150,000 tons of tonnage in the inland waters registered for Canada. I have no return of the exact amount registered on the American side, but it goes up among the millions of tons, and last year there were built 88 new vessels on the American side with a total tonnage of 108,525 tons, three-fourths of the whole of our tonnage registered in inland waters. It will be seen from these figures that the two interests cannot be compared, but are as a mountain to a mole-hill. It is impossible for us to expect that the Americans will give us reciprocity in the coasting trade merely because we hold off from accepting their offer of reciprocity in wrecking. Now, we have another Bill before this House, proposed by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson). It is apparently a very fair Bill, providing for reciprocity in wreckage, towage and the coasting trade; but the shipping men throughout Canada know very well that that is perfectly futile and absurd; as one of the correspondents says, we have not the ghost of a chance of getting reciprocity in the coasting trade. Then, why hold out the delusive hope of getting it by passing such a Bill? It is only keeping the promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope. We might say, in the words of Macbeth:

"And be these juggling fiends no more believed,  
That palter to us in a double sense;  
That keep the word of promise to our ear  
And break it to our hope?"—

The hon. gentleman, seeing that there is a great cry for the acceptance of this question from the whole country, has

brought down a Bill which purports to give it, but the effect of which really will be to prevent us having reciprocity in wrecking. I hope the Government will not support that Bill and its principle as opposed to the offer which is now open to it. Not only are the shipping men in favor of the Bill of which I have the honor to move the second reading, but all the underwriters and insurance companies, and the people interested in marine trade are in favor of it. That being the case, why should we not adopt it? Last year, the Government in their wisdom, because the United States offered us reciprocity in trees and fruits, accepted at once that offer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at once.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Well, two days afterwards. That being the case, why should they defer accepting the present one? Then an offer of reciprocity was accepted against the protests of the fruitmen and the nurseymen of Canada, but now we have an offer, the acceptance of which is advocated by every person interested in the business. I am not going into all the cases that were alluded to last year. I submit that this Bill ought, on every principle, to be adopted. It is a measure in the interests of the marine trade, it is a Bill called for by international courtesy, it is a Bill which rests on the broad ground of humanity, and which on that ground alone, if on no other, should be accepted. If the House will pass the second reading, it would be well that the Bill should be referred to a select committee; and I think a committee might be named which would consider this Bill and also consider, if necessary, the principle of the Bill proposed by my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson), so that the latter, if it has any merit, might be incorporated in the measure before you; but we should not allow the question of reciprocity in wrecking to be coupled, as my hon. friend has coupled it, with the question of tolls and navigation laws. Should the House pass the second reading, I intend proposing that the Bill be referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Cockburn, Bergeron, Diekey, Edgar, Charlton, Labelle, Langelier (Quebec), Masson, Holton, Mulock, Shanly, Patterson (Essex), Weldon (St. John), Weldon (Albert), and the mover.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I do not call your attention, Sir, to the irregular proceeding of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in discussing in advance a Bill which is not before the House—

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is before the House.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex)—but I will place myself in order by moving, in amendment, that Bills Nos. 2 and 7 be now read the second time and referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Bowell, Tupper, Kirkpatrick, Ferguson (Welland), Boyle, Charlton, Préfontaine, and the mover. I think I am consulting the best interests of the country in placing some members of the Administration upon the committee, as it is a matter, after all, in which the Government of the day should have a decided policy. My hon. friend, in dealing with the question, has appealed to this House on the plea of international courtesy and humanity. I do not think, after our recent experience of the treatment we have received from our American cousins, that the plea of international courtesy should have very great weight with us to-day. As to the plea of humanity, I think I satisfied my hon. friend last year that in that plea he was quite mistaken. I supposed then that his generous heart had clouded his better judgment, but I am afraid I cannot give him that credit to-day, for I must say that to-day, for want of a better argument he is making use of the *ad captandum* cry, in trying to make us believe that the question of humanity is involved in this business matter. Many of those who, in good faith, support the hon. gentleman in this matter, are under the impression that the Canadian Government are acting harshly towards American

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

vessels in distress; and they believe that the object of my hon. friend's Bill is to enable wrecking companies to assist vessels in distress. Nothing of the kind is the case. When may a vessel be said to be in distress? A steamer, when it springs a leak, or when its machinery is damaged, and a sailing vessel, when it springs a leak, or loses its sails or spars, or its rudder or sailing gear is damaged, and there is no law, human or divine, to prevent any vessel of any nationality aiding such a vessel in distress in Canadian waters. The only occasion when American wrecking tugs or tugs of any description, with their appliances, are prevented from interfering in Canadian waters, is when the vessel they wish to rescue is an absolute wreck, when it is beached or stranded, and in that case, owing to the action of the American Government in 1876, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was head of the Administration, with that sturdy manliness which characterised him, had an Order in Council passed retaliating on the Americans. He acted in favor of Canadian wrecking men and Canadian labor, and it was in harmony with the whole spirit of the National Policy that this existing system should be maintained, unless we could get substantial concessions in return for what we might give. Now, the Bill I have introduced does propose that substantial concessions should be obtained from our American neighbors. The vessel men of the United States are eager in seeking a concession which will be granted by the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and I leave it to the common sense of hon. members of this House, whether we ever heard of our American friends being anxious to have concessions which do not yield them a material advantage. My hon. friend, when he speaks of his measure as being to the advantage of Canadian wrecking tugs, is altogether in error. He is altogether in error in supposing that the majority of wrecks occur in American waters. I admit that the majority of wrecks do occur in American waters in the case of Lake Michigan, but my hon. friend is not as well up in geography as he is in humanity. There is a corner of Lake Ontario, where, owing to the conformation of the coast, the majority of the wrecks occur in American waters, and my hon. friend's constituent in whose interest he is introducing this Bill is desirous of having access with his valuable wrecking plant to Collin's Bay and the wrecking waters of that portion of the lake. But my hon. friend is in error in supposing that in Lake Erie and River and Lake St. Clair, the majority of wrecks are in American waters. If the policy of my hon. friend be adopted, we may as well give up attempting to maintain the National Policy at all, because we would be giving away absolutely to our American neighbors those valuable concessions which might possibly bring about in the near future a reciprocity treaty on an extended scale. But if we give them everything they desire, everything they demand, there will be nothing left for us to exchange with them on any future occasion when we desire to bring about a reciprocity treaty on a larger scale; and therefore I think this Bill should not become law, but that the Bill which I introduced should find favor with the House and with the Administration, because, should that Bill be accepted, it will bring about a complete system of reciprocity in our inland marine navigation. We would be able to get some advantage if our Canadian tugs had the privilege of towing American vessels in American waters. There has been no case pointed out by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and I defy any member of this House to point out a case where an American vessel has ever been interfered with in coming to the aid of a vessel in distress or where a wrecked vessel, although not in danger, has been refused the use of American tugs and appliances when Canadian tugs were not available. The whole argument on the ground of humanity is erroneous and false;

There is no question of humanity involved in it, but it is simply a question of business. If it is desired to encourage American labor and American tugs at the expense of Canadian labor and Canadian tugs, then the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac should become law; but there is not an argument that he has put forward which cannot be applied to the abrogation of the Treaty of 1818, and I do not see how the hon. gentleman can consistently support the present Administration, can support the National Policy, and can support the course of the Government towards the Americans on all other grounds, and yet take the ground he does in this Bill which is now before the House. To show the effect of carrying out the existing law, I may say that a Detroit wrecking firm have bought property in Amherstburg, and are establishing themselves there in order to do wrecking in Canadian waters. That is fair, if they use Canadian vessels, employ Canadian labor and start from Canadian ports; but we are not willing that they should bring in their seamen and their tugs from American ports to oust our Canadian seamen from their legitimate avocation. I quite favor sending this measure, in conjunction with the Bill which I have introduced, to a committee. I desire nothing but an intelligent and well-informed consideration of the question. I should be glad that the House would agree to its going to an unprejudiced committee which may give to this House a full, fair and unbiassed report, so that you may be guided to an intelligent decision, not to a decision wrung from you by appeals to your sympathies and sentiments, but a decision based upon business principles and upon the facts laid before you, because I suppose a committee of this kind is intended to take evidence and to ascertain accurately the views of all those who are interested in the matter. I move that these Bills be read the second time, and referred to a select committee composed of the Hon. Mr. Bowell, Hon. Mr. Tupper, Messrs. Kirkpatrick, Ferguson (Welland), Boyle, Charlton, Lister, Préfontaine and the mover.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this motion is in order. The question now is whether the Bill should be now read the second time. It is not a question of whether it should be sent to a committee or not. Furthermore, the question cannot be to read another Bill which is on the Order paper, and which will come up in its place, but we cannot displace the orders on the paper. Every item is to be taken up in its turn, one after the other, except by unanimous consent. I suggest that the Bill be read now, and that, when the other Bill comes up, it might be referred to the same committee, and the committee on this Bill might be altered or amended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, after the statement of my hon. friend who promotes this Bill (Mr. Kirkpatrick) there will be no difficulty. Of course, my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson) has been a little too previous, to use the common phrase, in moving, as he has done, in reference to his own Bill, but my hon. friend from Frontenac has stated his wish that the two Bills should go to a select committee. I think so, too. The subject was discussed before, and Parliament came to a decision upon it. Of course it is a very serious thing for Parliament to change its policy, but, after the elegant speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), which has, no doubt, impressed every member of the House, if hon. members are convinced that they should change their opinion, they will do so. I think the matter is of sufficient importance that the whole question should go to a select committee, in order that gentlemen who understand the subject, gentlemen from different parts of Canada, and especially from different parts of our inland waters, should consider the whole subject. I understand that to be the proposition of my hon. friend, but I suppose that each of my hon. friends has his own favorites for the committee, and I would suggest that the

two gentlemen should sit together and agree on a committee to which the two Bills should be referred.

Mr. PLATT. How would it do for the Government to take up the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot prevent the hon. gentleman moving for the second reading of his Bill. The Government may be very powerful, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Platt) may have great confidence in the Government, but I think my hon. friend has a right to press his Bill to a second reading.

Mr. LABELLE. I have been connected with navigation for a number of years, and I have studied the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and, though it is not an elaborate Bill, it is a very good one. The American Government are not as bad as some members appear to think. For years I have been at the head of a navigation company, and we have had very satisfactory dealings with them. The letter which was read from Mr. Milloy I suggested to the hon. member for Frontenac to get, because Mr. Milloy was in charge of that end of our line. If we had had wrecking reciprocity with the Americans, they would have taken our boat, the *Spartan*, which was wrecked, to the Canadian side, and, instead of paying \$26,000 to the Americans for labor and material in repairing her, we would have paid it to Canadians. I think it is a protection for us to have reciprocity in wrecking between the two nations. There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. In England the Royal Humane Society give rewards for saving the lives of sailors and other people; but in this country one would think that, so far from giving rewards for saving life, we wish to prevent them from saving the lives of our shipwrecked sailors. Certainly it is time that this honorable House should accord to other nations the privilege of rendering assistance to our shipwrecked sailors. Suppose that one of our steamers was wrecked, as in the case mentioned, and that the only vessel in sight was an American vessel, at present she could not offer her services, because, however desirous she might be of saving life, she would have to save her property at the same time, whereas if she could save the lives of these people, their property would not be in danger of being seized. There is a humane element in this question which ought also to be taken into consideration. In regard to the coasting trade I must say that the Americans have always been very liberal with our company. We have had boats that have been stopping at American ports, one after another, and the Americans have never placed any obstacle in our way, and have given us every facility to go from one port to another. Therefore, I think it would be good policy to look at the question on a higher ground, and that our Government should accord them the privilege of coming into our waters to assist wrecked vessels. Certainly, if the Americans would not do the same towards us, I would not advise the course I do, but the Americans have passed a similar law which will go into force as soon as our Government do the same; therefore I think that we ought to pass the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. COCKBURN. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), it is strange that he should have thought it necessary to digress from the point in issue and appeal to the National Policy against this Bill. I am myself an ardent supporter of that policy, but I do not wish to see it used to give refuge to every measure that may be brought before this House. The subject of this Bill ought to be debated on its own merits; and I do not think that the arguments adduced by the hon. member are such as to carry conviction to the minds, either of those who are disposed to look at the matter simply as one of trade, or to take a higher view of it and look upon it in the light of humanity. He has talked to us about international



courtesy and international humanity. It ill becomes us, I think, to take such a ground, when for years the United States have offered us this international courtesy and it is we who have refused it. I do not think that this House, after the humanitarian vote we gave last night for the protection of the sparrows and the pigeons, is prepared to turn around now and not show the same humanity to our fellow-creatures. It is all very well to tell me that the vessel must be actually wrecked, or actually beached, or actually stranded, before this law comes into operation. Surely it must be necessary on many an occasion, that a vessel should be relieved as soon as possible from the perilous position in which it stands at the time, for the saving of an hour, or a day, may mean the saving of the cargo, and may be the saving of the lives of those on board. With reference to the desire to hold back this act of humanity, on the plea that by-and-by we shall be able to obtain some advantages in the coasting trade, I think we must consider that we have to deal with people who are not going to be blinded in that way. We have got little to offer—little in itself, considering that in one year the tonnage built by the Americans on the lakes was stated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) to be equal to the whole Canadian tonnage on those lakes.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, about three-fourths.

Mr. COCKBURN. Well, such is the proportion. Our chances, even on the low basis of making money by the salvage, must be greater in saving American vessels than could be the chances of American vessels in saving Canadian vessels. If we look at it from the money point of view, I think it is our interest to pass this Bill. But I desire to look at it from a higher point of view; and when I look at the words of this Bill it does seem to me strange that in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and before an intelligent audience, we should require permission to bring in an Act to permit foreign vessels to aid our own that are wrecked or disabled. I think the feeling of humanity itself ought to be sufficient to make us cry out for the passage of such a Bill. I have myself, on one occasion, been in a wrecked or a disabled position—I do not mean politically, I mean on shipboard—and I should have thought little indeed of any man who, before coming to my aid, or before rescuing the cargo, was to consider the question whether I belonged to his own nationality, or whether there was any Act to disable him from performing an act of humanity. I trust, therefore, that the facts adduced will be considered by this House sufficient to lead it to pass this Bill, and to wipe from our legislation this blot upon our humanity in the way we treat wrecked vessels.

Mr. WALDIE. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), from a business point of view. In my past experience it has been my misfortune to have a vessel wrecked. The wreck occurred at Rondeau, during a great gale, and there were three other vessels either wrecked or ashore at Long Point at the same time; and to say that we are to be prevented from employing any tug, no matter what its nationality may be, to save our property or to save lives jeopardised, is to say something unreasonable, and to adopt a principle which I do not think this House will adopt. It has been urged that we should reject this Bill in order that we may get a more extensive reciprocity from the United States with regard to marine property; but seeing that the United States have extended their proposition so as to permit wrecking to be reciprocal, let us accept what they have proposed, especially as it is entirely in our own interest. It is a fact that our Government has been exceedingly liberal and have never refused permission to secure the services of an American tug for a wrecked vessel; but the owners of these wrecked vessels have to pay more for the use

Mr. COCKBURN.

of that tug than they would if this Bill was passed, because there is a hesitancy on the part of the owners of a wrecking tug and the owners of wrecking appurtenances, to come into our waters, for fear of violating our law and rendering themselves subject to seizure. It is also my conviction that we should pass this Bill as a humanitarian measure, if for no other reason; but there are also financial advantages which will accrue to the owners of our own marine property. In view of all these considerations, I trust this Bill will pass the House.

Mr. MASSON. As representing a riding containing the port which has, I believe, the heaviest tonnage of any port in Ontario, I do not think it would be right for me to allow this discussion to end without saying a few words in behalf of the interests at that port. As has been stated by the mover of the Bill, the shipping men are unanimously in favor of the Bill. Not only vessel owners, but their employes on vessels, the mariners, are all in favor of it, and the insurance companies, I am informed and believe, are also all in its favor. It is, then, not a question so much of humanity as a question of our own business interests. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) when he says that the Americans would not offer us reciprocity or exchange of privileges unless they expected to obtain a benefit. They do expect to get a benefit in one way, and we may get a benefit in the same way or in some other way. They expect to get a benefit on account of their large shipping interests on the northern lakes—Superior, Michigan, Huron and Georgian Bay—and the advantage, in case any of their vessels are wrecked, of being able to go to the nearest point and there obtain assistance. I know of cases where an American vessel has gone ashore in Lake George, where the channel is narrow, and where it is a dredged channel part of the way, and on a passing vessel throwing a line, and pulling the craft off, the vessel rendering such assistance was seized immediately, for entering an American port. As a matter of international courtesy, therefore, I do not think we owe the Americans anything. It is purely not as a matter of humanity, because I think the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) met that point, by stating that relief had never been refused where life was in danger, but as a matter of business I consider it, because in cases where vessels were stranded, or went on the rocks, the delay of one hour, or one day, may mean a loss, not only of the cargo, but of the vessel, and, unfortunately, perhaps of life. When this subject came before the House last Session, I took the opportunity of corresponding with all the ship-owners interested in it in my port, and I received from them an unanimous request to give the Bill all possible assistance. As to the other point, that if we refuse this offer it may be used as a lever to secure something further, I think with my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson), that equal towing and coasting rights would certainly be a benefit to us if we could obtain them, but I agree with hon. members that it is impossible to obtain them. The Americans will not grant them; and when we have an offer which the Americans suppose will be a benefit to them, if accepted, we have to consider whether it would not be a benefit to ourselves. I believe it would be of very great benefit to our shippers, our vessel owners and insurance companies. The sooner a vessel stranded on the rocks is assisted, especially on the northern lakes, where the storms are not only frequent but very sudden, the better it is for all parties concerned, and for that reason, independent of any question of international courtesy, and independent of the question of reciprocity or no reciprocity, I think it is desirable to secure any privileges we can get, and reciprocity in wrecking I think would be an advantage to our shippers, to our vessel owners, and to our insurance companies.

Mr. LISTER. As representing a county largely interested in the lake shipping, I have a word or two to say in support of the measure introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). I think I may say that there is not a master or shipper in Canada engaged in the carrying trade who is not in favor of the measure introduced by that hon. gentleman. The Bill proposed by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) we should all be glad to accept if we could get what he asks, but when we remember the statistics furnished by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), we must perceive the utter impossibility of hoping that the United States will grant us equal privileges in the coasting trade. When we remember how utterly insignificant our shipping interests are, compared with theirs, we must be convinced that for the States to give us equal rights in coasting would be injurious to their trade, while at the same time it would stimulate to a very large extent our shipbuilding industry and would be advantageous to us in that regard. It is, I believe, impossible to obtain such privileges, and under these circumstances it is the duty of Parliament, before navigation opens, to pass an Act whereby the vessels of either country, if placed in danger, would be able to get assistance at the nearest possible point. The First Minister has suggested that this matter be referred to a special committee. I think I voice the sentiment of almost everyone when I say that there appears to be no diversity of opinion upon this subject; in fact, there is a consensus of opinion in favor of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). In my judgment no committee is necessary in this case. I hold that it is the duty of Parliament to pass the measure just as it is. If it is thought that we could obtain coasting rights under the Bill of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), something might be done in that direction, but my own view is that it is impossible to get those coasting privileges, and therefore we owe it to ourselves and to the country to pass the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). It is quite possible that some people engaged in the wrecking business may object to this Bill, but I have received the circular referred to by the hon. mover, and it appears that the author of the circular declares he is in a position to compete with United States wrecking companies, and asks to be permitted to compete with them. Under these circumstances, and as there is no interest opposed to granting reciprocity in wrecking, I should not be discharging my duties to my constituents did I not raise my voice in favor of the Bill now under consideration.

Mr. EDGAR. Those who recollect the debate on this question last Session, will distinctly remember that the then Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper, only objected to this Bill so far as to ask a postponement for last Session. He most distinctly said the Bill had a great deal of merit in it, but he asked the House to postpone the Bill—for what purpose? In order to give the Government an opportunity to ascertain whether or not they could obtain reciprocity in coasting privileges from the American Government. This Government have had twelve months to make that inquiry. It is perfectly clear now that there is no answer, from the Government's standpoint of last Session, to the plea for the passage of this Bill, unless the Government can say to-day that they have ascertained from the American Government that there is a probability of getting those coasting privileges, because, if they have either taken any steps to ascertain the fact, nor arrived at any result from their negotiations, then there is no possible reason why this Bill should not pass this Session, even from their point of view. I am strengthened, too, in my opinion that the Government will favor this Bill this Session, since the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has become a member of the Administration, because

last Session he stated distinctly that he was in favor of this Bill, and said it was true reciprocity. Reference has been made, perhaps a little irregularly, to the Bill that comes shortly after this Bill on the Order paper, the Bill of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson). What necessity there is for that Bill I cannot understand. The hon. member proposes that instead of accepting the offer of the Americans for reciprocal wrecking, we should make a proposal to them for reciprocal coasting privileges. Why, we have made that proposal to the Americans. For nineteen years the proposal which the hon. gentleman asks us to make has been on the statutes of this country. So, why do we want to re-enact it? Does not the hon. gentleman know that nineteen years ago we made this proposition, and it was enacted and appears in our Revised Statutes? It is in the Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada; section five says:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which our ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country."

During those nineteen years that have elapsed, the First Minister has been in power for fourteen years, and he has not been able to induce the Americans to accept that offer, and I do not see any reason why we can expect to induce them to accept that offer by passing another Act, as is proposed. I really do not see that a select committee should be asked to enquire into that matter, for I think the House is prepared to put through this Session the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am afraid there is no use in my attempting to agree to a committee with my hon. friend for Essex (Mr. Patterson). If we waited until that is done we would have to wait until the end of the Session. Therefore, I move:

That Bill No. 2, intitled: "An Act to admit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters," be referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Cockburn, Bergeron, Dickey, Edgar, Langelier (Quebec), Charlton, Labelle, Masson, Mulock, Shanly, Patterson (Essex), Weldon (St. John), Weldon (Albert), Holton, and the mover.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I beg to move, as an amendment:

That said Bill be referred to a select committee composed of Hon. Mr. Bowell, Hon. Mr. Tupper, Hon. Mr. Kirkpatrick, Messrs. Ferguson (Welland), Boyle, Charlton, Lister, Préfontaine, and the mover.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that amendment can be put. If my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) will not agree to meet my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson), and settle on a committee, it shows he is afraid of his Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not at all, I am not afraid of it. I am only afraid we will not agree.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, you will not agree to the Bill. I think that my hon. friend had better not press his amendment.

Mr. CASEY. After the points raised by my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar), I do not see that there is any necessity for the Bill going to a special committee, unless the Government are positively determined that it should. The House has unanimously decided on the principle of the Bill, and my friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has pointed out that all that can be gained from the Bill of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) is already in the statutes. By adopting the principle of this Bill, the House has declared that it does not intend to bind up the question of wrecking along with that of coasting and towage. Having taken such action, and being practically unanimous on the principle of the Bill, I do not see why the House should refer it to a special committee.

Mr. LISTER. Persons will have to be subpoenaed before this committee at the expense of the country, and we will be put to an expense of one or two thousand dollars to take evidence on a matter which we all know about already. There is no person in this country, except he is the owner of a wrecking rig, who is opposed to this Bill. It will take many hundreds of dollars to bring witnesses here, and the result will be merely telling us what we all know already. Why not let the Bill go through the committee of the House now and pass it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) are disparaging to the committee named by my hon. friend. There are some names on that committee that may be taken as a guarantee that there will be no expense.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no power to call for persons, and you cannot go to any expense in that direction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is so.

Mr. CASEY. What is the committee for, then?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Just to consider the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). If my hon. friend would let the matter stand until to-morrow—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I wish to have members on the committee who are interested in the question because of the localities they represent. I do not wish the question to be settled from a party view as to who should be a member of the committee. I think that the Bill I have introduced is in the interest of the country, and I conscientiously believe that the effect of the Bill of the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), if it becomes law, will be to drive our Canadian wreckers out of business altogether, and that our Canadian sailors will have to seek employment on American vessels. It will not only affect the wrecking vessels, but the whole inland fleet. If we are going to have reciprocity at all I desire that we should have reciprocity as a whole, because the exception of coasting and towing would make a large difference. It is well, if this proposition is to be renewed, that the towing and coasting questions should be combined with the wrecking question. If the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) will consent, I think that we can come to an amicable arrangement as to the formation of the committee, but I believe that we should appoint members from localities affected by the Bill, and who will be able to bring valuable information to the House on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let the hon. gentleman withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn, and Bill referred to Select Committee.

#### RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING, TOWING AND COASTING.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to admit vessels registered in the United States of America to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian waters.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that we should pass this Bill through a second reading, because by so doing we would endorse the principle that we are not to have reciprocity in wrecking until we have reciprocity in towing and coasting as well, which would mean that, for the present at all events, we could not have reciprocity in wrecking, to obtain which we have just passed a Bill through its second reading. Everybody knows that at present it would be quite impossible to obtain the extended recipro-

Mr. CASEY.

city the hon. gentlemen's Bill proposes. I must compliment him, by-the-by, on the extreme liberality of his views in the matter of reciprocity. He expressed wonder that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) should support the Government when he advocated reciprocity in wrecking, although he himself advocates reciprocity, not only in wrecking, but in towing and coasting. I think his position is the more anomalous of the two, if there is anything anomalous in either. But I think the reciprocity which the hon. member for Essex desires can only be obtained as part of a far larger scheme of unlimited reciprocity or commercial union, or something of that sort. The hon. member said that we should not give this reciprocity in wrecking unless we got something substantial in return. That is the position I take. We know that we are getting something substantial in return, because as soon as our Bill becomes law, reciprocity in wrecking will be an accomplished fact; but by adopting his Bill we should be getting not only nothing substantial, but nothing at all, because matters would be left exactly as they are, and I think it is the sense of the House that matters should not remain as they are. I, therefore, oppose this Bill, and hope the House will not agree to the second reading.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I differ from my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I think the House should allow this Bill to be read the second time. I am in favor of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac, and I am also in favor of this Bill, and I think it would be well to pass both. If we can get reciprocity in wrecking, there is no doubt it is a good thing; but if we can also get reciprocity in towing and coasting, that is still better. I differ from hon. gentlemen who say that it is impossible to get reciprocity in towing and coasting. I believe it is possible to get it. It is true the coasting trade of the United States is very much larger than ours; but it is also true that they have very many more coasters, and it would be very convenient to them if the coasting trade of both countries were thrown open. Therefore I hope the House will allow this Bill to be read the second time.

Mr. LISTER. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House I have heard hon. members talk over and over again about the principles of Bills; I have heard people talk seriously about the principle of a Bill, as though if you departed in the slightest to the right or the left and violated what they called the principle of a Bill, you would commit a grievous sin. I do not think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) is called upon to pass any strictures upon the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson). If we can get what this Bill provides for, we shall get something that will be worth thousands of dollars to the people of this country. If we cannot get that, then we should get what the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) desires to obtain by his Bill. And so far as these Bills are concerned, dealing with the same question to a certain extent, but one going a step farther than the other, I think it is proper to refer them both to the same committee. I do not see any sacrifice or violation of principle by what is proposed to be done. If I could be at all satisfied that what the hon. member for North Essex asks could be accomplished, I would gladly aid him in every possible way. But I am afraid that nothing of the kind can be accomplished, because the Americans appreciate too highly what they have now to yield what we want. The measure we are obtaining by the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac is a valuable one, which ought to have been on our Statute-book years ago, although it cannot be said that the want of it has been any very serious loss, for the hon. Minister of Customs, humanitarian as he is, has always done what was necessary to allow aid to be given to disabled vessels.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is the best way to settle the discussion on these Bills. I think the House is in favor of the principles of both Bills. One does not go as far as the other. The contention is that, on the one hand, we ought not to make the attempt to get what it appears possible for us to get without, at the same time, getting all that is asked for by the Bill of my hon. friend beside me. I would suggest that my hon. friend should allow his Bill to go before that committee, and I have confidence enough in that committee to feel that the Bill would be fairly considered there on its merits, and that if we cannot get all that my hon. friend asks for, it is possible we may get much more than the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) asks for.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the principle of the Bill now before the House. I would merely say, without entering upon a full discussion of the Bill, that, so far as the records of the two countries are concerned with regard to wrecking, that of the Canadian Government stands in a much better position than that of the American Government. The Canadian Government has uniformly been liberal in its treatment of the subject. Numerous instances have occurred where they have permitted American wrecking plant to enter our waters, and I doubt whether one solitary instance has occurred of the Americans having returned that courtesy. In the speech I made last winter on this subject, I referred to a case of great hardship, the wreck of the *Algoma*, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had their own plant at Port Arthur, within 50 miles of the scene of the wreck, which they were not allowed to use for the relief of their own vessel, but were compelled to send to Port Huron, 600 miles away, in order to get wrecking plant. While the humanity cry may have a great deal of effect, it is impossible to show any single instance in which human life has been imperilled through the Canadian Government refusing assistance. If any charge lies against the Canadian Government, it is that they have been too liberal, and have not protected the interests of their own citizens in this matter. Without going further into a discussion of the question, I wish to say that I consider it highly desirable that both of those Bills should be referred to a special committee, and there is a middle course between the two measures which might perhaps be adopted with advantage. The Bill of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) proposes entire reciprocity in the coasting trade. It is possible that could not be secured, but a compromise might be effected by which we would propose to the American Government, if we gave them reciprocity in wrecking they should give reciprocity also in towing to the tugs of the two nationalities. I believe that is an offer that would likely be accepted, and which would be attended with advantage of some value to us, while if we adopt the measure proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), we will be giving valuable concessions without any consideration whatever. I would like to see these two Bills referred, not to a committee selected by either of these two gentlemen, but to one selected impartially, that is, a committee composed of parties not interested in the one Bill or the other. If the Government would name a committee to which these two Bills would be referred, that would be a proper course to adopt. The question is one of international import in which great interests are involved, which require careful consideration, and it is the duty of the Government to protect the interests of its citizens and see that no injustice is done in this matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Notwithstanding what has been said by some hon. gentlemen with regard to the question of principle, it does seem to me these two Bills are very different in their terms; and if we support the principles

of the one, we cannot support the principle of the other without stultifying ourselves. The hon. member for North Essex proposes that we should adopt a Bill relating to wrecking and to coasting privileges in Canadian waters. The hon. gentleman's Bill must be taken as a whole, it deals with those subjects together. If the principle of the hon. member's Bill is adopted, then we reject the principle laid down in the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). The hon. gentleman is on that committee. There is nothing contained in his Bill that he cannot have incorporated in the Bill before the committee, if he has sufficient influence in the committee, without his own Bill being referred to it, as well as with its being referred to it. The hon. gentleman, by acting on that committee, if he finds the Bill reported by the committee as unsatisfactory, may proceed with his own measure, or he may secure the rejection of the other upon the third reading. How is this House, if it supports the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), going to declare that the Bill of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) shall have effect, as soon as, and remain in force as long as, like privileges of wrecking, towing and coasting are conceded to the United States? Does this House, after declaring itself in favor of the principle of the Bill of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), propose that we shall not have freedom in the relieving of wrecked vessels upon the lakes, simply because the Americans will not allow us to share in the coasting trade along the Atlantic? That is the principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill; that is the provision he asks this House to support. The House has already, this afternoon, asserted an entirely different proposition. These two propositions cannot stand together. If the House supports the proposition of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), it, in fact, resiles from the position it took in supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). It seems to me that it is of great consequence to those who have property in ships, and to those who sail in and are employed in those ships, that they should have that property rescued and their lives protected as far as possible, no matter whether property is rescued or whether life is protected by a Canadian or an American vessel. It is true that the Government may, in any case of great distress, grant permission to an American towing vessel to come to the rescue of a stranded ship, but before communication with the Government can be had, the vessel may go to pieces and every person on board may be lost. That is the position, and it does seem to me a monstrous thing that we should undertake to jeopardise the lives of those who are employed on board those ships and the property that is invested in them, merely in the interest of those who have towing vessels on this side of the line. That is the proposition of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson). He says to the Americans: If you will not grant reciprocity—and the Americans have, so far as relieving wrecks is concerned, offered reciprocity—if you will not grant reciprocity in all these things, in the coasting trade and the relieving of ships in distress, we will not grant reciprocity in any of them. That is the proposition contained in this Bill, and against that proposition we have already pronounced in support of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). The hon. First Minister shakes his head, but I maintain that is a clear proposition. In supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) we have agreed that we will permit wrecking vessels to engage in wrecking on our coast, no matter whether the Americans agree to reciprocity in the coasting trade or not. There is no condition relating to the coasting trade attached to the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac. It is an inseparable portion of the proposition that we ask to make law in the Bill of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson). It is a principle of the Bill

which is the gist of the whole Bill; and it is that which distinguishes his Bill from that of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). If he thinks that the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is wrong in laying down too liberal a proposition, in granting terms which are too liberal, he will undertake to change it, and we will have an altered Bill, a Bill altered in principle, when it comes back to this House, and, if we choose to resile from the position we have taken to day, we may vote for a Bill essentially different in principle from the Bill which has now been read a second time. But the hon. gentleman says, I have here a Bill which I ask you to read a second time, and I ask you to read a second time a Bill which affirms a principle essentially different from the principle you affirmed a few minutes ago. A few years ago, we had a proposition made in this House that the rate of interest on money should be unlimited. We had another proposition a few minutes later that the rate of interest on money should be 8 per cent., and your predecessor in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, declared that the second Bill was out of order as being inconsistent in principle with the Bill which had been voted for a little while before. Now we are asked by some hon. gentlemen to read a second time a measure which, if we adopt it, will be wholly at variance with the one we have just adopted. I ask hon. gentlemen if it would be possible for these two measures, as they are now in this collection of Bills before us, to be adopted by this House? Could they be read the third time and sent to the Senate and read there three times, and ratified by His Excellency the Governor General? Certainly, the Bill that stood first in point of time would be in part repealed by the other measure. If these two measures cannot stand as they are here before us, then it is clear that the principle of the one is inconsistent with that of the other, and what we are asked now to do is to stultify the vote we gave half an hour ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was about to suggest that perhaps the better way would be to adjourn this debate. I agree with a great deal which has fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Mills). It appears to me that, if the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) is on the committee, as he is, he can possibly satisfy the committee that his Bill should become law, and the committee may make its provisions a part of the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). If he cannot satisfy the committee in that respect, there will be an opportunity later, if the debate stands adjourned, for my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson) to move this Bill and to have it dealt with by the House. I must say that my own view is entirely in favor of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac. It appears to me that the way in which we should look at this question is in our own interest, and in our own interest alone. It appears to me that it is in our own interest to conserve the interests of the vessel owners, and those who are interested in our marine, rather than the small or comparatively small number of those who are interested in wrecking. It is not because the United States has offered to us the privilege of reciprocity in wrecking that I would adopt such a measure, but it is because, upon the whole, as it appears to me, regard being had to all that we have heard and to all that we hear from those who are largely interested in marine matters, that the interest of this country would be better served if we permitted wrecking or the sending of our vessels by those who are prepared to undertake that business, although to that extent, and to that extent only, it may interfere with those who are specially interested in that industry in this country. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that that motion should be put, if my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Patterson) agrees to it; but I understand that the argu-  
Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

ment of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is that the two Bills are inconsistent in principle, that we cannot read the two together, that they are so utterly inconsistent that, having passed the second reading of one Bill and admitted the principle of it, we cannot pass this Bill; and yet the hon. gentleman says that the committee can report the Essex Bill instead of the Frontenac Bill. It is utterly inconsistent that the committee appointed to carry out the principle of the Frontenac Bill should rub that out altogether, and yet that the House cannot now entertain the Bill of my hon. friend from Essex. I do not see how the argument will hang together. I am very unwilling to agree to the restrictive doctrine of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to the extent to which he carries it, that the second reading of a Bill commits the House to the principle so far that you cannot pass any other Bill on the same subject if it goes further, if it adopts other clauses and makes other provisions. All we have done in passing the second reading of the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), is to say that we agree to the principle that foreign vessels should not be allowed to aid vessels which are wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Patterson) proposes a Bill on the same principle, but he wishes to go a little further, and the clauses of his Bill are, in principle, the same as the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). The fourth clause of the Bill provides that:

"This Act shall take effect as soon as, and remain in force so long as, the like privileges of wrecking, towing and coasting in United States waters are extended to Canadian vessels by the Government of the United States."

That is an additional clause which is not in the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac. If the committee do not like it, they will throw it out. If they do like it, both Bills being sent to the same committee, they will insert it, although it may be inconsistent, according to my hon. friend's theory, with the principle of the Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac. If my hon. friend's doctrine is true, then the very wise suggestion of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the committee might find a *tertium quid*, might find an alternative proposition, might decide that they would go half way and make certain conditions, and impose certain checks, could have no effect. It is monstrous, I must say, it is contrary to all my experience of the practice of Parliament, that we should be prohibited from sending these two Bills to a committee, and leaving it to the wisdom of the committee to adopt one, or to adopt the other, or to draw a Bill which may vary in every clause from the both of them, so that the principle is maintained, that foreign vessels may be allowed to enter our waters to save disabled vessels. I am rather surprised that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should fight this question so far, after the speeches which have been made by the hon. members for Norfolk and for Kent, both of whom spoke in favor of the extended principle contained in the Bill of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Patterson).

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). In deference to the wishes of members on both sides of the House, I am prepared to accept the motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I am aware that the probability is that, in doing so, in the present state of public business, I may not be able to reach this Bill again this Session. I take this opportunity of saying that it is a libel on the Department of Customs of Canada to say that a life has ever been momentarily in danger by any policy that they have carried out in connection with our wrecking system. If they have erred at all, if the Department of Customs have erred at all in this matter, it has been in showing too great a leniency and too great friendliness to American wrecking tugs seeking admission to Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the motion will not be withdrawn. I think this Bill ought to pass and be referred to the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is practically the same thing; we can move these in committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. The committee will not have the Bill under consideration.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They will have the ideas.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the debate closes I desire to say a word for fear a wrong impression may be left upon the minds of the members of this House from some of the remarks that fell from the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and also from the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman complained on behalf of the wrecking and towing company, which is situated, I think, in his own constituency, because more active steps were not taken to seize certain wrecking and towing vessels that were permitted to assist in saving the property of a wrecked vessel in the western lakes. The facts were simply these: Application was made on behalf of the owners of a vessel for permission to use American appliances to save property. The answer made by the department was that if there were no Canadian appliances, or Canadian tugs, or wrecking apparatus, to be secured, then the American appliances might be used. The answer that was sent—not to the party who made application for permission to use American appliances, but to the collector of customs at that port—was that there were no wrecking appliances belonging to Canadians that could be used, and it was necessary, in order to save property, that the Americans should be permitted to operate, and permission was accordingly given. Then complaints were made immediately afterwards that these parties who had informed the collector that no Canadian appliances were available, had made a false statement, and that we should at once take measures to seize the property which had been used. I did not deem it advisable, under the circumstances, to give any such instruction; had the department done so, the Government would at once have been condemned by the parties who are always ready to condemn the Department of Customs for being too rigid in the enforcement of the law, and in this case for having first, through the collector, given permission to use the property, and then having seized it. It would have been another case in which the press of hon. gentlemen opposite would have deluged the whole country from one end to the other with condemnation of the iniquity of the Customs Department. The hon. member for Bothwell mentioned a case in which lives might be lost while waiting for permission from the department at Ottawa to use American tugs or American life-saving apparatus. Instructions have been given to all collectors that in cases where property is in immediate danger, or in cases where life is in danger, they should use any appliances at hand, whether foreign or domestic, without asking for permission. That, I think, is a sufficient answer to what the hon. gentleman terms a "monstrous thing," in which he supposes a loss of life might occur. But it is somewhat singular that we should have these hon. gentlemen taking such a strong position upon this question at the present moment, when we reflect that it was the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member who issued the first order to prevent the use of American appliances in the saving of either life or property where vessels were wrecked in Canadian waters or upon Canadian shores.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think you are mistaken. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was not then a member of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Now, the orders which have been enforced since the advent to power of the present Government, have not been so rigid, neither have they been as strictly enforced as the orders which were issued by our predecessors.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think that was before the member for Bothwell came into the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps so. It was on the 1st of December, 1877. If the hon. gentleman was not in the Government—

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, he was.

Mr. BOWELL—at least, he was an energetic supporter of the Government at that time, hence I take it for granted that he approved of their policy. I am not aware of any single act of that Government from 1873 to 1878 that he did not approve of—at least so far as the outside world knew. My only object in rising on this occasion was to set the House right in case there had been any misconception in this matter. I will not discuss the merits of either one Bill or the other—I have my own views upon them, and I think that when the committee meets probably they will obtain information which will show that there are great interests at stake in this country upon the question of wrecking, as well on the part of those who are in the business, as on the part of those who have other interests.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

#### FRAUDS UPON CHEESE AND BUTTER MANUFACTORIES.

Mr. BURDETT moved second reading of Bill (No. 16) to provide against frauds in the supplying of milk to cheese and butter manufactories.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have on the Order paper a number of Bills affecting more or less the criminal law; the Bill which the hon. gentleman has moved is one, and there are several others. I think amendments to the criminal law is a matter which properly devolves upon the Government, who should take care of legislation of the kind which the hon. gentleman proposes. This Bill, along with some others, deals with a matter that ought to be left to the consideration of a committee of the House, and when these Bills come to a second reading I propose to refer them to a committee, and I propose that the committee shall consist of Messrs. Weldon (St. John), Mills (Bothwell), Langelier (Quebec), Kirkpatrick, Girouard, Moncrieff, Landry, Davies and myself.

Mr. BURDETT. I have no objection to the position taken by the Minister of Justice, but it is desirable to get this Bill through the House during the present Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BURDETT. As the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature has been declared *ultra vires*, unless some law is passed the cheese industry, which is a very large and important one, will suffer very materially.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend's name should be added to the committee, and probably also the names of other gentlemen who have Bills on the same subject, for it would be only fair that my hon. friend should have an opportunity of explaining to the committee the reasons why he desires that the provisions contained in that Bill should become law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object which the Minister of Justice has in view is to expedite the matter, and get it through. These Bills all affect the criminal law, and the Minister of Justice is primarily responsible to the House and the country for the criminal law legislation. It is, therefore, proposed to have this committee appointed, which has been drawn with some care, and have all the Bills

considered so that there will be no conflict with respect to clauses and punishments. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burdett) should be on the committee as well as any other hon gentleman in charge of a similar Bill, and that they should go with their Bills before the committee, if their names are not already on it.

Mr. BOWELL. Is it not a fact that the Premier of Ontario has given notice of his intention to appeal from the decision given by the courts below? He has declared, I understand from the public journals, that his Act is not *ultra vires*, that the decisions of the courts are not correct, and he intends to assert the rights of the Province of Ontario in that regard, and to re-enact the law.

Mr. BURDETT. I think, for two reasons, this House ought not to be deterred from taking action in this matter notwithstanding the fact that the Attorney General of Ontario may have made the intimation which the Minister of Customs has stated. The first reason is, that it is doubtful whether there can be an appeal from the decision given. In the second place, if a matter of this character affecting the butter and cheese industry was to be delayed until it could be carried through the different courts, the summer would be wasted and farmers would lose the summer business, by reason of the fact that many of them would not sell their milk to the factories, fearing they will be cheated. It is thus desirable that a Bill should be passed through the House this Session, otherwise great injury will be done to that interest, as I am instructed by those who are most interested in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have added the names of Mr. Burdett and Mr. Madill to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### ELEVATORS AND HOISTS.

Mr. MADILL moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) to require the owners of elevators and hoists to guard against accident.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

#### After Recess.

#### PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. JAMIESON. In resuming the adjourned debate, I desire to offer a very few remarks in reference to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment proposed to the resolution which I moved a few days ago in this House. I am not at all anxious to enter at any great length on the discussion at this stage, and my sole object at the present time is to lay the issue before the House in order that we may take an intelligent vote upon the question. In the first place we have the resolution which is on the Order paper in favor of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors with certain exceptions, and also indicating the lines on which a prohibitory measure should be formed. We have then the amendment of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) which is simply for the effect so far as I can understand it of sugar coating the question in order that those who have no very strong or fixed opinions on the subject may be enabled to vote upon it. What I want is that we should have a square vote upon the question of prohibition. On a former occasion when a motion of this kind was made in the House we had an amendment much of the same character as that proposed by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). We had an amendment to the amendment on that occasion also bringing about a square issue upon the question of the liquor traffic. We are not

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

placed in that position to-night, but I trust that the issue shall be thoroughly understood so that hon. members in voting on this question will understand the effect of the vote which they are about to give. For my part, as the mover of this resolution, I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). In my judgment it is too much of a milk and water character, and there is more water than milk in it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman object to water?

An hon. MEMBER. He would like it qualified.

Mr. JAMIESON. Water is very well in its own place.

An hon. MEMBER. But not in the stomach.

Mr. JAMIESON. But not in a principle when we are dealing with an important question like this. A word in reference to the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). It is double barrelled and I cannot accept it in its present shape, neither could I accept it under the present circumstances were the two propositions separated and placed before the House in an independent form. So far as the proposition to submit this question to a plebiscite is concerned, I would remark that the temperance people of this Dominion have had some experience of a proposition of that kind in the past. The largest and most representative body of prohibitionists and temperance workers ever held in the Dominion was held in the city of Montreal in 1875, and the outcome of that convention was that resolutions were adopted asking the Government of the day to submit the question to a plebiscite. These resolutions were carried to the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and he took exception to the proposition, as we were afterwards informed, because there was no constitutional precedent for any such thing under the British Crown. Inasmuch as governments are very likely to follow in many respects the precedents set them by a preceding Government I apprehend that we would have a like answer from the present Government should this House accept this proposition. However if the motion for a plebiscite were proposed as a single proposition it would not be objectionable as it is in its present shape, where it is submitted in connection with the question of the compensation of those engaged in the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I am not here to-night to pronounce upon that question and I have no desire to enter into a discussion of it. My judgment is that the question of compensation as has already been decided by this House will more properly come up in connection with any measures that may be submitted to Parliament by the Government of the day for the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I trust that all who are in favor of the prohibition of the traffic will vote both against the amendment and the amendment to the amendment and in favor of the main motion which embodies the principles of prohibition pure and simple, and provides that it shall be carried into effect within a reasonable time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Before the question is put I wish to express my views on this question. I am very much in favor of the resolution as moved by the member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and I am opposed to the amendment, as well as to the amendment to the amendment, on the ground that they are very indefinite in their expressions, and make no provisions for a plebiscite. I think, during the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment to the amendment, that he said the voice of the people might be taken in any way the people pleased: by municipal councils or any other way. If this were done it is certain to my mind that a plebiscite would not be taken at all, and, therefore, we would not get the voice of the people. Another clause in the amendment to

the amendment which I cannot support is the one which brings up the question of compensation. It appears that the mover and the seconder do not agree with regard to the meaning of their own amendment. One wishes to compensate those engaged in the manufacture only, and the other wants to compensate all those engaged in the manufacture and sale as well. That is beyond the power of this Government to do. At all events, it involves a complex question; and what we want to-night is to know how many members in the House are favorable to prohibition. If they are favorable to the principle of prohibition, then when an Act is brought down based on that, we will discuss all these questions, and no doubt be led to a wise conclusion. I am under the impression that if a good measure were brought before the country, that the sentiment of the people would be found in support of a reasonable prohibitory bill. As everyone knows, a large proportion of the people of this country has favored even the Scott Act, and the Scott Act is only partially prohibitory, because it is a local option bill, and there are several circumstances which surround it and which prevent it from being so effective as a regular prohibitory measure would be. A measure that will prevent the importation and sale of intoxicants in this country would have a strong and efficient effect in subduing that curse of our country, and we all admit that intoxicating liquor is a curse to this country. We all believe that this is a system of iniquity that should be removed, and we ought to put our wisest judgment together to devise some means by which it can be removed. There is nothing in the amendment objectionable, for we are all in favor of prohibition when the country is ripe for it, but it does not go far enough. I will support the main motion, which, if carried, will lead to a prohibitory law, and oppose the amendment which raises issues which I am not able to decide upon until the Bill comes before the House.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Taylor) :

That all the words of the amendment be struck out, and also all the words in the main motion after the word "purposes," and the following substituted therefor:—"If it be found on a vote of the qualified electors of the Dominion having first been taken and a majority thereof are in favor of a prohibition law which shall also make full provision for compensating those engaged in the manufacture of such liquors."

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Desjardins,	Moncrieff,
Armstrong,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Perley,
Barnard,	Guillet,	Porter,
Bécharé,	Hesson,	Prior,
Bergeron,	Hudspeth,	Rinfret,
Bowell,	Joncas,	Riopel,
Burdett,	Labelle,	Roome,
Cargill,	Labrosse,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Shanly,
Casey,	La Rivière,	Small,
Cockburn,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Smith (Ontario),
Costigan,	McCulla,	Stevenson,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Taylor,
Coulombe,	McDougald (Picton),	Thérien,
Couture,	McKay,	Tisdale,
Davin,	Madill,	Vanasse,
Davis,	Masson,	Ward, and
Dawson,	Moffat,	Wilson (Lennox).—58.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Andet,	Fiset,	Mills (Annapolis),
Barron,	Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),
Beansoleil,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Bell,	Foster,	Neven,
Bergin,	Freeman,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Perry,
Boisvert,	Gigault,	Platt,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Putnam,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Hale,	Rowand,
Boyle,	Hickey,	Ste. Marie,
Brien,	Holton,	Scriver,
Bryson,	Innes,	Semple,

Cameron,	Ives,	Somerville,
Campbell,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Jones (Digby),	Thompson (Sir John),
Casgrain,	Kenny,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Kirk,	Turoot,
Cook,	Landry,*	Waldie,
Corby,	Lang,	Wallace,
Dessaint,	Lépine,	Watson
Dickey,	Lester,	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	Lovitt,	White Renfrew,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Wilson (Elgin),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wood (Brockville),
Edwards,	McMillan (Huron),	Wood (Westmor't'd), and
Eisenhauer,	McMullen,	Yeo.—36.
Ellis,	Meigs,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HOLTON. I notice that the hon. senior member for Halifax did not vote.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am paired with Mr. Carling.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the amendment is put I beg to move in amendment to it, that the following words be added:—

And that a vote of the qualified electors of Canada be taken at a convenient time to ascertain the opinion of the country upon the question.

He said: It seems to me that the proposition contained in the amendment, that such a measure is necessary as soon as public opinion will support it, is not a fair proposition. We want to know what the public opinion on the question is, and in order to ascertain that, it is necessary that a vote should be had. I quite admit that on the great majority of public questions it is desirable that Parliament itself should assume the responsibility of legislation; but Parliament has already pronounced its opinion that prohibition legislation is desirable, but it has said that, in its opinion, public opinion is not prepared for it. That may be the opinion of some hon. members of this House; but it is possible to settle that question, and to ascertain what public opinion is beyond all controversy, by taking a vote of those qualified to vote at an ordinary election. Then, when the House shall have ascertained by a vote taken at a convenient time, when it can be done without seriously interfering with the industries of the country, we shall know what the public opinion is; and if it is found ready to sustain prohibition legislation, we shall be prepared to legislate in accordance therewith.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot altogether agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down. I quite agree with the proposition contained in the amendment offered by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) that prohibition might properly be enforced as soon as public opinion were ripe for it; but I question whether you could ascertain by a plebiscite such as is proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) whether public opinion were ripe or not. We have had local plebiscites in many counties upon the Scott Act. In my own county, for example, that law was carried by a tremendous majority, between 700 and 800, and in spite of that fact it has been found impossible to efficiently enforce it, notwithstanding the best efforts of everybody concerned. Now, I beg leave to suggest the fear that, even though a majority of the duly qualified electors of Canada, were found to be in favor of the enforcement of total prohibition, it might be impossible to carry it into effect, as it has been locally in the case of the Scott Act. Now there is a difference as to ease of enforcement between a general act and a local one like the Scott Act; but the great difficulty, would be the same in both cases, the difficulty amounting to an impossibility almost, of obtaining satisfactory evidence to prove infraction of the law, and getting the general support of the public in carrying it out. I believe these objections are so serious that it will be assuming a tremendous risk, even if we find a majority



of the duly qualified electors voting for it, to attempt to enforce prohibition. It might be, as has been the case in many counties in which the Scott Act has passed, that a large majority would be in favor of it one year and the next in favor of repealing it. I think it would be a serious blunder to make this experiment of general prohibition unless we were absolutely certain, that not only the majority of the electors were in favor of it in a theoretical way, but such a mass of public opinion as would enable the Act to be carried out after its passage. I believe the only way in which we can ascertain whether that can be done is the ordinary way in which a member ascertains the feelings of his constituents about other questions; and I see no reason for changing our mode of procedure with regard to prohibition any more than with regard to other matters. I shall therefore vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell, and in the future I shall endeavor to ascertain in the best way I can whether the sentiment of my constituency is in favor of total prohibition or not, and such as to secure its enforcement if passed.

Mr. FREEMAN. It is evident that all those amendments are moved with a view of defeating the motion upon which we are called on to pronounce. The movers of these amendments can have no other object in view. We have here a square resolution for prohibition, and I hold that it is a question of so much importance that it does not become this House, from its practice in the past, to ask whether the country is prepared for it or not. A few nights ago we had a question before this House with respect to one item among hundreds in the tariff; and this House spent two sittings in considering that question, and I presume that those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to a prohibitory measure thought that that time was well consumed. When to-night we ask to have discussed a question of greater moment than any question that has ever come before this House, hon. gentlemen are uneasy. They think we should not come here again because we discussed this question two years ago. I hold that it is unbecoming of the members of this House to refuse to listen or take part in the discussion of this question. To ascertain whether the country is ripe for a question that comes before this House in not the practice of the House. Last Session a measure was introduced into the Senate to prohibit the bucket shop business. The country was not asked whether it was ready for that measure or not; there had been no expression of public opinion upon it; but the one consideration pressed upon the House was this: Is it for the benefit of the country that this measure should be passed? Will it be promoting the best interests of the country that the bucket shop business should be suppressed? It was not asked that there should be a vote of the people taken to ascertain whether they wanted bucket shops or not. The Parliament of the country decided the bucket shop business was injurious to our best interests, and that it was their duty to legislate it out of existence, and they did so. I think this liquor traffic is injurious to the best interests of the country, and I defy any hon. gentleman to stand up in his place here and show me one good that comes from it. I defy him to show me one advantage we derive from it. I defy him to show me one man made better by it. And I hold that as men sitting here, holding the future of the country in our hands, as it were, sent here to legislate for the benefit of the people, we should not treat this matter as lightly as we have been in the habit of treating it. And I ask hon. gentlemen whether in their consciences they dare to regard this as other than a matter of vital importance. Take the statistics of crime that were published in the newspapers a few days ago, and then tell me whether the liquor traffic is of any benefit. One-third of the cases in the police courts arose out of drunkenness. Was that a benefit to the country? A few nights ago, we had a discussion here with

Mr. CASEY.

regard to the cost of the penitentiaries. Well, if you will give us a prohibitory law, we will reduce by one-third, at all events by one-third, the cost of your penitentiaries, the cost of your gaols, the cost of your police. We will lessen the cost of putting down crime and of sustaining good order by two-thirds; and unless it can be shown that the liquor trade gives us some offset to this, some compensating benefit, I hold it is our duty to pass a prohibitory law. It is said, and I believe the statistics prove it, that to-day there are half a million families in the United Kingdom of Great Britain who know nothing about home comfort. They know nothing about home happiness; everything that makes a home a place dear to the human heart, is unknown to them. What is the cause of that? The liquor traffic. The liquor traffic produces everywhere the same results. How many miserable families are there in Ottawa, made miserable through the liquor traffic? How many men in the penitentiary to-day who have reached there through the liquor traffic? How many destitute children in Ottawa made destitute through the liquor traffic? How many men whose lives have been wasted, men of great, noble, shining talents, whose talents have been lost to the country because of the liquor traffic? How many young people growing up to-day in this Dominion on the way to be drunkards, pursuing a course which must of necessity lead them to be drunkards, through the liquor traffic? I say, therefore, this House is in duty bound to vote for a prohibitory law. I know full well, and this country knows full well, that there is an adverse majority in this House against the Bill; and I feel great embarrassment when I speak on this subject before hon. members, knowing that a number of them are opposed to this prohibitory measure. The advocates of prohibition are in a great minority to-day, but the country is looking on. In 1874, petitions were presented to this House containing about 10,000 names, asking for a prohibitory law, these names representing 59,000 inhabitants. To-day that 10,000 has been multiplied very largely. I will not say just what number, but I say that 10,000 has been multiplied very largely, and the multiplication is going on. The principle of prohibition was recognised in the House at the time. We were told that we would have a stepping stone to prohibition. We were told that Parliament would give the Scott Act, and that from the Scott Act the step would be easy to prohibition. But we are told to-day by the opponents of the Scott Act, by the friends of the liquor traffic, that the Scott Act has failed. Well, if the Scott Act has failed, give us a full measure of prohibition—the principle which you recognised in 1874. The House is bound, if the Scott Act has failed, to give us something that will in some measure put down this terrible evil, some measure that will answer the purposes of prohibition. Some hon. gentlemen ask for compensation. Compensation for what? I would like to ask hon. members who voted for compensation, who is it who deserve compensation? I believe it is not disputed, that, in business, anything that disturbs the peace and harmony of the people, anything that is injurious to the commerce of the country, and to the good order and well-being of the Government, is a nuisance. We have proved, time and again, that this liquor traffic is an injury to the peace and happiness of the people and therefore a nuisance; and yet we are asked to give the men who have inflicted this nuisance on the Dominion, compensation for not being allowed to continue the evil. Is that the principle which is to be recognised by this House? I say we are willing to share compensation with you—compensation for the families ruined, compensation for the poverty and distress brought upon the country, compensation for all the property which the liquor traffic has taken out of the hands of those who were deluded by it, compensation for the outlay of this country on reformatories, gaols and prisons—compensate us for all these things, and then we will compensate the liquor sellers for the loss of their

custom and business. Compensation is a thing which the people of this country will never agree to.

An hon. MEMBER. Amen.

Mr. FREEMAN. No doubt the hon. gentleman who said "amen" is a teetotaler. I hope I am right. If he would practise teetotalism, he would utter his amens in some other place than the House of Commons, I am sure. Now, while I vote for prohibition pure and simple, and that is my motto, and I am happy to say it is the motto of a majority of the people in my own Province. I have been forced out of the contention that I have made in my own Province that this country is ripe for prohibition. If I take the representatives of the people here as fairly representing their constituents in this great question in Ontario and Quebec, I am compelled to the conclusion that the people of these two upper Provinces are not ready for prohibition. In my Province, I believe a large and overwhelming majority of the people would to-day vote for prohibition, and I should be pleased if the vote were to be taken in my own Province, and I believe in the Maritime Provinces generally. If the question of prohibition could be left to the Provinces bordering on the sea, I am satisfied that in less than 12 months hence we would have a prohibitory law in those Provinces, and the people favoring it would be able to enforce it thoroughly. But I am not so sure, and my hopes fail me, when you put it to the whole Dominion of Canada. I feel, therefore, in duty bound to my convictions and to my conscience to vote for nothing but the pure and simple, clear and distinct question. Shall we have prohibition or shall we not? I shall vote for the prohibitory measure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to make a few observations on this question, although, by my arrangements with Mr. Carling, I cannot vote on it to-night. I was rather surprised at the observations made by the hon. member for Queen's, N. S. (Mr. Freeman), because I think the hon. member should be aware, and doubtless is aware, that the temperance bodies of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick presented petitions to this House last Session, asking for the passage of an Act similar to the proposition embodied in the amendment to the amendment now before the House. The temperance bodies of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick presented petitions to the Minister of Finance of that day, asking that the temperance question should be submitted to the people of the Dominion at a proper time, and that the result, if it were favorable to their views, should be embodied in the legislation of the country. I think, therefore, the hon. member is mistaken in the views he takes of the public sentiment in his own Province. They may, or may not be in a majority in that Province. I am not prepared to express an opinion on that, though I am prepared to state that I entertain a very moderate difference of opinion with the hon. gentleman as to the extent of public opinion in that Province on the subject. Be that as it may, and it is not material at present, if the temperance organisations in that Province asked that the question should be submitted to the people of the Dominion, and that their verdict should be embodied in the legislation of the country, I think the hon. gentleman is hardly consistent in opposing the resolution of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think, it is very desirable that we should know to what extent the public opinion of this Dominion favors prohibition. We have had that question brought forward at different times under different circumstances, and it has been said, though I do not say it was the case, that it has been brought here for party purposes alone, and that many votes have been given in this House on the merits of the question itself which did not fairly reflect the opinion of the hon. members who gave those votes. Be that as it may, this question would be set at rest in a fair

and proper manner if the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should meet the approval of the House to-night. We are anxious to know how far public opinion would favor prohibition in this country, and having once ascertained the strength of the hold it has on the country, the Government of the day, whether Conservative or Liberal, would be bound to respect the verdict of the country taken in that way. For that reason I should strongly favor the amendment to the amendment, because I believe it would be a most satisfactory way of settling a question which is a very difficult one, as we all admit, a question which it is very desirable should be settled on the basis of intelligent public opinion, which can only be ascertained by going to the people themselves. For that reason I hope the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I stated my views fully when I moved the amendment to the amendment which has just been voted down. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) differs from mine in this respect, that it does not carry with it compensation to the manufacturers. Now I believe that, if this question is ever submitted to the electorate of this country at all, it should be submitted having in view the legislation which is to follow it. I stated before that I would yield to no man in regard to my temperance views, but I believe in dealing fairly with those who are engaged in the manufacture of liquors, who have been so engaged ever since we had a Province of Canada, who have been co-partners with the Governments that have been in power all that time, and so have built up these industries. It would be unfair for the temperance people to say to these men to-morrow: You must close up your factories that have been built up under the different Governments of this country. Therefore, if the temperance people desire to act fairly, they should, when they submit this question to the people, propose compensation to these men, so that, no matter what Government may be in power, that Government will make compensation to those who are engaged in the manufacture of liquor. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) voted against my resolution, and I must differ with him in regard to his. My views are that we should vote on a fair and square issue and that, if the people are prepared to carry prohibition, they should carry compensation along with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not vote against the hon. gentleman's proposition because I thought the parties were not entitled to compensation, but because I do not think that is a proper question to refer to a plébiscite.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let us go fairly before the people so that they may not afterwards say this is going to cost too much. Let them, when they vote for prohibition, vote for the expenses necessary to carry it out.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I cannot vote for the amendment proposed by hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) because I am on principle opposed to the agitation of this question before the country. I voted for the amendment just now, although I did not like the part of it which proposed to provide compensation, but in order to defeat the main motion, and because there is in that amendment a strong restriction as to compensation to manufacturers of liquor, a restriction which provides that this compensation shall be paid only when the principle is adopted by the electors. But I have no fear that the electors of this country would adopt such a measure. I am prepared to vote for all amendments that tend to defeat the main motion, because I think it unnecessary and useless to agitate this question, either in this House or in the country.

Mr. KIRK. For the very same reason given by the hon. gentleman which has just taken his seat I, too, intend to vote against every amendment which has been offered.

It appears to me that the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Queen's, so far as the feelings of the people of Nova Scotia are concerned, the Province from which we both come are very nearly correct. I think that I can endorse every word he says in regard to that sentiment. We have very good evidence of the state of feeling in that Province from the fact that although we have a very stringent license law in Nova Scotia, there is not a single county in the Province in which a license exists to-day or the sale of intoxicating liquors by retail, except in the city and county of Halifax. I think there cannot be a better evidence of the fact that the people of Nova Scotia are prepared for prohibition pure and simple, and prepared for it now. For that reason I shall vote for the resolution and against every amendment which has been placed in your hands, to defeat the object which the resolution has in view.

Mr. BERGIN. I cannot see the necessity for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think all must be blind who cannot see that public opinion is strong at the present moment against prohibition in this country. The general elections showed to every member of this House how the public pulse beat in his county. I know that in my county, and in the counties adjoining, the prohibition question and the Scott Act question—practically the same—were strongly urged by the temperance people against my election and against the election of my colleagues, but we succeeded by large majorities. Since then we have had throughout the Province votes upon the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act, and in every county that Act, after a fair trial, so far as the temperance people were concerned, was overwhelmingly defeated and consequently repealed. Now, the general elections throughout the Dominion, and the Scott Act elections, have proved to a demonstration that there is no strong feeling for prohibition in this country, and that we would be putting the country to a very large expense, to a very great inconvenience, and to a very great loss, by taking the people from their labor to vote upon this question because, forsooth, some people who do not like to vote fairly and squarely against prohibition, desire to dodge it by calling for a plebiscite. We desire nothing of the kind. When the time comes that the people of this country demand prohibition, as shown by their votes at general elections, I shall be prepared to vote for it. I am willing to go further, and to say that I believe prohibition is the only cure for drunkenness, but I do not believe that it is practicable, or that it can ever be carried out. We must resort to a good license law, and a good license law properly enforced, will, I believe, lessen drunkenness in this country and lessen the evil effects of it. And whilst I speak of the evil effects of drunkenness, let me say that to the temperance people of this country more than to any other class, is it due that drunkenness has been in excess during the last few years. During the time that the Scott Act was in force we had, as we are told by reference to the statistics of the country, little or no crime in comparison with the crime before and since that period. Why, Sir, there were few or no convictions for crime, caused by drink, during the period of the Scott Act. It is notorious that in every county where the Scott Act was in force, the policy of the temperance men, or the so-called temperance men—for the majority of them were not sincere—was to show to the people of this country that there was little or no crime, that crime had decreased, that drunkenness had decreased, and as a consequence it was almost impossible to get a conviction, and indeed it was almost impossible to secure the arrest of any man, or bring him before a police magistrate, during the existence of the Canada Temperance Act. But the Canada Temperance Act had not been re-

Mr. KIRK.

pealed a day till every poor wretch who happened to take a glass was hauled up before the police magistrate and fined; and now they point to the increase of convictions since that Act was repealed. It is this dishonesty, it is this intemperance on the part of men who have been leading agitators in the different counties, that have done the temperance cause so much harm, and it has a great deal to do with the want of success in that cause. Men like myself, who are total abstainers, but who do not feel that it is part of our mission to take our neighbors by the throat and prevent them from taking that which they honestly think they have a right to take—feel that it is this intemperance on the part of temperance agitators which has prevented the success of a license law in this country. And the Scott Act has done much in another direction to injure the temperance cause. It has led to the opening everywhere of unlicensed shops and unlicensed taverns that demoralise the public sentiment; and to-day, in every county where the Scott Act has been in force, we have a large number of this sort of grogeries, and, as a consequence, more or less drunkenness, although the number is gradually diminishing, I am happy to say, and with the enforcement of a license law I am sure it will continue to diminish until we have a comparatively happy state of affairs, such as we had before the initiation of the Canada Temperance Act. Still, we are suffering from the evil effects of it to-day. I yield to no man in this House in my temperance principles, but I rise in my place to protest against this thing being brought up Session after Session, until we have some evidence that the people of this country call for such legislation.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before this question is submitted to a vote, I desire to say a word or two. I do not see for my part how the temperance men of this House can do anything else but vote against any amendment to the broad resolution moved by the hon. member for North Lark (Mr. Jamieson). In all the public representative gatherings of temperance men at which I have been present, or taken a part in, or of the proceedings of which I have read an account, this question of submitting the advisability of having a prohibitory law to a plebiscite of the people, has never been raised, and has never been entertained for a moment. The temperance men have taken the ground that public sentiment is ripe for such a law, at all events that the representatives of the people assembled in Parliament should pass such a law. They have taken that position for a long time past. I do not see how they can consistently take any other position than that. For my own part, while I admit there is a certain plausibility in the motion, representing that it would be advisable to ascertain public sentiment with regard to this matter, I must say that I doubt whether any practical good would result from it. I believe in the educational influences of a prohibitory law, and upon that ground, as well as upon the ground that it is right and proper such legislation should be enacted, I think temperance men can do nothing else than vote directly and squarely in favor of the immediate enactment of a prohibitory law. That is my position, at all events.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is not my intention to detain the House at any length on this subject. I was somewhat surprised at my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) proposing the amendment to the amendment now before the House. No man in this House knows better than he does, few know as well, that the method he proposes for eliciting the opinion of the people upon this subject is one which is if not unconstitutional, I do not think it is unconstitutional, is at all events opposed to our system of legislation. We never since the period of Confederation, I do not believe in any one of the Provinces before Confederation—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Scott Act.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We have never submitted in advance to the people the question whether they wish legislation of a certain character to be adopted by this House, we have never tried to ascertain the views of the people by means of a plebiscite. That is a system which is in vogue in the country to the south of us, one which is a part, I may say, of their constitution, almost every amendment to their constitution being first submitted to the people. As I understand it, we elicit the opinion of the people upon all public questions by having them submitted at the time the representatives of this Parliament go to their constituents. That is the constitutional method of eliciting public opinion upon any question that is likely to come before this Parliament. No man knows this better than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I am surprised, as I have said before, that he should have proposed this as a measure for eliciting the opinion of the people. Suppose that a vote of the people was taken upon this point in the manner proposed. Suppose that Ontario carried it by a majority and Quebec did not carry it by a majority, that New Brunswick carried it by a majority and Nova Scotia did not carry it by a majority, would we in this Parliament, in the face of such a state of things, in the face of such an expression of opinion, be justified in passing a prohibitory liquor law for the people of the whole Dominion, legislating as we are here for the whole Dominion, for all the Provinces, and not for any one Province in particular? For that reason, among other reasons, I am opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am opposed also to that amendment because it does not carry with it the principle of compensation. As the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has said, and said truly, for years past, ever since we were a country, so to speak, we have licensed breweries and distilleries for the manufacture of liquor, ale and beer. We have derived large revenues from both institutions. We have got the money from the brewers and distillers and it has become a part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Portions of it have gone into our public works, and it can be truly said that to that extent we have been partners in the traffic. Rightly or wrongly, we have taken this money, and have encouraged them also by licensing them and taking their money for the manufacture of liquor, however objectionable that may be. I am not going to say one word against prohibition. I believe every honest man will be glad when the day comes that public sentiment is ripe for the reception and proper enforcement of prohibition. I believe there is no man if he is honest with himself, whether he believes in the principle or not as an abstract question, but will be glad if the time should arrive when the public sentiment of the country would welcome any measure that would do away with the evils of intemperance. But we have had during the past two or three years an experience we have never had before, at all events, in Ontario. We have had an experience here of a measure very prohibitory in its character—the Scott Act. I believe the effect of that Act has been to retard the progress of true temperance in a great many parts of the country. In the face of that, I can say safely to this House that any man desiring to see prohibition does not desire to see it until the time does arrive when the public sentiment of the country will be not only ripe for its reception but for its enforcement, as is embodied in the amendment I have moved. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), from his place during last Session of Parliament, drew an analogy which to my mind was complete, when speaking on this subject, or a subject very similar. He said it was not alone a question as to whether the people voted for or whether they were fit for the reception of the measure, but it was a question also whether the people were fit for the enforcement of it. That is a very important point to consider in connection with this whole ques-

tion. It may be said, it has been said, that because there are violations of the criminal law in this country and of other laws, that therefore nothing could be said against the Scott Act or a prohibitory liquor law if there were violations of those laws. The analogy is not complete. The public sentiment of the country, the moral sentiment of the country is at the back of the police force in enforcing all infringements of the criminal law. But the moral sentiment of the country is not at the back of the police force or of liquor inspectors in endeavoring to enforce a prohibitory liquor law or the Scott Act, and until the time arrives when the moral sentiment, the honest public sentiment, is just as anxious and willing to assist the officers of the law in punishing any violations of a prohibitory law, equally as they are ready to enforce other laws made criminal, it never will be a success. For these reasons I believe the amendment I proposed and to which I have referred is a proper amendment for this House to adopt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that his leader just voted for a plebiscite.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I did not.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I do not think I would have offered any observations on the question before the House had it not been for a statement made by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). I utterly object, as a representative on the floor of this House, that the statement should go abroad that if no great progress has been made, as is asserted by that hon. gentleman, by the temperance cause during the last few years, the fault lies with the temperance people. I entirely object to that statement, and I would not have risen to say anything except for the fact that the hon. gentleman made that assertion, and made it very strongly indeed. I do not know but that the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has, in effect, made the same statement. I believe that if there has been a slow growth of temperance sentiment in this Dominion for the last two or three years, it is not the fault of the temperance people; but it is due rather to the exertions made by those opposed to temperance sentiment for the purpose of preventing that sentiment prevailing in this country, because the temperance sentiment is endeavoring to make strides forward and to enforce the law has been strenuously opposed by the liquor interest by all means in its power. When it is said that the moral sentiment of this country is not behind the police force in carrying out the law, I believe that is not a proper statement. I am satisfied the moral sentiment, or at all events a very large proportion of it, is behind the officers in carrying out even the Scott Act; but while that is true, and while the moral sentiment is quite strong, yet we find perhaps that the interested sentiment, the pecuniary interests of the persons engaged in the liquor traffic is somewhat stronger than the moral sentiment put forward, and, therefore, the moral sentiment has been checked. The moral sentiment having to oppose the liquor interest has, perhaps tired too soon of conducting prosecutions under the Scott Act, in trying to carry out the law; and the pecuniary interest has proved much stronger and has not been forced back from the fact of its being a pecuniary interest. They who opposed the carrying out of the laws felt that they would profit if they could eventually prevent the carrying out of the Scott Act or any other prohibitory law. What has been the great argument used by the opponents of the Scott Act wherever it has been in force? The greatest argument in our Province was that, if it was a general prohibitory law all over the Dominion a large number would support it, while they did not feel bound to support the Scott Act because it was only partially prohibitory. If it was a general prohibitory law which the Government would feel bound to carry out the sentiment of the people was that they would give it their moral and active support. A portion of the same people who made use of this argument

then, now hold that as the Scott Act has to some extent been a failure and has not met the entire expectations of those who wished to see that Act in force, so a prohibitory law would not be successful. That is the sentiment of some of the people, but for my part I am in hopes that a prohibitory law would be successful if carried out. While I am not prepared to say whether it would be successful or not I believe the principle to be a correct one, and believing the principle of prohibition to be correct I am here as the representative of a constituency in this Dominion to vote in favor of that principle which I think is correct. I am here to record my vote, if it be any example to the people I represent, in favor of prohibition. The amendment submitted to this House is a very plausible one, but I shall feel it my duty to vote against it and against every amendment that may be proposed which will prevent a direct vote on prohibition, because I feel that any such amendment is an impedient put in the way of arriving at the point which we are discussing and on which I at any rate desire to vote.

Mr. JAMIESON. With reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I must say that at first, when the proposition was submitted by him, it seemed to me not to be an unfair proposition. However, on reflection, I have come to the conclusion that the better course for those who favor prohibition will be to vote squarely on the resolution and against all the amendments. I think that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) is quite correct in reference to the position taken by the temperance men of the Dominion on this question. I quite agree with him that since 1875, at all events, I have not heard the question of a plebiscite mooted in any temperance body. It seems a fair proposition that the sentiment of the people should be taken on a law of this kind, but while I do not agree with all that has been said by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) I agree with him to this extent, that a plebiscite is not a usual course to adopt in this country. I have a word to say in reference to the position taken by my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). My hon. friend is, I fear, backsliding somewhat on this question. If I recollect correctly sometime ago he was an ardent prohibitionist, but his opinions seem to have changed on this question. I am not here to charge that he is acting dishonestly, for I believe he is above that, but just take one of the united counties which my friend represents and I believe that the county council have sent to this House a petition in favor of prohibition and I am glad to say it was presented by my hon. friend. That would indicate at all events that he does not represent the sentiment of his constituents on this particular question. In addition to that my hon. friend has taken me to task because we have been introducing figures here which have gone to show that drunkenness and the punishment of drunkenness have increased since the Scott Act has been repealed in several counties of this Province. I am not aware that figures of that kind have been presented to this House. Although I used figures to make a comparison between the state of public morals before the Scott Act was in force and the state of public morals during the time the Scott Act was in force, I used no figures of the character referred to by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin).

Mr. BERGIN. I said figures were used before and since, by temperance people. I did not say that the member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) was the whole temperance party, or that he used all the figures.

Mr. JAMIESON. Probably my hon. friend is correct in saying that parties have used these figures, and in my judgment perhaps very correctly. So far as public sentiment is

Mr. LANDRY (Kent).

concerned upon this question, I may say that I believe it is our duty if we deem a law correct in principle to pass that law, to use that law as an educator and to bring public sentiment up to the support of such a law. I believe that if this House was to pass a prohibitory law to-morrow the public sentiment of this country would support such a law, and we in this House at all events reflect the public sentiment of the country to a large extent. I believe it is our duty to ascertain if the principle is correct, and if the principle is found to be correct we should crystallise it into the statute law of the country. Then when that is done let us by every reasonable and proper means in our power endeavor to enforce that law, if it be in the interest of the public at large to do so. After giving the matter mature reflection I have decided to vote against all the amendments and in favor of the original resolution. As the mover of this resolution I am glad that it has brought about a very general discussion on this question which will do good in the future. I am not so unreasonable as to say that we ought to force our opinions on the people, for I believe, as a deliberative body, it is our duty to canvass every measure submitted to this House, and to give it a fair and reasonable consideration. In my judgment it is in the interest of the people that we should support this motion, and I trust that the hon. members of this House will take the same view.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am a temperance man, but one of those temperance men who is going to vote for the amendment of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I do so because I believe that legislation of this kind should not be carried in this country adverse to the sentiments of the majority of the people. I will give the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a practical illustration in my own case of the fact that in some degree, at all events, a vote of this House does not represent fully the sentiment of the people. I am a temperance man, and have voted and will vote for every resolution in favor of temperance. I do so because I believe there is no measure that would be so greatly in the interest of this country as a prohibitory measure; but I also believe that this country is not ripe for prohibition, and I will give you an illustration in my own experience. I represent a county which, with the county of Prescott, gave an anti-Scott Act majority of 2,000. Now, do I represent the people of my constituency when I get up here and vote for prohibition? I say I do not. Now, I am going to support the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Bothwell and, at the same time, if the main resolution comes to a vote, I will vote for it. The hon. member for Brockville said that a prohibitory liquor Act would be a very queer piece of legislation for this House to adopt, if there were a majority for it in Ontario and a majority against it in Quebec. Is not all our legislation legislation of that kind? Are there not many measures adopted in this country which if left to single Provinces would be rejected? Furthermore, I believe in being governed by majorities. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been sent here by the people to enact certain measures, and it is perfectly right that they should carry them into effect. But this question of temperance is one that has not been referred to the people, or that the members of this House are sent to vote upon at all. I am a temperance man, but not a temperance crank, and I do not believe in bothering this House with this question every Session. Let it be threshed out in one Session of each Parliament; that is sufficient; we do not require to vote on it every Session. I will vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell, because I think we should not legislate in advance of the sentiment of the people, and the only way to arrive fairly and squarely at a decision is to let the entire people vote upon the question.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Mills, Bothwell):

YEAH :  
Messieurs

Barron,	Guillet,	Platt,
Brien,	Innes,	Roome,
Burdett,	Labrosse,	Rowand,
Campbell,	Lang,	Semole,
Carpenter,	Larivière,	Somerville,
Cartwright (Sir Rich ),	Livingston,	Trow,
Charlton,	Macdonald (Huron),	Waldie,
Colter,	McGulla,	Watson,
Cook,	McMillan (Huron),	White (Cardwell),
Edwards,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin), and
Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wilson (Lennox).—35
Flynn,	Moncrieff,	

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Amyot,	Doyon,	Madill,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	Masson,
Audet,	Edgar,	Meigs,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ellis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Moffat,
Baird,	Fisher,	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Foster,	Mulock,
Beausoleil,	Freeman,	Nevau,
Bécharde,	Gauthier,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Perley,
Bergin,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Bernier,	Girouard,	Porter,
Boisvert,	Godbout,	Prior,
Borden,	Gordon,	Putnam,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Rinfret,
Bowell,	Guay,	Riopel,
Bowman,	Hale,	Rykert,
Boyle,	Hesson,	St. Marie,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Scriven,
Cameron,	Holton,	Shanly,
Cargill,	Hudspeth,	Skinner,
Casey,	Ives,	Small,
Chasgrain,	Jamieson,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Chisholm,	Joncas,	Smith (Ontario),
Cimco,	Jones (Digby),	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Stevenson,
Cockburn,	Kirk,	Taylor,
Colby,	Labelle,	Temple,
Corby,	Landry,	Thérien,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson (Sir John),
Coughlin,	Laurier,	Tisdale,
Conlonbe,	Lépine,	Turcot,
Daly,	Lister,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Lovitt,	Wallace,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Ward,
Davis,	McCarthy,	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wilmot,
Denison,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wilson (Argentecil),
Desjardins,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dessaint,	McKay,	Wood (Westm'd), and
Dickey,	McKeen,	Yeo—128.
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. LABELLE. I noticed that the hon. member for Northumberland is in his seat and has not voted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can only say that if I had been free to vote I should have voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell; but as I have been paired with Sir Adolphe Caron, I could not do so.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Before the amendment is put, I would like to address a few words to this House. The motions before the House on this occasion are practically repetitions of the motions we had two years ago. The main motion we had then was framed in similar terms to the one we have before us now, and an amendment was moved to the effect:

"That this House, while admitting that brady, gin, whiskey and other alcoholic liquors might be prohibited, is of opinion, that the dealing in and sale of ale, porter, lager beer, cider, claret and other light wines should be exempted from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act."

That motion was defeated. That was a motion made for the purpose directly of amending the Scott Act, and was in effect that wherever the Scott Act had been passed by the people, light wines, cider and beer should not come within the operation of the Act, and the vote

against that amendment was absolutely a vote against an amendment of the Scott Act to that effect. I also voted for a measure of prohibition the same as I intend to do to-day, if the House will permit me; but hon. members must know that there are two things, at any rate, which this House has not been in favor of so far. It has not been in favor of a vote of the people being taken when the question of compensation to manufacturers accompanies the question of prohibition, and it is also not in favor of a vote being taken at present on the question of prohibition. I voted for the amendment that the vote of the people should be taken in each of those instances, because I believe it is the people who should have the final say in this matter. However, this temperance question is not a new one, and if the *personnel* of this Parliament is any reflection of the opinions of the electorate of this country, it is evident the electorate are not in favor of prohibition just now. In addition to what I said a moment ago in reference to our Parliament being a reflection of the opinions of the people, let me call the attention of this House to the results of votes taken upon the Scott Act in 1888 in different counties. I see by the returns from the Secretary of State that there were twelve elections in 1888 for the purpose of considering the advisability of repealing the Scott Act. In eleven of these the Scott Act was directly defeated. In the other the old Dunkin Act was sustained, and in every one of those elections, except the one in which the Dunkin Act was sustained, the people repealed the Scott Act by large majorities. There is not one instance last year of the question being submitted to the people for the repeal of the Scott Act in which they did not repeal it by large majorities. In Arthabaska, Quebec, the majority against the Scott Act was 228; in Bruce, Ontario, 1,392; in Dufferin, Ontario, 213; in Halton, 197; in Huron, 1,310; in Norfolk, 722; in Stanstead, 142; in Simcoe, 3,102; in Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, 2,143. That is evidently an expression showing that the people in all those counties were dissatisfied with the Scott Act. We have had an expression of opinion in the House to-day by the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman), which may be the reflection also of the opinions of a number of his supporters on this particular question, and he stated that he would vote for nothing except prohibition pure and simple. Well, I agree with the hon. gentleman that he has the right to vote for prohibition pure and simple. I intend to do the same on this occasion. I am in favor of any legislation that will promote the interests of temperance; but at the same time I believe that progress is generally accomplished piece by piece, and that when people cannot obtain everything desired—total prohibition either with or without compensation—they should, if there is a midway, give that a trial. I will not take up the time of the House in discussing the advisability of light wines, beer and cider being drunk to the exclusion of strong liquor. That subject was very fully discussed in 1887. I would much prefer seeing the people indulge in nothing else but cider, light wines and beer, than have them indulge in the strong beverages that do so much harm. And I am sure every temperance advocate will be of the same opinion. There may be in this country counties where the Scott Act would not be carried, and yet the people of such counties might be in favor of the use of light wines, beer and cider under a license system. I know I shall be met at once by the objections of one or two temperance people, that it is all nonsense to try and sell light wines, beer and cider alone, and that in such case all other liquors will be sold at the bar. If it is true that intoxicating liquors are sold in the counties where the Scott Act is in force, it cannot be much worse to try the experiment of light wines and beer. I intend submitting to the House a resolution to the effect that when the Scott Act is being voted upon, the electorate will have the choice of three alternatives. One, to vote for the second part of

the Act just as it is; the other, against the Act *in toto*; the third, for an Act prohibiting the sale of all intoxicating liquors with the exception of light wines, beer and cider. And if the people chose to carry the Act, excluding from its operation light wines, beer and cider, it is possible in those 11 counties I have just read to you, many of them would have taken the alternative. I intend to move, therefore:

That all the words after "that" in the amendment be struck out and the following substituted:—

That inasmuch as the result of recent votes taken under the Canada Temperance Act have been in favor of repeal, and inasmuch as the electors of some counties in Canada may be in favor of a license system for the sale of cider, light wines and beer only,

Be it resolved that, in the opinion of this House, the said Act should be amended so that, upon any vote of the electorate being taken under the Act, either for its adoption or its repeal, it shall be competent for the electors to vote on any one of the three following alternatives:—

1. Either for the Act; or
2. For the Act limiting the sale of intoxicating liquors, but excepting cider, light wines and beer from the operation thereof; or
3. Against the Act.

If this amendment should be defeated, I still reserve my right, and I will vote on the main question in favor of prohibition.

Mr. LISTER. That is not an amendment to this motion.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I anticipated that such an objection might be raised, but I find that, in the last Parliament, when this question came up, and the same resolution was moved by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), Mr. Girouard moved in amendment that the Scott Act should be amended by exempting beer, cider and claret, and other light wines. A suggestion was made to the Speaker that that was not a proper amendment to the motion, and the Speaker ruled that it was in order, and the question was voted upon on that occasion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That amendment is not in order. It is not germane to the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think myself, it is not relevant to the proposition now before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It might be a very proper motion to make, in order to amend the Scott Act, and to give an opportunity of voting for an intermediate proposition, but that is not a question now before us, and cannot be dealt with on the motion now before the House.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I have sent you down the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The objection may not have been raised upon that occasion.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The objection was raised, and the Speaker ruled the amendment was in order.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Moncrieff) ruled out of order, and question put on the amendment (Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Mr. FISHER. We have already had one or two amendments before the House upon which votes have been taken, and perhaps it has been observed that those who were responsible for the original motion proposed by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and seconded by myself have voted consistently against all amendments that have been proposed. It was necessary for us to take that course, after having, with due deliberation and consultation with the temperance bodies of the country, adopted the course we had. We conceive it to be our duty, as well as to be in the truest interests of the cause of temperance, to get the resolution in its entirety, as we proposed it, adopted by the House. In pursuance of that view, we voted against the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and against the second amendment to the

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and now we have come to the amendment itself. I would rather, on some grounds, have supported the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell, but, believing it necessary to come to a straight vote on the original motion, I deemed it my duty to vote against that amendment, and I see no course open to me, or to those who wish to see the original motion carried, other than to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). If that amendment should carry, I consider it would practically nullify all the good that would arise from the adoption of the original motion. It is in the memory of many of us that, in 1884, practically the same motion which is now before the House was made, and an amendment was moved which was practically, though not exactly in the words and form, the same as that of the hon. member for Brockville. If we are not to advance one step beyond that motion in the course of four years, I think we must consider that the temperance cause has stood still. I am not prepared to believe that that is so, or to support any motion which would lead the country to believe that such is the case. I, therefore, consider that the test vote on the temperance question must be taken on the amendment of the hon. member for Brockville. If that carries, and it may carry, it will practically nullify the original motion. We have already had such a motion carried, and now the temperance people want something more. For this House to reaffirm that motion of 1884 would be of no avail, and this House would be wanting in dignity to so act. If that resolution meant anything, the House, and the Government having the confidence of the House, ought to have acted upon the resolution. If it meant nothing, there is no reason for us to adopt it in any shape. I, therefore, call upon those who are desirous to see the temperance cause advanced and to see the original motion proposed by my hon. friend from North Lanark adopted, to vote against this amendment, and I tell them that they will be judged by the temperance people of this country according to the votes which they give on that amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. The right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." He knows perfectly well that in 1884 the temperance people of this country did not accept the vote of those who voted for the resolution of my hon. friend who sits opposite me, as it was amended by the amendment of Mr. White, at that time member for Cardwell—I say they did not accept the votes of those who voted for that amendment as being in favor of the cause of temperance. The right hon. gentleman knows it very well, and I can tell him, if he does not know it now, that the temperance men will take the same view now, and they will not accept the votes of those who are in favor of the resolution of the hon. gentleman for Brockville (Mr. Wood) as being votes in favor of the cause of temperance.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Wood, Brockville):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Denison,	McKay,
Armstrong,	Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Audet,	Dessaint,	Madill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Doyon,	Masson,
Barnard,	Dupont,	Moffat,
Béchar,	Fiset,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Foster,	Perley,
Bergeron,	Gauthier,	Porter,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Putnam,
Bernier,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Bowell,	Godbout,	Riopel,
Bowman,	Gordon,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Grandbois,	Semple,
Burdett,	Guay,	Shanly,
Campbell,	Guillet,	Skinner,
Cargill,	Hesson,	Small,
Carpenter,	Hickey,	Smith (Sir Donald),

Casey, Casgrain, Chisholm, Cimon, Cochrane, Cookburn, Corby, Coutignan, Coughlin, Coulombe, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davin, Davis, Dawson,	Hudspeth, Innes, Ives, Joncas, Kenny, Labelle, Labrosse, Langevin (Sir Hector), La Rivière, Laurie, Macdonald (Sir John), McCarthy, McCulla, McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Pictou), McDougall (C. Breton),	Smith (Ontario), Sproule, Taylor, Temple, Thérien, Thompson (Sir John), Tisdale, Trow, Vanasse, Ward, White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Wilmot, Wilson (Argenteuil), Wood (Brockville), and Wood (W'stmorel'd)—99.
--	---	--

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth), Baird, Barron, Beausoleil, Boisvert, Borden, Bourassa, Boyle, Brien, Cameron, Cartwright (Sir Rich), Colter, Cook, Dickey, Dickinson, Edgar, Edwards, Eisenbauer, Ellis, Fisher,	Freeman, Geoffrion, Gillmor, Hale, Holton, Jamieson, Jones (Digby), Kirk, Landry, Lang, Lépine, Lister, Lovitt, Macdonald (Huron), McKeen, McMillan (Huron), McMullen, Meigs, Mills (Annapolis), Moncrieff,	Mulock, Neveu, O'Brien, Paterson (Brant), Perry, Platt, Robertson, Roome, Rowand, Ste Marie, Sriver, Somerville, Stevenson, Turcot, Waldie, Watson, Wilson (Elgin), Wilson (Lennox), and Yeo.—59.
---	--	---

Amendment agreed to.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

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

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 59) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill No. 60 respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 63) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 66) to ratify an exchange of land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.—(Mr. Small)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Assiniboine Water Power Company.—(Mr. Ross)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

## DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That Mr. Prior be substituted for Mr. Baker on the *Hansard* Committee.

Motion agreed to.

## STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That Mr. Ferguson (Welland) be appointed a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, that Mr. McCullough be appointed a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation, that Mr. Bryson be appointed a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, instead of Mr. Colby in each case; and that Mr. Edwards be appointed a member of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce."

Motion agreed to.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yesterday, before adjournment, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked what we were going on with to-morrow, and the answer given was that we will go on with Supply early. Subsequently a communication passed between the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Finance, in which it was stated that the Opposition would probably move an amendment on going into Supply, and this afternoon the hon. gentleman gave notice to my hon. friend that he was going to move on an important subject. We think it would be well that the discussion, which must be an important one and would most likely be a lengthy one, should not be undertaken on Friday, when we have to adjourn until Tuesday; accordingly, we will ask the hon. gentleman to allow us to go on with the Estimates, and agree to take up any motion that may be made on Tuesday and let the discussion proceed on Thursday and until it is finished. I throw out this suggestion to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the motion which we propose to make will occupy anything like the time the hon. gentleman supposes. It will probably be disposed of in from two to three hours, likely, I think by six o'clock. I do not like to interfere with the hon. gentleman's arrangements unnecessarily, but there are a good many reasons which would make it inconvenient to defer the amendment till Tuesday, when, I may intimate to the hon. gentleman, we probably shall have another motion for the consideration of the House. I think it will save time to the House if we carry out our intention. No doubt the subject we propose to introduce has a bearing on the whole question, but it is not our intention to discuss it at any great length on the present occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman could not control the discussion, and as hon. gentlemen on both sides are very apt to make arrangements to go away on Friday night, unless there is something specially keeping them here, I would press the hon. gentleman to allow the matter to stand over and allow us to go into Supply to-night. I think it will expedite business if these little cour-



tesies across the floor are exchanged, and I will also say that we shall be exceedingly obliged to the hon. gentleman, if it is convenient, if, before the discussions come on, he will give us the points of the amendments. Of course, I cannot press it, except as a matter of convenience. It would enable us to be ready to meet the hon. gentleman, and as he is a formidable foe, we require to be well armed to meet him successfully or on equal terms. I shall be very much obliged to the hon. gentleman if he will allow us to go on with the Estimates to-night and put on our armour on Tuesday and fight it out. I should also be obliged if they would let me know on what grounds they are going to fight. It would be very convenient if the hon. gentleman would inform me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may just say to the hon. gentleman that our arrangements were a little disconcerted by the temporary indisposition of my hon. friend, Mr. Laurier, who has not been able to be in his place for a couple of days, otherwise the hon. gentleman should have in very good time the *ipsissima verba* and all the rest of the motion that we had intended to bring forward to-day. I must repeat to the hon. gentleman that the motion is one which could be disposed of in a short time if he will use the undoubted and very great influence which he possesses on his side of the House not to prolong the discussion. I think it would be for the public convenience to be done with the motion at once.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think there are some other gentlemen in this House besides the right hon. the leader of the Government and the acting leader of the Opposition, who have something to say about the progress of public business.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. The Third party.

Mr. MITCHELL. I recollect an occasion last year when business of importance called me to Montreal and when I was excessively anxious that some questions in relation to the Customs Bill should be postponed, but I met with a decisive denial and refusal from a Cabinet Minister who went so far as to show an entire absence of courtesy to me. So much so was this the case that I was, practically, insulted by a member of the Cabinet because I remonstrated with him for pushing forward the matter and not assenting to consult the convenience of a member of this House. The leader of the Opposition, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), has stated what everybody knows to be true. He has made that statement, speaking for himself and his party, and now I wish to speak for myself.

An hon. MEMBER. And your party.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have heard some slight whisperings as to what the motion is to be, and although I am not in the confidence of the gentlemen who initiate these thunderbolts, I have had some slight intimation of the motion. I will take up but a short time of the House, because I have something to say about it, as I think it is an important thing. Everyone knows, judging from the exhibition shown the other night on an important matter, how easy it is for the right hon. gentleman by a wave of his hand or a nod of his head to keep the gentlemen who follow him in their seats and to prevent them from speaking. We had an example of that the other night in a most marked manner. I hope, however, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will not give way, but that he will go on with his motion, for if he does not he will probably compel me to proceed with it in his place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry that my hon. friend of the Left Centre (Mr. Mitchell) should differ from me in any one point, but as he very rarely differs with us one cannot complain. After the statement made by the First Minister, if he still persists in pressing it upon us, I think

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that parliamentary courtesy requires that we should yield to his request, particularly as I did not state to him the exact character of the motion to be made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will follow the example of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that he will be Christian enough to forego any rudeness, which I hope was not designed, or any rudeness that was felt—

Mr. MITCHELL. That I "experienced," not "felt."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I hope the hon. gentleman will forego all that. It is a new year, and we have a new Session, and I hope that he will now allow us to proceed with the Estimates. I think, if he does so, that it will not defer or prolong this Session very much.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose, after such a recognition of the importance of the Left Centre in this House, that I can scarcely refuse to accept the influence which the tongue of the charmer has, not only on the House at large, but upon myself in particular. Therefore, I will have to follow the suit of the acting leader of the Opposition (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. COOK. I regret exceedingly that the hon. the leader of the Government should object to this motion coming on now. I do not know exactly what the motion is myself, but I suppose that he must be in the secrets of our party, because he appeared to have some great fears that the motion is of great importance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend appreciates what very justifiable apprehension I have of this motion, and I am glad that he is going to help us in having the matter postponed.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salary of the Deputy Speaker..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Always reserving to myself the attitude that I have expressed as to the expediency of having a Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to say that if we are to have a Deputy Speaker, I am inclined to think that we cannot fill the deputy chair better than it is at present filled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very certain, Mr. Chairman, that you have very thoroughly deserved some recognition at the hands of the members of this House, although I must not be understood as in any way approving of the office itself.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, as you are the item that I have to speak to, I will say that if we are to have a Deputy Speaker I do not think that we could have one who could deal out more courtesy to every hon. member of this House than you do. Therefore, neither I nor the party which I represent shall offer any opposition to your occupying that office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There was a time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I had an objection to the office of Deputy Speaker, but under the present circumstances I will heartily withdraw my previous objections.

Salaries per Clerk's Estimate..... \$70,050

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is god-father for this increase? It seems to me a considerable increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker will explain.

Mr. SPEAKER. The increase is made up as follows :—\$50 each to twenty clerks, annual statutory increase; al-

lowance to deputy sergeant-at-arms, in lieu of living rooms, \$200. There was such a demand for rooms for the committees and for some other purposes, that we took from the deputy sergeant one of his rooms, which the Deputy Speaker has occupied during the last two years, and we gave Mr. Smith this increase of salary as an indemnity. The following clerks were promoted:—J. Dalton, to first class, \$150; J. A. Polkinghorne, to second class, \$200; E. P. Hartney, to first class, \$200; R. Brewer, the assistant accountant, to first class, \$200; C. E. Clarke, to second class, \$150; J. Stansfield, to first class, \$200. Then there are increases to T. Ouimet, \$200; H. P. Macdonell, \$100; W. Dube, \$50; and N. Robidoux, \$100, making a total increase of \$2,800. I may explain, that at the end of last Session there was a demand on the part of many hon. members, which seemed to be received very cordially by the House, for some of these increases. Besides, a question usually arose at the end of each Session, as to extra allowances for clerks of the different committees. The committees were accustomed to recommend to the House bonuses to their clerks, varying from \$100 to \$400, for extra work. The sense of the House seemed to be that that practice should cease, and it was suggested that the salaries of the clerks should be re-adjusted, so that there would be no occasion for them to try and influence any of the members in favor of such bonuses. For that reason I suggested to the Commission on Internal Economy that there should be a kind of readjustment of salaries all around, so that every clerk would receive a permanent salary in conformity with the character and amount of his work. The House will readily understand that the work of these clerks varies according to circumstances. For instance, a third class clerk may be acting as an assistant to a first class or chief clerk whose powers of working, on account of age or illness, become impaired, so that the assistant has sometimes work of greater importance and responsibility than one would expect from an assistant with a small salary. These are the reasons why the salaries of these different clerks have to be adjusted every three or four years, and it is what has been done this year. In the Sergeant-at-Arms' estimates you will observe a small increase of \$420. This is made up of the following increases:—\$100 to the chief messenger, who had no increase for many years, and whose affability and efficiency everyone knows; \$90 to Claire Hugg; \$50 to the bank messenger; \$50 to the clerk's messenger; \$30 to the doorkeeper; and at the suggestion of some of the members, I also recommended an increase of \$100 to the salary of Mr. Turgeon, the assistant chief messenger. You will observe that these increases produce a very small total increase in the expenses of Legislation, because there have been decreases amounting to about \$2,500 in other branches of the service. Through good management and increased surveillance in the stationery office, the clerk thought we might reduce the expense of that department by about \$1,500; and other decreases have been made in different departments, so that I think, on the whole, with a relatively small increase, greater efficiency in the service will be brought about to the great satisfaction, I hope, of hon. members.

Expenses of Committees, extra Sessional Clerks, &c.. \$13,200

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many extra clerks are there employed this year?

Mr. SPEAKER. The regular number, twenty-five.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are they employed as private secretaries to hon. members opposite, or are they generally distributed?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are none that can be so employed, unless in their spare time. We have seen that only the regular number have been employed, according to the

resolution of the House, and up to the present time twenty-five clerks have been able to do the work efficiently.

Printing Voters' Lists ..... \$15,500

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask the House to allow me to reduce that to \$10,000, and it is not certain that the whole of the reduced amount will be required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that vote is carried, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether any of these voters' lists have been distributed or not to any parties?

Mr. BOWELL. I answered that question the other day very fully. There had been none distributed, according to the memorandum given me by the Queen's Printer, except in counties where a vote was to be taken on the repeal of the Scott Act, and in one or two instances which at present I forget. I think my reply is fully recorded in *Hansard*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some hon. members of this House asked, and a reasonable request it appeared to be, to be allowed to buy one or two of these for their own convenience, and it appears very odd they could not obtain copies of the voters lists if they were actually printed in such a shape that they could be distributed in other cases.

Mr. BOWELL. I was not aware of application having been made for the purchase of voters' lists, until the Queen's Printer called my attention to the fact that application had been made for them. After consultation with the Minister of Justice, we came to the conclusion that it was not advisable, nor did the law justify, giving them to any person except in the cases to which I have referred, and had the Queen's Printer applied for permission in the first place, it could not have been given. The hon. gentleman will understand that the placing of the old voters' lists in type was simply to enable the department to forward them to the proper authorities, when a revision of the list would take place. Those that were given, were given upon the responsibility of the Queen's Printer himself, and after the attention of the Government was called to this, it was stopped.

Mr. TROW. Are the voters' lists now ready for distribution, and can they be purchased?

Mr. BOWELL. They are ready, but I do not understand that they can be purchased or obtained until the law is amended, and they are required by the proper authorities in preparing the next voters' lists. Then they will be sent in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not possible some of these lists may have been sent out before this Order in Council was passed, because it was currently reported in the city of Hamilton some months ago—early in the fall—that the Conservatives of Hamilton had received copies in advance of the voters' lists, and were making use of them in their committees for the purpose of securing good lists for the next general elections? This statement was made in the *Hamilton Times* months before the assembling of Parliament, and it was not contradicted in the *Hamilton Spectator*, the Government organ, and the general impression amongst the public is that the statement is true. Is it not possible these lists were sent to the interested parties in Hamilton, and other places, probably, before the Order in Council was passed?

Mr. BOWELL. It is just possible that the lists may have been obtained by parties not entitled to them, but if so I have no knowledge of it, and my information from the Queen's Printer is that the statement made by the Opposition press in the west concerning this matter is not correct.

I will, however, make further enquiry and let the hon. gentleman know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this was done to any one party and refused to another, it would be very wrong. I should be very much disappointed if it is found that the statement is true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As bad as gazetting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never heard of it before now, but I do not see there is any illegality in allowing these lists to be issued. However, the Minister of Justice looked into it, and he is not here at present. Of course it will not do that the Queen's Printer should be obliged to strike off any number of these in order to supply either side. It may be a matter for consideration whether, when the lists are struck off, an additional number should be issued for sale at such a price to either side as would compensate for the extra expense. I merely throw that out as a suggestion, but, at all events, if any one man gets the lists his neighbor has an equal right to get them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see why there should be any objection to either party getting the lists. They are for the public benefit, and as soon as printed by the Queen's Printer, they ought to be for sale. I do not see why they should be kept secret.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no reason whatever.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. While on this subject, I would like to ask the Government if they have caused to be made any comparative statement with regard to the expense of running the Printing Bureau as compared with the expense of getting the printing done by contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is too early for that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would not be too early if a man were in business for himself. In that case he would have found out by this whether the new system was paying or not.

Mr. McKAY. I have heard the statement of the hon. member with regard to advanced voters' lists having been sent to the city of Hamilton. I saw the statement first in one of the Hamilton papers. I knew nothing of it nor did I hear anything of it, but after reading the item I made enquiries and could not discover anyone in Hamilton who had received such advanced lists. I do not believe, from my enquiries, that any advanced lists came to the city of Hamilton, and I do not think there is a word of foundation for the statement made in the press.

Mr. BARRON. I happened to learn that the voters' lists had been distributed to some of my opponents in my own riding, and I at once applied to Ottawa to be given a voters list, and my application was refused. It is true I was referred to the Printing Bureau, and I applied there, and the answer was the lists were not being distributed. I thought at the time there must have been something very curious, because I was well aware of the fact that some of my opponents had the voters' lists and were making use of them for the ensuing election.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry as to the statement made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), and, if he can give me the names of those who received them, I will investigate the causes.

Library of Parliament..... \$34,860

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see a vote here of \$2,000 for binding newspapers. What is the rule in regard to that? What newspapers are selected?

Mr. FOSTER. I have only found in my experience in the library that a number of the principal newspapers are

Mr. BOWELL.

kept on file and are bound, such newspapers as the *Globe*, *Mail*, *Empire*, and others of the principal papers, not, I think, to a very large extent, but sufficient to keep the current records in a permanent form.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not myself object to preserving the newspapers. They may not be of very great interest to us now, but, 100 years hence, they may show to the people of that day a curious photograph of the affairs of the country at the present time. What I desired to know was upon what principle these newspapers are selected?

Mr. FOSTER. It is entirely in the hands of the librarians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems to be a tolerably large amount for the purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of it and enquire of the librarians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the explanation of this revote of \$2,500 for preparing and reprinting the catalogue of the library of American history?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a memorandum from the librarian, who says:

"The work has been going on. Part of the contingencies of the library has been used to pay the expense, and the bulk of the work remains over till the Government printing establishment is in working order. We shall need our vote during the coming year."

Printing, binding and distributing the laws..... \$10,000

Mr. BOWELL. The Queen's Printer tells me that \$6,000 will be sufficient.

Vote reduced to \$5,000.

Printing, printing paper and bookbinding... .. \$75,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention of the Government to pursue the course they have been pursuing in the past, of awarding contracts for the supply of paper and afterwards giving orders for paper to the various stationers and paper mills throughout the country without a contract? That has been the system in the past to a large extent, as the examination of the Auditor General's Report from year to year will show. Very large amounts have been paid to paper manufacturers and stationers in Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, and other places, for paper which has been used in the Government service, and which was not contracted for. I think that is a very wrong system, and it has resulted, I believe, in a suit being entered against the Government for damages by one of the parties who held the contract. I understand there is a suit now pending in the Exchequer Court, for damages claimed on behalf of some of the contractors, who are asking to be recouped for the loss they have sustained in not having the opportunity to supply all the paper the Government required for the public service. I think the system is not a good one and that it should cease. I would ask if the Government proposes to continue it?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not heard of a suit being brought as the hon. gentleman states, and the members of the Government who are beside me have not heard of it. The system followed now is the same, I think, as that which has been followed for some time past. It probably gives a little more facility for buying the exact kind of stock which is required. Stock is of a varied character, and it may be that purchases could be made to better advantage in that way at times, than by getting the whole thing under contract.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have no personal knowledge of the suit being entered, but I have seen it stated in the public newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should know of it if it had been entered.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see how the Government can make a better bargain without a contract than with a contract. The contract system is the proper one, and the one under which it is more likely that money will be saved than the system of giving orders in a promiscuous way here and there. Not only is the latter injurious in that respect, but I have been informed—and my authority in this matter is undoubted, because it is the authority of a man who sold the paper himself to some of the newspapers who secured contracts for printing immigration pamphlets—that the party who purchased the paper from him required that he should give a discount of 20 or 25 per cent.—I am not sure which—on the amount of the purchase. Thus the newspaper which did the work for the Government not only secured an enormous price for the printing, much more than the work could be done for by the Government contractors here, but obtained also a percentage or a discount of 20 or 25 per cent. on the paper which was used in these pamphlets, and the country suffered to that extent. This is a wrong system, and is not an honest mode of dealing with the public funds.

Mr. FOSTER. What city was that in?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not going to give away the name of the dealer who gave me the information, but I make the statement deliberately.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of this and will look into it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's notes will be overburdened.

Mr. CASEY. I find that this Session there is great difficulty in getting copies of the departmental reports. We used to be able to get a considerable number of extra copies from the Distribution Office, but this year there are no extra copies there, and we are told to go to the departments for them. Those reports are printed for the information of the public, to be sent out to persons in the country who take an interest in these matters, and who desire to post themselves and their neighbors in regard to them. The item for printing is very large, and we ought to have something for it; we have a right to have accounts from all the departments in considerable numbers, to scatter about amongst our constituents, and if we are to have them at all, we had better get them in the Distribution Office as before. I think it would be much more convenient. Such a report as the Auditor General's, for example, I am sure my hon. friends opposite would be glad to scatter rather more freely than they have been doing amongst the people. It is a report in which they ought to take great pride as coming from an official of the Government, and I have no doubt they will not say that they have any reason to dread the scattering of any statements that appear in the document. I would like to understand from the Minister in charge of this branch, how it is going to be with the reports in general, and that one in particular?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly the same number of reports in each of the departments is being printed this year as have been ordered in previous years, and the same method of distribution is taking place as has taken place formerly. It may be that the whole number of copies which are to be printed have not arrived at the Distribution Office. Each department has a number which are printed off and sent to the Distribution Office for the use of members alone, in advance of the total number. But no different system is being followed from that of previous years. Then, I may say, with regard to the general distribution, it is a matter for serious consideration, I think, as to whether we are to

increase the number which are printed for the sake of scattering them through the country, because there is a demand which might be very difficult to satisfy when once you went beyond the regulation number. It has heretofore been considered sufficient.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to hear this explanation from the Minister; but that is not the explanation I got from the Distribution Office. Mr. Botterell himself was not in, but I asked the gentleman in charge of the office, how it was they had no extra copies, was it because they had not yet been published? He said they were not going to have any, and that we had to go to the different departments this year, if we wanted to get extra copies. I am glad to hear that he was laboring under a mistake in making that statement. As to the total number of copies to be printed, I do not think the demand for them is altogether unlimited. Every member knows that he has certain constituents who make a specialty of one line or another, and who want to get a certain number of reports from that particular department. These larger reports no one cares to scatter very freely; it would be a waste of the public money to throw them around the country as freely as you do the smaller documents; but there is a very considerable demand from each constituency; and I hope if the present number is not found to meet the demand of members for such literature, that it will be increased. I think if there is such demand from members for more of that kind of literature, it ought to be provided. Some counties may want more than others. I think the demand ought to be met, and I do not think it will be so very excessive as to make any material difference in the expenses, and it will make a great difference with those who get them.

Mr. BOWELL. If such a demand for the Trade and Navigation Returns were met as the hon. gentleman suggests, the edition would have to be quadrupled. There is scarcely a member in the House who is not constantly asking for additional copies. I do not think there has been any change in the mode of distribution. The Secretary of State may possibly have adopted some system by which the distribution should take place from the Printing Bureau. I will enquire into that. But it will be very difficult, I assure the House, to make a distinction between the country and city members. If the member who represents a commercial constituency is given half a dozen copies, every other member would be equally entitled to it. The only deviation I have made in the distribution has been in favor of prominent members who represent commercial constituencies entirely, and also the leader of the Opposition who, as a rule, has applied for an extra number, and as far as possible we have supplied him with them. If the House is desirous of having a larger distribution they must give us a larger appropriation; for myself I have no objection to order the printing of a double number, or three times the number, if it is thought necessary in the interests of the country. I will only say to the hon. gentleman with reference to the Auditor General's Report, that it is very interesting reading, and I am quite sure he would like to have a much larger number for use in order to enlighten his constituents and the country generally. From past experience I very sincerely regret that there was not an Auditor General's Report published, containing all the minutiae of the transactions of the Government, while I had the honor of sitting on that side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How you would have rung the changes.

Mr. BOWELL. Wouldn't I?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You would not have got through for ten months.

Mr. BOWELL. I would have done my duty to my country.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Customs did his duty very well as it was; he rang the changes continually on the items that were put before the House; and I quite agree with him that it would have made things more spicy if we had had a similar report in those days as we have now. Therefore, both sides of the House will agree as to the utility of this report. The Minister says that it is a useful thing, and we say so also. Of course, we cannot expect to have more of the reports of the Auditor General, or of the Trade and Navigation Returns, without paying more for them. But I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that even a quadruple edition, as he speaks of, in the case of the Trade and Navigation Returns, would not quadruple the expense by any means; it would only cost the price of the larger quantity of paper used, and the extra presswork; the composition and the translation, which form the largest part of the cost, having already been done. It does seem to me, when we look at the large cost of composition and translation, that a comparatively small edition is struck off for such a very considerable initial cost. He says there is a tremendous demand for the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I take that to indicate that more of them ought to be printed. I would urge it upon the Government, and would urge the members of this House to press it upon them, to have a larger number printed, for they will find that their constituents care a good deal for this sort of information, and it is their right to have it. I have no doubt that the Government will think proper to accede to the demand. It does not follow that every member requires one and the same number of copies. I can quite understand that in a large commercial centre a great many more copies of the Trade and Navigation Returns would be asked for than in my own county, for example, almost purely agricultural; but then there are other counties that want a different kind of literature, and I think each county should be supplied according to the demands from that county, and that, practically, a great number of these reports should be at the disposal of members. They need not all be printed at once. It might be necessary to strike off a few hundred more, or a thousand or two more, as time went on. I think that members should not be stinted, especially in such reports as those I have mentioned. We have a right to know how our own money is being expended, and how our trade and commerce are managed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have a suggestion to make which, I think, if put into operation, would get over this difficulty. Ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House I have observed that an unlimited supply of emigration pamphlets have been furnished to the members to send to their constituents. Any member can go over to the Agricultural Department and order five hundred, or a thousand, or just as many copies of emigration pamphlets as he pleases. This system has been pursued from year to year. Members, as every one in the House knows, spend a large portion of their time in addressing to their constituents copies of emigration pamphlets, pamphlets describing British Columbia, pamphlets describing Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and all the Provinces of the Dominion. My idea is that these pamphlets are prepared for distribution abroad, not for distribution among the electors in the various constituencies in the Dominion. This money, if properly expended, would not be expended in sending these pamphlets to constituents of members of this House. The distribution of this literature among the people of Canada does no good. They receive these pamphlets and they are laid aside; it is true they are considered to be a mark of attention from their member, and the people think that he remembers the influence they exercised in the

Mr. BOWELL,

election and they will be glad to assist him again. But all this is doing no good to the country, it is doing no good to the public service, it is wasting the public money, it is wasting the time of members of this House in sending out that literature, and it has become a burden to the Post Office Department, because I am safe in saying that tons and tens of tons of this literature are sent out of the House every Session. The literature intended for distribution abroad is thus wasted upon our people at home, it is of no use whatever, and the money expended is thrown away. If the Government would make a new departure, and if, instead of supplying these immigration pamphlets, they would devote the money thus expended to providing a sufficient supply of blue-books, which contain information of value to every reader, they would be doing a public service. If the Government would give members more blue-books and do away with those immigration pamphlets, which are given to members without regard to numbers or expense, it would be a move in the right direction, and I suggest to members of the Government that this is a matter which should receive their serious consideration. They should put a stop to this system of distributing immigration literature to people to whom it does no good; it does not promote immigration, we do not want our people to emigrate from one Province to another, we want people to emigrate from foreign countries to this Dominion. This expenditure is a waste of the public money, and I contend that if the Government cannot see their way to give members more blue-books on the ground that that would increase the expenditure, then, at all events, they should curtail the expenditure on these immigration pamphlets and allow the supply of blue-books to be increased. There is no member who is not receiving from some of his constituents letters asking for blue-books, and it is impossible to obtain a supply equal to the demand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can hardly agree with the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in his statement that the only use of these descriptive pamphlets of our country is to have them sent as inducements to foreigners to emigrate to this Dominion. While I admit that is the primary use to which they should be put, I think the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his conclusions respecting their circulation in our own country. We have no objection to inducing foreigners of the right class to settle in our country. It should be our object to do so, and if we are to get them in large numbers we must furnish them with the necessary information to enable them to form a correct estimate of the value of our country as one to which to emigrate, and furnish them with a correct idea as to the various parts of the country whither they may bend their course. But I submit there is another class, the very class to whom the hon. gentleman objected to furnish information, that is the young men of our own country who are contemplating moving from their present place to some other locality where they can establish themselves in life. I hold it is a matter of the utmost importance that information regarding the resources of our country and the best parts of our country to which to emigrate should be furnished to those parties. I need not tell this House, it has been mentioned over and over again, that there are 1,000,000 of our own people on the other side of the line. If pains had been taken properly to open up our own country to settlement, and to furnish correct information respecting its resources and the advantages offered to settlers, a great many of those people might have been saved to this country. Our friends across the line are well aware of this fact. You cannot enter a steamboat or a railway carriage but you are handed a pamphlet descriptive of the country, setting forth the advantages of this part and the other part, and making representations so as to induce people to leave this country and settle in their country. I hold that

the expenditure made by the Government is not wasted. It is, on the contrary, absolutely necessary if we are going to induce our people, who are being crowded out of the older portions of the Provinces, or are seeking better fields of enterprise in the new Provinces, to remain in our country that we should keep them posted with regard to the resources of the North-West, and of the different points where they can settle with advantage, and the Government has been doing this by means of this expenditure.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has stated that members have only to go to the Department of Agriculture and give an order for 500 or 1,000, or whatever number of copies they may require of pamphlets for distribution among their constituents. I admit that, perhaps, some years ago a number of immigration pamphlets were given to members for distribution in the different constituencies, but it was done only at their urgent request, and this literature was to be distributed among young men who intended leaving their country and going either to the United States or to our North-West. We have discontinued the publication of immigration pamphlets to a great extent, and I have had more than one complaint from members of the House this Session because we were not able to give them such supplies as they had received in previous Sessions, and because now we are not publishing any pamphlets for distribution in Ontario or in Canada, and, in fact, we have discontinued it altogether at present. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), judging from the statements he made, is under a wrong impression. One of the objects we had in distributing the literature to which the hon. gentleman refers, was to give information to the young men of Canada, who are inclined perhaps by statements made in the public press and by gentlemen holding public positions to think the western States a better country in which to settle than our own country in the North-West. I think hon. gentlemen will remember that, a Session or two ago, such statements were made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and it was said that a large number of people were going to Dakota instead of our own North-West. It was the duty of the Government and this House to do everything possible to retain our young men in our own country, and to show that the North-West was preferable to Dakota or Minnesota, or any of the northern States. That information was given to the people through their representatives, and I think it has had a good effect in inducing our young men to go to our North-West instead of Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has that been the effect?

Mr. CARLING. I believe it has been the effect. From information we have received from our agents in the North-West, we learn that a number of people who have gone to the United States from Canada are now turning their attention to our North-West, and enquiries are being constantly made for our land regulations and a statement of the advantages offered by that country as compared with those offered by the United States. I feel satisfied that the information has proved to be of great value.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to hear the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that this year, at all events, the supply of pamphlets is to be curtailed. I think the hon. Minister is taking a wise step. This matter was brought to the attention of the House by me, some years ago, and I am glad the advice I then gave is now being acted on by the Minister of Agriculture. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) that it is necessary to circulate such literature in order to keep our young men in the country, I may say that in some respects I agree with him, but I do not think it necessary to send the same pamphlet to the

same man every year. The same pamphlets have been published every Session since I have been here, at all events, for several Sessions. An unlimited supply of the Guide Book have been circulated, Session after Session, and year after year, among our young men all over the Dominion.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the Department of Agriculture sent those books for distribution, or whether the department was asked by members for this literature, for the benefit of their constituents?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I believe that the members asked for this literature, but they asked for it in some cases, not for the purpose of enlightening our young men as to the merits of their own country, but just to have some communication with their electors. I think that this was the chief object they had in view.

Mr. CARLING. You cannot get any better information than is contained in the Guide Book.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Certainly it is good information, and it is information that is endorsed by every member on this side of the House. Every member on this side is just as attached to his country as any member on that side, if not more so. I do not believe that any statement ever made by a member on this side of the House has had any tendency to induce the young men of this country to seek homes in any other country. The members on the opposite side of this House are not any more loyal than the members on this side of the House. Sometimes it is necessary for us to state bare, bald facts, but they are distorted by members of the Government for political and party purposes. We have stated what we believe to be true, and our statements have been borne out by facts in the past history of Manitoba, that many of the people who have settled in that Province were driven out of the country by the land regulations, and other impediments placed on the settler.

An hon. MEMBER. Nonsense.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is not nonsense, it is true. There are hundreds of men in Dakota to-day who were formerly inhabitants of Manitoba. That is a fact that cannot be disputed, and it is a fact that we should all look in the face and try to overcome. Therefore, I do not think it is in the power of any man to say that any member on this side of the House has by his statements induced men to settle in a foreign country. We have a country rich in every natural resource; our country speaks for itself, and we have a right to be proud of it, but it ill becomes any follower on the Government side to charge a member on this side of the House with uttering statements which tend to induce the young men of this country to settle in the United States. We are all anxious to see this country settled and to have it a great and growing nation, and in this respect we are as much interested on this side of the House as they are on the opposite benches. With regard to the statement of my friend from Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), I would say that his reasoning would be all right if the supply of those books was limited to some extent, because if a supply of books is sent during any one year to the people of a section of a country it ought to be supposed that the information contained would be sufficient for some time to come. But the dose is repeated year after year and Session after Session. Tons and tons of this literature is literally wasted and thrown away. Why should it not be sent to foreign countries where we might secure some benefit from it. I believe that my suggestion is a good one, that it is in the interest of economy and in the interest of the people of this country, that instead of wasting the money of the people in distributing this literature at home we should send it to foreign countries, because our

people have had a surfeit of it in years past. We should put this money into the blue-books and give the people of Canada all the information they ought to have.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is foolish enough to send the same pamphlet to the same parties year after year, I cannot help it. I can assure him that I am not foolish enough to do so, and I do not believe there is another man in this House who is. I can only repeat and reiterate what I said before, that it is a matter of the utmost importance that we should keep the merits and the claims of our country before the people of our country. Let me point out that the Americans see the importance of this, and carry it out to a much larger extent than we do. You can scarcely open any of the leading newspapers of the United States, without seeing large advertisements about the lands in western Kansas, in Texas, and other parts of the Union. The people on the other side of the line are wise enough to keep the matter before the public, and not only do they advertise in the papers of the United States, but also in the papers of the old and this country. A few years ago some acquaintance of mine in the State of Nebraska sent me a newspaper, and I remember seeing in it an account of where they had formed a new corporation for a county. They had organised a county council, and although there were only a few scattered inhabitants in the place, the very first thing which the new county council did was to grant \$25,000 for the purpose of circulating information about the county in the papers of the old country. I believe we will be entirely lacking in our duty to Canada, if we do not take means to keep its advantages and its greatness before the whole world, and above all, before the people of our country, for I hold that one young man raised in Canada is worth three at least of those we get from other countries. I can stand in my own doorway, and I can look at the houses of five intelligent young men who have gone to Dakota and Nebraska, within the last few years. Every inducement that can be offered, should be held out to those young men to settle at home, and not to leave us to swell the ranks of a rival country. I hold it to be the duty of the Government of the day, by all the means in their power, to spread information regarding the resources and advantages of our country among our own people, and to try to induce young men to believe that they should stay in our country in preference to any country in the world.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) must know that it would materially militate against the Government if they had those pamphlets printed and did not have the opportunity of spreading them all over the country. My friend from South Middlesex expressed a strange idea, when he extolled the Government for producing such wonderful results in keeping the young men from going to a foreign country, while at the same time he remarked that from his own residence he could see the houses of several young men who had left their country and gone to the United States. If those pamphlets are so useful and so beneficial, and so much in the interests of the young men of this country, why is it that he has to lament the loss of those young men who have gone to the United States. He says he was not so foolish as to send the same copies to the same people every year, so he must have sent out fresh copies, but, notwithstanding that, the people have left the country, as he says himself. The very argument used by my hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) ought to show plainly enough that those pamphlets, instead of being of utility to his section of the country, have produced a very contrary effect. I would suggest to him that he would send a few blue-books instead of those pamphlets, and then perhaps he will not have to lament so seriously and so sadly the departure of young men from this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

An hon. MEMBER. The reading of the blue-books would drive any man out of the country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have no doubt that if the young men of this country studied the extravagant expenditures made by the Government, it would be enough to drive them away. I agree with my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville), that there has been an enormous and unnecessary expenditure in printing those pamphlets, but, of course, we have to remember that it has been beneficial to the Government of the day. From the statements made by the Minister of Agriculture, one would think that the young men are not leaving the country in as great numbers as formerly, although we know that they are. All he has to do is to look at the reports of his own agents. I would call his attention especially to the report of the agent at Winnipeg, who says that when on a pleasure tour through the western States, he found a great many people who had previously been located in Manitoba. I would advise him to recall that agent, and to restrain the publication of these pamphlets, and devote the money which would otherwise be expended upon them to proper and legitimate purposes which will be beneficial to the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised that the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) should raise the objection he does, for he, like all hon. gentlemen, must have been applied to from time to time by young men in his own locality who wished to change their locations, for these very pamphlets which he is now so strongly condemning; and such applications do not come from men belonging to one political party only. My experience is that they come from the farmers' institutes. Last year and the year before I received urgent appeals from the farmers' institutes to distribute the pamphlet known as Lynch's pamphlet on Butter Making, throughout the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is not an immigration pamphlet.

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to this as one of the important pamphlets got out by the Government. I have also had applications from various members of these institutes, as well as from the grange societies in my locality, asking me to send them immigration pamphlets containing information about our own North-West, because many farmers' sons belonging to them wished to change their locality. I have been written to every Session since 1881 for such pamphlets in relation to agriculture and immigration, and I find these applications coming from both political parties. They value and appreciate them, and are thankful to the Minister of Agriculture that he has issued so many of them.

Mr. WATSON. I would just like to say that we cannot overestimate the value of distributing literature which will show the natural advantages of our country; but I believe the Department of Agriculture might adopt a better system than that of publishing such a book as the Guide Book, which in its present form is not suitable for circulation in Canada. It contains a sketch of all the Provinces in the Dominion. There is no use of sending a description of Ontario to Ontario settlers, or a description of Manitoba to Manitoba settlers. If a pamphlet were issued to show the advantages of our great North-West, it would be of immense value to distribute that in the eastern Provinces, because a great many people leave these Provinces for the west, and unfortunately a large number are settling in the western States. We have had frequent instances of men who went from the eastern Provinces and settled in Manitoba, and afterwards left for the western States; but I am glad to inform this House that many of them are now coming back to settle in Manitoba. Before they left the North-West they knew it was a good country to settle in, with good soil, if they had been let alone; but

they were hampered at that time by restricted land regulations, by the disallowance of railways, and by the monopoly which existed from one end of the country to the other. They left the country; but knowing the quality of the soil, now that monopoly has been abolished, that lands which were formerly chequer-boarded by colonisation companies have been returned to the country for settlement, and that the policy of the Government has been changed, I am glad to say they are returning to the country; and we hope, with the competition in railways which we expect in the near future, that the country will rapidly settle up. The Local Government of Manitoba are doing considerable in their way to induce settlers to go there from the eastern Provinces. They are distributing literature at the expense of the Province, and in that way are doing good work. I would suggest that such pamphlets as the Guide Book might be divided up, and the portion referring to the North-West would be very good literature for hon. members to send to their constituents.

**Mr. SOMERVILLE.** It is, of course, within the knowledge of this House that we have a printing bureau established at an enormous expense, and the understanding was that after its establishment all the Government printing would be done there at a less cost than was formerly the case under the contract system. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if it is his intention to abandon the practice which has been in vogue for many years, of distributing this printing patronage among the various newspapers supporting the Government, and do away with the system by which such papers as the *Hamilton Spectator* got \$15,000 or \$20,000, and the *Montreal Gazette* and other papers got similar amounts yearly, for printing? I think it would be satisfactory to the members of this House and the country to know that it is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to have these pamphlets and all the printing of his department done at the printing bureau.

**Mr. MACDOWALL.** I am glad to be able to agree on this occasion with the general tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), because they tend to show that the pamphlets issued by the hon. Minister have assisted immigration to the North-West. I am also glad to be able to agree with him that farmers are returning from Minnesota and Dakota to the Canadian North-West. I think that is a sign that the policy adopted by the Government has been a wise policy and beneficial to the country—

**Mr. WATSON.** The Local Government.

**Mr. MACDOWALL**—and now that the people understand it, now that they understand the advantages the Canadian North-West offers, they are wise enough to make use of those advantages. Referring to the pamphlets, I have a little paper in my hand, written by a practical farmer, Mr. W. A. Webster.

**Mr. MULLOCK.** In the civil service.

**Mr. BOWELL.** Does that make him any the worse?

**Mr. MACDOWALL.** I consider it a very valuable pamphlet. We have heard so much discussion in former times on the comparative value of Dakota and Minnesota, on the one side, as a farming country, and the Canadian North-West on the other, and we have heard so very much said in favor of Dakota and Minnesota, that I think it is just as well the world at large should have a comparison between these two countries made by a practical farmer, and this little pamphlet is very useful and interesting in that way. It gives the experience of an actual farmer, who makes his living by farming, and I think anyone who reads this will agree that the Canadian North-West is most assuredly a much better country for settlement than Dakota or Minnesota. One point alone will prove to the poor man that the Canadian

North-West is a much better country for him than Dakota or Minnesota. Mr. Webster says that notices such as this can be commonly seen through Dakota or Minnesota: "All parties are warned not to let stock graze on our land." This is stuck up on the prairies where there may be none or very few inhabitants, because the land is owned by speculators. These speculators will not allow farmers owning stock to graze their cattle on the land, but in the Canadian North-West it is just the reverse. If a man has a crop, he is bound to put up what is called a legal fence, and the North-West Council passed an ordinance describing what a legal fence is. If this fence is put up round a piece of land, the owners of stock straying within this fenced enclosure can be prosecuted and made to pay damages; but it appears in Dakota and Minnesota, although the whole prairie may be unoccupied, the settler with a few head of stock cannot let them run at large, for fear of being prosecuted and mulcted in damages. There are also other matters referred to. Mr. Webster refers to the case of Captain Comstock, who purchased some land, as he believed, in Dakota from the United States Government. He paid the sum of \$1.25 an acre for it, but as there happened to be, before the patent was transferred, a change of administration in Washington, he was told by the Land Commissioner, that he could not have the land; and, as he said, they did not give him the land or even return him his money. I do not think anything of that kind has ever occurred in the North-West. If a man pays for his land, the patent is issued with as little delay as possible. While on this point, I would like to compliment the Department of the Interior on the improved method which they have adopted during the last two or three years in the issuing of patents. These patents are now issued so quickly and so regularly that the purchasers of land have not a long time to wait for them. I would refer to another observation of Mr. Webster, to the effect that in Minnesota and Dakota a great deal of land grabbing has been going on, and that the class of settlers who went in there evidently did not go to make their homes in the country. They borrowed a yoke of steers, plowed a few furrows around the land, which they called breaking forty acres, and then, as soon as possible, they got their patents, merely to sell the land over again, and go somewhere else where they could repeat the same performance. The land laws in the Canadian North-West will not permit this, and that is a great advantage, because we do not want any speculators in the North-West, but wish to see the country occupied by *bona fide* settlers. There is another point worthy of notice in this pamphlet. After going through Minnesota and Dakota, Mr. Webster says:

"I have travelled over the Nelson county and examined it carefully. The Canadians there are generally in some little business; very few of them are farmers, and these few seem eager to sell out. Everything seems to be for sale."

We can find no such remarks with regard to the Canadian North-West in any of the United States pamphlets or newspapers, because such a state of affairs does not exist there. Canadians and others who have gone to our North-West have settled down, and though at first times were rather hard, they were men of iron energy and strong determination of will, who, in spite of all difficulties, are pushing their way and will make a country of it, whereas across the boundary line the land is being taken up in the manner described by Mr. Webster; and I venture to say, that after a few years our Canadian North-West will assume a much better position than that of the North-West on the other side of the boundary line. His pamphlet also goes on to show that an immense lot of land is held in Dakota and Minnesota by speculators, while in the Canadian North-West this is happily not the case. We have a very large field there for immigrants, and but little land is held by speculators except where it is held in very small lots, say



lots of half a section, and by railway companies, and these companies well understand it is best for them, as it is for the country, that the land they hold should be rapidly occupied. I need only refer to the very able way in which the land of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, in our Canadian North-West, has been administered by their very able commissioner. This company are adopting every means possible to colonise these lands and have them settled. They offer the lands to actual settlers at a small and fair price, and offer the settlers every inducement to settle on the land by giving them length of time to pay and an easy rate of interest. If we can have a few pamphlets such as Mr. Webster's distributed throughout the world, it will be the very best thing we can do. I was an emigrant from the old country myself, and adopted the course most emigrants take when coming out. I went to the steamboat offices and other places where pamphlets were to be had, and I read, not only the pamphlets relating to our Canadian North-West and the other Provinces, but also those dealing with Australia and New Zealand, and the effect produced on my mind by the emigration literature of Canada was such that I thought this country would afford better opportunities to an emigrant than Australia or New Zealand, and better opportunities to an emigrant who preferred to live under the flag of the glorious old Empire under which he had been born, than the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What year does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I came to Canada in 1873, and there was an abundance of literature at that time—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; of the right sort then.

Mr. MACDOWALL—and I hope to see this immigration literature, of the same class as that which has been so ably selected and sent to the old country by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, continued.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will answer the question which I put to him before. I asked if he intended to pursue the course which had been adopted in his department in the past, in having immigration pamphlets printed by outside printers instead of at the printing bureau, which has been established by the Government for the purpose of economising in that respect? I might say, in response to the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), that no one objects to the circulation of this literature abroad. We all desire that the advantages of Canada should be known, that it should be known that this is a good country for immigrants, but we do not think that this literature should be circulated in places where it can do no good.

Mr. CARLING. I believe the system of distributing the printing of immigration literature to the different newspapers was started by the Government of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) in 1876 or 1877, and is continued by the present Administration. Since the commencement of this financial year, no pamphlets have been printed outside the Government printing office, and it is the intention of the Government to get all the literature of that kind printed at the Government printing office in future.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to be able to agree with my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) on several points, as he agrees with me on some points. He congratulates the Interior Department on the way in which they are conducting their affairs in the west, but he does not condemn them for the way in which they conducted their business in the past. He confines his remarks to the last two or three years, and no doubt within the last two or three years things have improved. But the hon. gentleman should not be contented with congratulating the Government of the Dominion, because the fact that confidence is

Mr. MACDOWALL.

restored in the Province of Manitoba is due to our having a Government there to-day which is fighting for the rights of that Province, a Government that has taken the Dominion Government by the throat and demanded its just rights, and the result is that the Manitoba Government is receiving those rights, and the people who were leaving the Province, when a miserable servile Government was in power there, are returning to Manitoba now. As long as we have people in that Province who will maintain their rights, and a North-West Council in the Territories who will maintain their rights, and all we ask for is fair play—both Manitoba and the North-West Territories will prosper.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has quoted Mr. Webster as a reliable agriculturist, as a witness who satisfies him. I think he is quite right in quoting Mr. Webster. I do not know many men who are more extensively engaged in the farming business than he is. There are some people who are engaged in farming out the whole of Canada, and he is one of them. I have seen him engaged in farming in my own constituency, and I observe that he generally selects the winter, when we are all here in Ottawa, to conduct his farming operations. It is always a harvest season with him. He was harvesting in Haldimand in December last, and he was harvesting in Halton and East Hastings. In fact, he carries on his farming operations in every riding in which there is an election, and his farming is always on behalf of the Government, and of course he carries it on because it is a very profitable occupation on behalf of the head foreman of the whole Dominion. The member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) says he hopes the North-West will develop. I entirely agree with him in that, and had the gentlemen who have been farming that part of the country acted in the interest of the country, it would have been developed before this. But did the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan ever do anything to help to develop the North-West? Did he ever give a vote in this House to develop it? Did he give a vote to give railway competition to that country? Did he vote to relieve the people there of the objectionable features of the landlordism which we contended against from year to year? No, he only voted to send an agent of the Government to every elector in his constituency when he was running, and to tell the electors that the manner in which they voted would be sent down to the Government here and they had better vote right. That, of course, accounts for the hon. gentleman's being able to represent the riding here to-day. That country has been kept back by just such a class of men as this immigrant who came here in 1878. I admit that he showed one glimmer of intelligence when he was able to discriminate between Canada and other parts of Her Majesty's Dominions. He accepted the statements in the literature published by the Government of the hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and I can sympathise with him when he throws some little doubt upon the general reliability of the literature which has been distributed in regard to Canada since that date. If he could only think of the general interests of Canada and not endorse everything which comes from his party, he would see a far greater development, but he and many others will have reason to regret the unpatriotic course they take now in simply showing loyalty to their party, in season and out of season, in the House and out of the House, when they really are the principal obstructors of the progress of the North-West.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon. gentleman has made some statements in regard to myself which are absolutely false, I must rise once more to give them a complete denial. He says that I sent Government agents to the voters in my constituency to cause them by threats to vote for me. The hon. gentleman will probably be very glad to hear that he was mistaken when he made that statement, and if anybody

gave him information to that effect, he will no doubt be equally glad to hear that he was misinformed. Such was not the case. As to what I have said in this House or the votes I have given here, I have always considered the great interests of the country when I have spoken on public occasions, and I have always considered the great future of the Dominion which it is my hope to see some day a very great power in the world. I believe that, if the hon. gentleman had voted and acted as I have done, he would have done more to help the future development of this great Dominion than he has by adopting the course he has followed.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Last Session we had a little information on this point, and I think it was clearly established on the floor of this House that a person in the service of this Government—I have forgotten his name, but the *Hansard* will show it, I think he was a legal gentleman living in the hon. gentleman's own town of Prince Albert—took a great interest in promoting his election. He attended meetings of the free and independent electors of Saskatchewan, and he told them, what? Gentleman, you owe the Government for certain lands, you have not got your patents yet, you are under obligations to do certain duties, the time will come.

**Mr. BOWELL.** And that is so.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Well, suppose it is.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I am not talking to you, I am talking to this gentleman.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Very well, you are very well occupied.

**Mr. BOWELL.** Much better than I should be if I had a conversation with you.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with you—

**Mr. BOWELL.** Then, there is no dispute between us.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Mr. Chairman, he stated who was the common agent in his election for himself and the Government, and this agent appealed to the "independent electors" as he calls them to-day. He said to them: You have been sufferers by the rebellion, you have claims against the Government for compensation, you will in a short time have these claims adjudicated upon by the Government of the day, and remember that there is an election coming on, and under the law applicable to the North-West the voting is open, and how every man votes is afterwards to be known to the Administration; it is the duty of the returning officer, the moment the election is over, to return the election roll to Ottawa, and the Government will understand how each man has voted, the Government will be obliged to take notice how every man votes; therefore it is of extreme importance to consider these facts in connection with your prospective claim for compensation. The member for Saskatchewan, through his agent and the agent of the Government, tells these "free and independent electors": "Remember that however you vote, your compensation depends which side you vote for," and that is what he calls, I suppose, letting them have their own way. He says that no Government influence helped him. I ask him now, did not the Government agent distribute a circular informing them that the way they voted would be made known to the right hon. gentleman who presides over the destinies of this country, and that he might be compelled to punish them if they were not good boys and do as they were told? He cannot deny it. Now tell us whether such a circular was distributed or not among those who sent you here.

**Mr. MACDOWALL.** I am sorry that the valuable time of the House should be taken up with this little matter, as it is a very small one indeed. It was fully discussed by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) last Session,

and an explanation was given which, I think, ought to satisfy any reasonable man. I merely wish to repeat the explanation that was given last year, and to say that I have pleasure in correcting the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He stated that a circular was issued by a gentleman who was both my agent and the agent of the Government, threatening the electors unless they voted for me. Now I have pleasure in being able to state that I can deny this.

**Mr. MULOCK.** What do you deny?

**Mr. MACDOWALL.** No agent of mine ever sent such a circular to the electors, and no agent for the Government ever acted as agent of mine; therefore I think the charge falls to the ground. With the regard to open voting in the North-West and the reference he has made to the "free and independent electors," as though he thought they were not very free and independent, let me tell him that the people of the North-West are exceedingly independent, and they know themselves what is best for themselves. I think they have several times asserted themselves, and whenever an election comes round they always will assert themselves; they will pronounce their own opinion, and I hope their own opinion will always be pronounced as wisely as it was in the last election.

**Mr. WATSON.** I regret to have to take up any more time of the House, but when statements are made here that are misleading, I feel it my duty to correct them. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that a circular was sent around in the district of Prince Albert and in the district of Saskatchewan, by a gentleman there, who was acting on behalf of claimants, parties who had claims against the Government, and that circular was read in this House last Session, and was not denied by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall). That circular was circulated by an agent of this Government who was acting on behalf of parties who had claims against the Government. The circular stated that they should vote for the Government candidate because the Government were sustained, and the way in which they voted would decide upon how their claims were considered. The circular also stated that the voting was open, and the voters' lists had to be returned to Ottawa to the Government that it might see how each individual had recorded his vote, whether for or against the Government candidate, and this was to be used as a reason why these men should vote for the hon. gentleman who now occupies the seat for Saskatchewan district. As for these electors being independent, I say, Mr. Chairman, it is a disgrace to have open voting in our North-West. There is no class of people in the Dominion of Canada to-day who are so dependent on the Government, on account of the use the Government may make of their votes. They are dependent on the Government for their patents, for their land for settlement, and their land claims, and when you have an agent who boldly issues a circular over his own name warning these people that they will be taken to account for recording their votes against the Government candidate, I say it is a disgrace to have open voting, under these circumstances, in our North-West.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I think it will be interesting to the House to hear exactly what that circular was, and although, I must admit, the discussion has taken a wide range, this is a matter of sufficient importance to be recalled to the attention of the House. The circular is as follows:—

"(Confidential.)

"PRINCE ALBERT,  
"TUESDAY, 2nd March, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—I deem it to be part of my duty, as solicitor for your rebellion losses—

"as solicitor for your rebellion losses"—

—“ to inform you, in reference to the Federal elections, that on Friday last I telegraphed my agents in Ottawa, who are attending to your interests there, the following message :—

“ Please wire me what seems the real result of elections so far.

“ And yesterday I received by telegram the following reply :—

“ Government majority so far is 12. 204 constituencies have, so far, elected members; there remain eleven more to be held. It may be assumed that the Government will receive at least half of these.

“ Now, in conclusion, I will remind you that by section 51 of the Representation Act each vote is cast openly and his vote goes one for or against the Government in the poll books; and by section 61 of same Act the poll books must be forwarded to Ottawa after the election here. And it is certain that the Government is not defeated, the losses will be paid this Session, yours, I trust, with the rest.

“ Your obedient servant,

“ WILLIAM V. MAOLISE.”

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has made a grave misstatement with regard to the independent electors of the North-West. In the district of Alberta, which I have the honor to represent, I must say that I was not the Government candidate, but beat the Government candidate, and sit here as one of the independent men. It is true I did not run as an independent, but ran as a Conservative, and beat the Government candidate. So I think his statement that the people of the North-West did not know who they wished to represent them in the House of Commons, is far from being correct.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very sorry that the time of this House should be taken up with this sort of wrangling. The fact is this, that the Reform party seems to devote itself to the study of the infinitesimal, to grumbling at cab hire, uttering elegies on the disturbed old carpets, and talking a lot of nonsense, such as we have heard to-day, that does not bear examination for a moment; this is the way the great Reform party thinks the time of the country should be taken up. In regard to the statement about seed grain made by the hon. gentleman for North York (Mr. Mulock), I may tell him, as he was told here the very first Session, that his statement made in regard to the use of seed grain as an election machine has not an *iota* of foundation. It was shown, when first this question was brought up, that Reformers in several sections of the constituency had the distribution of this seed grain. But I have observed this about hon. gentlemen on the Reform side of the House, that they are like a beetle: if a beetle is running in a given direction and you turn him aside, still he tries to go right on; you turn him on his back and he more or less wriggles; put him on his feet again and he goes right on in the same direction. Place hon. gentlemen opposite on a certain track, let it be proved that there was no foundation for the course they are following or the statements they are making, still they run right on and repeat the same statement Session after Session, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) rises and makes the same speech for ten years successively with slight variation. Like a celebrated character in Shakespeare, all the hon. gentlemen on the Reform side of the House are eloquent in saying an infinite deal of nothing; and will anyone deny that in this committee we have had an infinite deal of nothing? The statement was made that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), sent round a circular. That was the statement made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) refutes his fellow member, the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), by reading the circular, and it turns out that the hon. gentleman's statement is wrong, and that the solicitor of certain claimants, taking his own view as to what was in the interests of those claimants, as he had a perfect right to do, wrote the circular. What on earth my hon. friend or the Government have to do with the fact that that man wrote that circular, I fail to understand. And so it is with everything else. I am sorry the time of the committee has been taken up in this manner,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

and I should like, but it is a hope of despair, to say I trust hon. gentlemen on the Reform side of the House, who fulfil a great function here as Her Majesty's Opposition, will rise to a higher plane and give us something better; we are tired of these pettifogging politics, and I should like, if for nothing else than the fun of the thing, to see them make a vigorous onslaught on the Government. What effect can it have on the Government to be peppering away at them with pea pods? Why, hon. gentlemen only make themselves ridiculous before the country. I should like to see a vigorous attack made, but I confess, having observed those hon. gentlemen for two Sessions and a half, it is a hope of despair. When the hon. leader is here—I am sorry he is poorly—I like to hear his silvery eloquence, but after all there is no thunderbolt in his thunder, and while the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), talks indeed a little more vigorously, I will not say it is all thunder and small beer, but I will say it is all stage thunder and concocted apollinaris. Sometimes the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gets into his Bengal-tiger-mood, and deals very vigorously with us all. He is very sensitive if we say anything about him, but he does not care a bit how hard he deals with us, and the fact is that he deals us a kind of attack that has lost all interest, because it is a sort of stale draught of concocted assafoetida, and my intellectual stomach rebels against it. No man ever said more in the interest of the Reform party than what I am saying here now. I say to that party, that unless they change their tactics, they will not only become smaller by degrees and most un-Beautifully less, but their present confusion will become worse confounded. Why, they have so many leaders that one does not know what to make of it, and of course what they want is to extend their numbers, but, as Bigelow says, what is the use of adding to the tail when it is the head that is in need of strengthening.

Mr. WATSON. I do not suppose I can say anything as amusing to the House as the remarks made by the hon. member. He told us the other day that he was a kind of funnel which communicated the views of the Minister of the Interior to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and now he is acting as a kind of funnel for the Minister of Agriculture. He is accustomed to use funnels, I believe, and he is therefore the right man in the right place. He is an example of the loyal men of that party, a loyalty I might say for revenue purposes, for in the Auditor General's Report I see the *Regina Leader* entered for \$4,976 for printing. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman wherein he has interested himself in the North-West? He has put notices on the paper in regard to the North-West. He introduced a Bill last Session providing for representation of the North-West, or for the Government of the North-West, by a Local Legislature, and he asked one or two questions in regard to the subject, and especially as to what the Government intended to do in regard to that Bill. I would ask the hon. gentleman and this House what he had to say when the Bill was brought before the House? Not one word is recorded of advocacy by him of the interests of the people in obtaining the establishment of a Local Legislature in the North-West. I say that the North-West should have a local representative body and have within itself the power to govern its whole country, and I admired the action of the hon. gentleman during the first portion of last Session in introducing a Bill with that object; but he saw fit to quietly withdraw it, I suppose at the bidding of his masters. We find the hon. gentleman on all occasions ready to rise and defend the Government in this House, but when matters are brought up that are of vital interest to the North-West, the hon. gentleman is not present to defend them. He is always acting as a funnel for some representative gentleman on that side of the House.

Mr. WELSH. A gas meter.

Mr. WATSON. He may properly be termed a funnel. There has probably been some time wasted in this discussion, but I hope what has been said may have effect, and that the House will be satisfied that undue influence is brought to bear on electors in the North-West under the open voting system. No doubt such pressure is brought to bear in the North-West, although probably I should not say so. This may be due in a great measure to the system of open voting. I know that at the election in East Assiniboia—I was there during the election—pressure was brought to bear, not by the hon. member who now represents that constituency, but by his predecessor who is now in the Senate. I know that undue influence was brought to bear there, and particularly on a class of people who were induced to come out and settle there on account of our free institutions, namely, the Crofters. Undue influence was brought to bear on them to my certain knowledge. The son of the First Minister was shown there as a Crofter, to start with. The people were told they would not receive any extension of time in connection with Lady Cathcart's payments unless they voted for Mr. Perley, and also that they would not receive a second homestead unless they voted for that gentleman, nor would they receive seed grain unless they voted for Mr. Perley. All these arguments were used on these poor people, and further than that, there was a man belonging to a particular religious denomination brought up there to work on the feelings of these poor people also. They were to lose their heavenly bread as well as their daily bread unless they voted for Mr. Perley.

Mr. DAVIN. As a personal reference has been made to me, permit me in two sentences to deal with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. He says that I accomplished nothing last year in regard to responsible government. I put that notice on the paper, and what happened then? The right hon. gentleman brought down the 13th clause, and, according to the editor of the *Edmonton Bulletin*, who is now a member of the Legislative Assembly, and who is, perhaps, the strongest Reformer in the Dominion of Canada, has stated publicly, and stated in his paper, that the Advisory Board is practically responsible government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Watson) has made the statement that in some way I am controlled by the Government, because, in looking over the Public Accounts he finds that a company called the *Regina Leader Company*, in which I am supposed to be interested, is down as having received certain sums.

Mr. MULOCK. How much?

Mr. DAVIN. I don't know.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Oh, it is infinitesimal to the hon. member?

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman know that the Dominion Government has no power whatever, any more than if the money was voted in England, to give the printing in the North-West to anybody. That is done entirely by the Advisory Board. I was able at one time, when I was proprietor, to actively apply myself to the conduct of that paper and to manage its business, and I can say that the profit from work done for the Government was very small. Hon. gentlemen rise up here and make a statement in reference to some items of the Public Accounts—be it \$4,000, or \$5,000, or \$10,000—and endeavor to let the public go away with the idea that the man got a present of that money, while they seem to forget that work was done for that money. In the North-West I know that—what with the tremendous expense which was gone to in getting in printing materials and plant and working expenses you will find a number of books printed for the Local Government, as your statutes are printed here, at a

price which did not leave 5 per cent. profit on the capital and labor.

Mr. WELSH. That is cutting it pretty fine.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not want to go too closely into the facts of the case, because, if I did, I might be interfering with the great policy of the Liberal party. Their policy does not amount to much more than this attack on expenditure, for which value was given to the Government in return. They have no other policy to bring forward, and there they sit, as Mr. Disraeli once said of a number of great statesmen, "like extinct volcanoes." They can erupt nothing that will challenge the public ear. They cannot contrive any policy that will attract the attention of the people of the country; they are absolutely without a policy, and, as a consequence of their being without a policy, they come down here and take up a whole night wrangling about cab fares. Another time one of those hon. members on the Opposition side of the House sheds tears about a torn-up carpet. Let the hon. gentleman not fret about this torn-up carpet, but let him dry his tears, because I can ease his soul on that matter. The Minister of Finance promised the other night to tell the hon. gentleman about that carpet, but I was so anxious to soothe the perturbed soul of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I enquired about the carpet myself. I may tell him that when a carpet is torn up in one room it is sent to a less dignified habitation. If it is taken up from the floor of one room where there must be a best carpet it is sent to a committee room or some place else, where its old age and infirmity are not so readily conspicuous, and I can calm the mind of the member for Wellington with the assurance that there is not a yard of carpet wasted in this whole Dominion. I cannot say that this announcement has taken a plank from the Liberal platform, but it certainly has taken some of the carpet off a plank, or otherwise the platform of the Reform party might go to the country covered with a ragged carpet excogitated out of the agitated imagination of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Once more, I repeat this policy of small criticism is the only policy they have on the other side, and it is equivalent to saying before they can get to those benches they will have to evolve a man of genius from among them. But I do not think however that even the daring spirit of Darwin would even conceive that as possible. I can tell them that they will have to change their manners and their methods if they want to get to the other side of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. Permit me to tender my thanks to the hon. member for the information he has given the House. He stated to us the other night, when the Minister of Interior was interrogated, that he was constituted a funnel through which would pass all the information we were asking. We see now that he is not only a funnel for the Minister of Interior, but that he is also a funnel for the Minister of Finance, for he has given us a little bit of information to-night that the Minister of Finance had promised to give to the House. He did not get the information from the Minister of Finance, but he appears to have wormed himself into the place where that carpet was used, and he now comes forward as the funnel through which the information passes to this House.

An hon. MEMBER. Where was the carpet?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know where it was; but the hon. gentleman is a funnel no matter where he goes. He appears to be a political funnel, and, as he has described himself, he is the funnel of his own party. We are grateful to him for the information he has given this side of the House, and I hope that to the end of the Session, whenever a Minister of the Crown fails to give information to the House, he will prove himself up to his undertaking, and prove himself this peculiar political funnel

so that we will receive all the information needed. We have nothing to do with a funnel among our party, nor have we one and we do not want one, but I congratulate the party opposite on having this distinguished individual who represents the North-West discharging the peculiar duty of a funnel. He is an admirable one, because he appears to be able to convey any amount of information, and what the Ministers are not able to give he can find out for himself.

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

#### After Recess.

#### ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. SHANLY moved third reading of Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

Mr. WATSON. Before this Bill is read the third time, I wish to say that I feel, as representing a district of the Province of Manitoba, that it is of the utmost importance that coal should be laid down at the cheapest possible rate to the consumer. At the time the original Bill was passed, in 1885, granting power to this company to build a narrow gauge railway, and granting it a large subsidy of land, to assist it in constructing the railway, it was pointed out, by the promoters of the Bill, that it was intended to secure cheap fuel for the settlers in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. At that time, being accustomed to the actions of monopolies, and railway monopolies in particular, I felt that we should make provision that coal should be carried at a certain maximum rate per ton per mile. I find from experience that my contention at that time was right. I find that this company did not operate their mine or their railway in the interest of the settlers, but in the interest of the company. I suppose we should not blame them for that, because they are business men, and they desire to make as much money as they can; but we are here representing the people, and when we assist this company out of the resources of the country, we should see to it that the people's interests are protected. Now, I am glad to see that this company is composed of men of enterprise. They opened up their mine, and they built a narrow gauge railway, although that was a mistake. They now come to this Parliament for power to broaden the gauge and to extend the road to the south in order to open up a new field for the sale of their coal. I am glad that they are doing so, although this extension will enable the Western States to enter into competition for coal with the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Now, I have taken the trouble to ascertain the cost of producing coal and the prices at which it is sold, and I will leave this House to judge whether we should not ask this company to carry coal at a certain maximum rate. I have obtained the figures from men who have experience in mining coal at this Galt Coal Mine. The cost of mining is put down at 80 cents per ton; the estimated interest on the mining plant, and wear and tear, 20 cents; screening and shipping charges, 8 cents; freight from Lethbridge to Dunmore, 110 miles, at  $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per ton per mile, 82 cents. That would make the cost of the coal at Dunmore \$1.90. To that we may add \$1 per ton for profit, which is considered a very fair profit. That makes \$2.90. This coal has to be transhipped at Dunmore from the narrow gauge cars to the broad gauge cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 10 cents per ton is allowed for this, which would bring the cost of the coal at Dunmore, with \$1 profit, to \$3 per ton. I will give the freight charges to different points, to show that this company are charging an excessive price for coal, and that, notwithstanding the fact that the whole country in the vicinity of Lethbridge is a coal bed, the company have practically a monopoly of the supply of coal, because they own the railway and charge what they see fit. The distance

Mr. McMULLEN.

from Calgary to Dunmore is 188 miles, and  $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per ton per mile on that distance would be \$1.41. That would make the cost of the coal at Calgary, with \$1 per ton profit, \$4.41. But that coal is sold on board the cars at Calgary at \$8 per ton, which means a total profit of \$4.59 per ton, which I think you will admit is a very large profit. Now, we will take the price at which coal is sold at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, and compare it with the cost. The cost of coal at Dunmore is \$1.90; the freight from Dunmore to Winnipeg, a special rate on coal which is given to the Galt Company by the Canadian Pacific Railway, is \$3.59, making the total cost of the coal, delivered at Winnipeg, \$5.49. The selling price of the Galt coal at Winnipeg, on board the cars, is \$7.50, showing a net profit to the Galt Company of \$2.01 per ton. Now, when you consider that the average sales at Winnipeg are estimated by the company at 20,000 tons a year, and allow the company a profit of \$1 per ton, which is a fair profit for so large a quantity, you will see that the Winnipeg people are contributing to this company, in excess of what they should for their coal, at least \$20,000 a year. The output of the Galt Coal Company, estimated by themselves, is some 200,000 tons annually, so that you can easily see what a handsome profit they are making on their undertaking, and I believe they intend increasing their output. Now, I will give you the prices stated by the *Winnipeg Commercial* as prevailing on the 18th of February, 1889. Under the heading of "Coal in Western Canada," it says:

"Five hundred and twelve tons of lump coal were taken out of the mines at Lethbridge, Alberta, on one day recently. 'This, with forty tons of nut, is the largest output for a single day,' says the *Lethbridge News*, 'since the mines have been running.' The coal industry in the Territories is steadily developing, and when the Galt railway is constructed into Montana, as it may be before another year, the industry will be given a great impetus at Lethbridge. The Lethbridge mine is the only one which has been worked steadily and continuously since it was first opened. With the increase in population, coal mining will become a vast industry in the Territories. \* \* \* At present the Lethbridge is the only native article to be had in this market. It is used to considerable extent in Winnipeg and other Manitoban towns, and sells here retail at \$3 per ton delivered, in competition with Pennsylvania anthracite at \$10 per ton, and imported soft coal at \$3.50 per ton."

Allowing 50 cents per ton for delivering the coal, the price given here agrees with the figures I have given. Now, I think the rate of  $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per ton per mile should be considered a fair rate for carrying the coal from Lethbridge to Dunmore, and from Dunmore to Calgary; and the rate I have given from Dunmore to Winnipeg is the exact rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Galt Coal Company. We find, in comparing rates, that the Government railway, the Intercolonial, carries coal at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. Of course, we all know that that does not pay, but the Government see fit to encourage the mining interest of Eastern Canada, and tax the whole country for carrying their coal. I will give you the figures and freight on soft coal from Pennsylvania delivered in Winnipeg. The cost of soft coal on points at Lake Erie delivered on board is \$1.25 per ton; the freight to Duluth or Port Arthur is \$1.25 per ton; and the cost of wharfage and transshipment is 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents per ton at Duluth or Port Arthur. That makes the cost of soft coal at Duluth, \$2.62 $\frac{1}{2}$ . That includes the freight; 516 miles from Duluth to Winnipeg, at  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cent per ton per mile, \$3.87 $\frac{1}{2}$ . This makes the total cost of Pennsylvania soft coal at Winnipeg \$6.50, and the selling price is \$8.50. The Pennsylvania coal commands a little higher price than the Galt coal in the Winnipeg market, only 50 cents a ton more. Now, Sir, I do not propose to detain the House at greater length. I think I have shown sufficient reason why the amendment I propose to move should be accepted. There is no doubt it is of immense importance that we should have cheap coal in Manitoba and the North-West, and that cheap coal we cannot have so long as there is a coal monopoly; and there is practical monopoly existing to-day

because the Galt Coal Company have the only railway that can carry coal from the mines where good coal is turned out, to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I beg, therefore, to move in amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to insert a clause providing that the maximum rate on coal over the company's line shall not exceed one cent per ton per mile.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has notice been given of that amendment? I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to Rule 67.

Mr. WATSON. The only notice I have given lies in the fact that I consulted with the promoter of the Bill and told him I proposed to move this amendment.

Mr. TROW. When the Bill was reported on by the Committee in this House and application was made for the third reading, we objected, and I made some remarks on that occasion. My objecting to the Bill was on the principle my hon. friend has set forth, that it was creating a great monopoly, and that it would inflict a great hardship on the settlers on account of the extortionate prices charged by the company. I gave notice then verbally that this question would be brought up at the third reading.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman should have given notice, according to Rule 67, which says:

"No important amendment may be proposed to any Private Bill in a Committee of the Whole House or at the third reading of the bill, unless one day's notice of the same shall have been given."

I put the question whether this amendment is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my opinion the notice must be given in writing according to the form generally followed—that is in writing, and then be entered in the Votes and Proceedings. As to the question whether the amendment is of the importance required by Rule 67, I think it is. It is really very important that this company should not be saddled with a limitation as to its power to charge freight, and this is what is proposed to be done by the amendment. I think the objection is well taken.

Mr. TROW. The object of the Government should be to encourage settlers in that country. The Government are aware, as the promoter of the Bill and most hon. gentlemen in this House are aware, that there are hundreds of miles in that section of this Dominion where the only fuel is coal. That country may not fill up as rapidly as we expect, but there are numerous settlements along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it would be an extreme hardship to them if the Government were not to place some restriction on the company such as that called for by this amendment. My hon. friend has just fixed what would be a reasonable compensation and profit to the company on their capital, and I understood the other night from the hon. the Minister of Justice that the Government were prepared to restrict the company in a certain measure, and that the tariff rates of the company would be regulated by the rule which the Government have adopted with regard to other lines. I hope the Bill will not pass in this shape, but that some provision will be made in favor of the poor settlers along the line.

Mr. SHANLY. With regard to one point to which my hon. friend refers, the scarcity of fuel, that country was without fuel until the Galt Coal Company solved the fuel question, and in solving the fuel question it also solved the question of settlement. The coal is delivered to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Danmore. It is delivered, practically speaking, at the mine. The railway and the mine are all one, and you might just as well ask this House to fix a market price for the coal as to fix the price of carrying it along the mine railway. The company are not coal carriers. The coal is carried by the Canadian Pacific

Railway to the different points along their railway. The Galt Company, I repeat, practically deliver their coal at the mine, and their road is simply a switch from the mine to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the coal company can in no way control the carrying cost of the coal beyond Danmore.

Mr. SPROULE. While every one would desire to see the settlers of that country get their coal as cheap as possible, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is a very unreasonable one. The calculation he made is not a fair one as to the cost. It is entirely unreasonable since he fixes a rate below the rates in Ontario, where 100 tons are carried to one that is carried in the North-West. From Toronto to the section of country from which I come, 100 miles, the freight is over 1 cent a ton, taken by the car load, yet the hon. gentleman proposes that in this North-West country, a country but sparsely settled, and where there is but little freight, coal must be carried at  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cent per ton. It costs over a cent a ton in our own country, and yet the hon. gentleman pretends it can be moved in that country at  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cent per ton. The hon. gentleman also says it can be transhipped at 10 cents per ton. Well, I was in Port Arthur while a vessel was being unloaded, and on enquiry I found it cost 40 cents to take the coal out of the vessel and pile it on the wharf; so that 10 cents for transhipment is an entirely unreasonable price. I always understood that transshipment cost 40 cents to 50 cents per ton. Take those two items into account, and ascertain, as you will by comparison, that they are far below the actual cost, and judge the other items in the calculation by them, and I think it will be seen how unreasonable the hon. gentleman's calculation is. In a country where there is very little freight to carry, and where the money expended cannot bring any reasonable or adequate interest upon it in carrying freight, I think the company should be allowed a reasonable latitude. They are doing a great good to that section of the country, they have reduced the price of coal very much, and they are making improvements now which will reduce it still more; and I think they ought to have some return for the money which they have invested.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the argument which has been used by the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill. He says the mining company are the proprietors of the mine, and the railway is merely a secondary matter in connection with the mine.

Mr. SHANLY. It is a part of the mine.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It can hardly be said to be a part of the mine. However, this railway received aid from this Parliament in the same way as other roads which were constructed in the North-West, and it is only on the ground of the public being interested in a railway that Parliament would be justified in giving aid to it, either in the form of land or of money. There must be some advantage to be derived by the country, beyond the mere interest in the construction of the road, before Parliament would be justified in giving aid to that road. When any company comes here for a charter which is to enable it to exercise rights of sovereignty, such as the expropriation of lands or the receipt of parliamentary aid, Parliament has a right to exercise a controlling influence and to declare how far the company shall be allowed to exercise those rights, which, in the case of a company which receives no aid and has no special right granted by Parliament or the Crown, would be granted. I would be sorry to see any restriction placed upon this or any other company which would make it a profitless investment, but Parliament is bound to see that it is not operated in such a way as to shut out the development of other mines, and that it is to be used for the carriage of the products of other mines to the market. If the position taken by the

promoter of the Bill is sound, the company would have an absolute right to refuse to carry coal for any other company whatever. It would have a right to say to any other company, or to the owner of any other coal mine: You shall not be permitted for any sum you may choose to offer to send your coal by our road. It is certainly the duty of Parliament, in the public interest, to interfere, and to say how far, without sacrificing the interests of this company, without doing it any injustice, it will determine upon what terms it shall be a common carrier for the whole of the community. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has declared that Parliament has no right to interfere in these matters. I say that, the moment a railway company is given the power of expropriation, or receives aid from the public Treasury, or receives a donation of public lands, it has invited the oversight of Parliament, and Parliament would be wanting in its duty if it permitted such a railway company to make exorbitant charges after receiving such aid from the country. Take, for instance, the Intercolonial Railway. I think the charges there are three-tenths of a cent per mile. I do not say that would be a sufficient charge in the North-West. I do not say that a cent a mile is an adequate charge to make the road profitable, but the promoter of the Bill is bound to show that it is not a sufficient charge, that a higher maximum charge should be fixed, and I would not distinguish this road from any other that has received aid from the public Treasury, but some charge or other should be fixed by Parliament in order to prevent the company sacrificing the public interest of the shareholders for the time being, no matter who they may be. I am pleased, as every hon. member must be, with the enterprise and energy which induced these persons to invest their capital and construct this road, and develop these mines in the public interest, but it was their own private interest they were promoting, it was with the view of putting money into their own pockets, and they served the public interest with that object. I do not find fault with that, but it is the duty of Parliament to see that the power given to them is not abused; and there is no doubt whatever that every railway corporation in the country, if it enjoys a monopoly will make the most of its opportunities. This road, I apprehend, will be no exception to the rule, and I would like the House to say how other mines in that section are to be developed, how persons are to be induced to invest their money in other mines, and enter into competition in the production of coal at the pit's mouth if no facility is given to them to bring their coal to market. Parliament does not want to aid a railway company for every coal company or every mine in that country. The railway ought to be run not only in the interest of this mining corporation, but in the interest of every other mining corporation that may undertake to work coal mines in that region. In the end that will be a benefit to the railway. It will certainly be better for the public because there will be no competition in the production of coal. If we were to-day to fix the price at 1 cent or even 2 cents, or at whatever the hon. gentleman might establish before this House to be a reasonable freight charge, the company, as long as they are the sole coal miners in that country, might put on the price of coal the amount which they would have to pay for the freight, allowing always for the coal which might be imported from abroad. But that would lead to the establishment of other mining companies and the development of other mines, and the cost of production, with a reasonable profit added, would fix the price of coal to the people of the North-West Territories. It would not, however, have that effect if one company has the control of the road which the public have in part built, and if they control it in such a way as to interfere with rival companies that may be engaged in mining operations. If we want to secure the settlement of that country, and we all desire it; if we want

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

to develop the mineral resources of that country, and we certainly desire that, it is only right and proper for Parliament to exercise the powers it possesses, and, as in this case, to exercise the right in a reasonable way, not to the ruin or the absolute injury of those who have invested their money in it, but in such a way as to secure to the company a fair compensation for the capital they have invested, but at the same time secure the public against monopoly and oppression.

Mr. SHANLY. I think my hon. friend has misrepresented what I said, in one particular at all events. I have not said that the Alberta Railway is not prepared to carry all the business that will come to it from whatever source. It is ready to do it, it must do it. We are not asking for a charter, the charter is already existing; the road must accept whatever traffic comes to it. What the hon. gentleman proposes now is that we should make interference such as never has been made by any government in the case of any other chartered railway—that we should fix by Act of Parliament the rate at which the railway should carry coal. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he knows of any railway charter in this country or anywhere else that undertakes to fix the rate of freight. We have the right, of course, of appeal to the Privy Council; but as for Parliament determining what the rate shall be, I repeat what I said in the earlier part of the evening, that it would be better to strike at the root of the thing at once, and let Parliament state distinctly what shall be the price of coal in the market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the local railways are compelled to carry cordwood at certain fixed rates.

Mr. SHANLY. They are local railways not chartered by this Dominion.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the Galt Mine has solved the fuel question in the North-West. The fuel question in the North-West cannot be said to be solved when, in the capital of the North-West, the lowest price charged for soft coal is \$8.50 a ton, coal inferior in burning and staying qualities to the soft coal that comes from the United States. I think it is to be regretted that the company, whose enterprise we take pleasure in contemplating, have not sought to solve the fuel question in the North-West. Now, what happens? My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) has told the House that soft coal sells in Winnipeg for \$8 a ton. Why is that? It is because when the coal gets to Winnipeg it comes into competition with coal from the United States, sold at a lower price than that coal is sold in Regina. In Regina the anthracite coal from the United States is loaded with the freight from Winnipeg to Regina, and, as a consequence, we pay \$13 to \$13.50 a ton for anthracite coal against \$10 in Winnipeg. Well, the Galt coal immediately is put up 50 cents a ton. I think myself that as the Government is opening up that territory, and the fuel question being one that the Government has to grapple with, we might have expected that the Galt Company would, at least, have sold coal at Regina at the same price as they sell it in Winnipeg. Because what that comes to is this: that they will put on the very last cent that they can put on. When anthracite coal was \$14 a ton we paid more than \$8.50 for soft coal.

Mr. WATSON. Even \$10.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, as high as \$10 for soft coal from the Galt Mine; and when you pay \$9 for soft coal and \$13 for hard coal, you are burning gold, and you cannot be said to have solved the fuel question. Now I will say that probably we are on a wrong line when we charter branch lines in this House. My own opinion is that it would be

far wiser for this Government to give to the Government of the North-West so many acres of land for the purpose of subsidising branch lines. This Local Assembly being on the spot, and being under the immediate control of the people of the Territories, would keep a watchful eye on every line of railway they charter, and would undoubtedly see that the interests of the people were more closely guarded than they can possibly be expected to be in this House. I am not fond of looking at analogies from the United States, but we may learn something sometimes from those enterprising and wide-awake Yankees. What happens when they organise a territory? They do as we do, they give the territory a governor, but they give it also an elective legislature, they pay the judges out of the federal fund, as well as the other officers, and they give so many hundred miles of land for the purpose of branch lines. See what was done in Minnesota. Minnesota has about 83,000 square miles. Assiniboia has about 93,000 square miles. When Minnesota was organised it got its governor, it got its legislature, its judges and officers, all paid out of the federal treasury, and it got 1,800 square miles of land for the purpose of chartering branch lines. And what has been the result? The branch lines chartered by that state, are paying 3 per cent. on the gross earnings into the treasury of the State of Minnesota, amounting to \$600,000 a year. Therefore, I say that the system that we have pursued in dealing with the North-West is radically wrong. Our system has been to skim the cream and let it go into the pockets of the Canadian capitalist, or the English capitalist, or the Scotch capitalist, as the case may be. Our system has been not to strengthen the young territory, to coax it into vigor and leave it what native energy and physical resource might properly belong to it; on the contrary, we have taken away the strength that should be there, the milk that should have been there to nourish it, and then we have left it to fight the battle of life and struggle into existence as best it could. What is the result? The result is that we find rich men, rich companies, have hold of the North-West here and there, they have in fact, pecked the eyes, to some extent, out of the North-West. We find the country full of interests of persons hundreds and thousands of miles away from the country; and when you come to a town like Regina, or any other town along the line of railway, you find a lot of struggling men, whereas, if you had pursued the system you ought to have pursued, of allowing the wealth of the country to remain in the country, while it was young, you would have in all those places at the present moment rich men to help them forward, and you would have had the profits of their early enterprise helping to build the country up. There is no one in this House, on either side of it, can blame one party more than the other for the policy that has been pursued; because in the manifesto issued by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in 1882, one of the planks was the land for the settler, the profits for the public. But who are the public, Sir? That was to say the profit for the Government; and how was the profit to come to the Government but by selling the land to some person who would have the money, and the man who would have the money to pay would not be the man who would settle there? The same policy has been pursued by both parties. It is a mistaken, it is a short-sighted policy. In regard to the railway such as my hon. friend is promoting, I think it is a short-sighted policy on the part of that company to pursue to go on the line of the highest possible profit; because, as sure as I am speaking here, when more people come into that country, and when we get control over the country, as we are bound to have, then it will not be conducive to the welfare of such companies that, in the earlier days of the Province, when the settlers were in struggling circumstances, they shaved us as close as ever

they could. My hon. friend is quite mistaken in supposing that the fuel question has been solved. This is a very important thing for Parliament to take up; and let no hon. member here, from whatever part of the country he may come, regret any time that is taken in discussing a matter like this, because I tell you here, you are bound to give up all possible time to the discussion of North-West affairs, for you are our Government, you are the closest Government we have. It is your duty, we say. We are not yet in a position to deal with our own affairs in those Territories, and there is the more necessity that you should willingly give your time and attention to the North-West, because the majority of you, I say it with all respect, can know very little of the country you are bound to govern. Therefore, whenever any member, knowing anything about the North-West, presumes with great diffidence to speak to you on that question, you are bound to listen to him or else be false to your duty and misapprehend the issue he may put before you. What makes this still more serious is, that along that line of railway the nearest timber is at least from fifteen to twenty miles away. The farmer along the line of railway, where is he to get his fuel? The artisan, where is he to get his fuel? He has to pay \$3.50 per load; I do not know whether it amounts to a cord, but I know it burns away pretty quickly; and he cannot get his timber anywhere else. The coal question is, therefore, a most serious matter, and one the Government is bound to consider, and if it can alleviate the position of the settler either in dealing with this railway or any other railway or any other company, the Government is bound to do it. So I have a great deal of sympathy with the view taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and I am not sure that if proper notice had been given I would not have agreed with his motion. I think the proper way to have put it, if it is a wise plan at all—I am not discussing it now, for it is not necessary to discuss it as it has been ruled out of order—but if we were doing so, then what I think would be fair would be to have insisted that this railway company should carry coal at the same rate as it would be carried on other lines open to freight. That would, I think, have been fair, but there is a danger, if other mines are opened near Lethbridge, that this company controlling the line might possibly put on a freight rate that would be practically an embargo. I hope the House will excuse me for having trespassed on its time in regard to a matter like this, but it is a matter of vital importance to us in the North West, and I cannot emphasise it too strongly that this Parliament of Canada is the real Parliament dealing with our affairs in the North-West, and it is bound not to be impatient, but on the other hand to be patient and thoughtful in dealing with our affairs, because there is no part of the country to which they owe a more conscientious duty than that great Territory.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think hon. members from other Provinces in the Dominion have undoubtedly an interest in matters relating to the North-West as well as those members who live in that Territory. We have already contributed a very large sum of money towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the development of that country. As has been stated by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, we are bound to protect the interests of the people of that country in regard to matters of legislation. A great many of our young men from the older Provinces are going into the North-West. It is, therefore, highly desirable that we should guard legislation so as to keep them free as far as possible from monopolies. The land regulations in the North-West undoubtedly have been a detriment to it. There have been a great many complaints with respect to the manner in which large sections of land have been locked up by speculators. That has undoubtedly injured the country, and now it is proposed to pass legislation



which will vitally affect the interests of the settlers; and under these circumstances it becomes the duty of members to look carefully into every Act passed here, in order, if possible, to prevent corporations being formed here that would unreasonably and unjustly levy on the people exacting rates for commodities they require in excess of their value. This is apparent when we consider the fact that in the development of that country coal is one of the most important factors, and one upon which the development of the resources of the country will chiefly depend. The climate is cold, and great facilities should be afforded for delivering coal at different places where it will be required by the settlers. In that view of the case we should be very guarded in seeing that any measure, giving a charter for the construction of any railway for carrying coal or running to coal mines, should contain provisions and restrictions in the public interest and that the people should not be made subject to extravagant rates. The promoter of the Bill has drawn the attention of the House to the fact that no such restrictions have hitherto been inserted in Bills. We are prepared to admit that we have not been in the habit of restricting the powers of railways in that regard, but also it must be remembered that we have not acted towards the North-West, as we have acted towards other sections of the Dominion. It is well known that the fuel question in Toronto has been a very important one, especially that of supplying cordwood. It is well known, and the hon. senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) will remember it, that in the charter for The Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, granted by the Ontario Legislature, a provision was inserted that wood should be carried to Toronto at a fixed rate per car per mile. The reason for inserting this provision was to secure to Toronto certain advantages, in the shape of cheap fuel, in return for the grant the city gave towards the construction of the road. If it was right in the case of Toronto, and in order to protect the interests of that trade centre, that she should guard her interests in the wood supply, and see that it was delivered at a reasonable rate per car per mile, is it not highly desirable that we should protect the interests of the settlers in the North-West in regard to the coal question in a similar way? It is nothing but fair that we should insert in this Bill a maximum rate which the company should be able to charge. It has been stated that three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile has been charged on the Intercolonial Railway for carrying coal. As a Dominion we have contributed to the development of the coal mines in Nova Scotia for the purpose of working up an intercolonial trade, and it was declared by the Minister of Railways last year that the road had actually been carrying coal at a loss, and that it was doing it, in the first place, in order to lay the coal down to consumers in Montreal and other points east, at the lowest possible cost, and, secondly, for assisting the coal miners of Nova Scotia. We, undoubtedly, have an interest in this line, for the country has contributed towards its construction in money and land grants. Although the company has the charter, we have a joint interest and we should see that the company properly handle that road, and that they will operate it and fix the rates in the interest of the public at large. We have a joint interest with them and, if we in our wisdom, and in the interest of the consumers of the country, choose to dictate that they should carry coal at a certain maximum rate per mile, we will take a step towards securing to the people who may become settlers of that country some advantage in return for the money and land grants we have given towards the construction of a railway. If that company was merely asking a charter and not asking for a land grant or a money consideration it would be quite a different thing, but when we consider that the country has contributed a great deal towards that line it is but fair that we should ask that company to consent to a reasonable fixed

Mr. McMULLEN.

rate for the carriage of coal to such a city as Winnipeg, and beyond which rate they should not be permitted to go. We are laying the foundation of a great country in the North-West, and in doing so we should be careful to guard the interests of the people there. We all admit that we have made mistakes in the past in our land regulations and other legislation connected with the North-West. The hon. gentleman says that the Mackenzie Government made mistakes. It may be so, and I am not prepared to say whether it did or not, but if mistakes have been made it is an undoubted fact we have been forewarned by such mistakes. Had we not better be cautious as to what we should do in the future? If this coal mine is going to supply the people of a large district with coal, had we not better make the necessary provisions to prevent those people being imposed upon by high rates? The instances given by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) show plainly that the company is making a great profit at the present time. When we consider the fact that in the city of Winnipeg alone some forty thousand tons of coal are consumed in a year, and that as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Watson) pointed out, after the cost of mining and carriage, the company has two dollars a ton clear profit on that coal, we must see that they already enjoy an enormous mine of wealth. If in granting this charter we give them a further advantage and monopoly in addition to what they now enjoy we are only strengthening their hands and legalising what we all must see is an injustice to the people of the North-West. If we look at the matter in this light it is our duty to call a halt in the direction in which we are proceeding. If we see that the people are called upon to pay more now for coal than they ought to pay, is it not right that Parliament should interfere for their protection? Those people are not legislating for themselves, we are legislating for them, and they will have just right to find fault with this House if we place a law on the Statute book that will prove vexatious and oppressive to those people for all time to come. I hope that the hon. member from Grenville (Mr. Shanly) in view of these facts will not press this Bill to a third reading at present. I think that he should consent to hold it over in the hope that he and the representatives from that country should agree on a clause that would be mutually satisfactory, and which the members for the North-West would consent to accept in the interests of their people. I am sure the hon. gentleman has confidence in my friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and after having made the speech he did make on that particular question it will be readily seen that there must be some cause for complaint. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) must see that the members from the North-West on both sides of the House, who are conversant with the whole facts of the case and condition of things as they are, have plainly stated that there are just grounds of complaint and that advantage will be taken of the people there if this charter passes in its present form. I think the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) should suggest to the North-West members that he will give them an opportunity of agreeing upon a clause which will meet their views in regard to this coal question and I am sure it will be a pleasure to the House to realise, that an amicable settlement has been come to. I impress this suggestion on the hon. member and I think that it would be the proper course for him to take.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must confess that I see no just reason why, after the facts of the case have been placed before the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) by the representatives from the North-West, he should not consent to some concessions to the people in this Bill. I believe that it certainly would be in the interests of the country that a concession should be made by this company. I am perfectly well aware, as stated by the hon. member for

Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that we all ought feel a great deal of interest in whatever may conduce to the prosperity of our great possessions in the North-West. If this railroad company is going to ask this Legislature for certain rights and privileges they ought be willing in return to make certain concessions in the interests of the people. It is hardly a year since the country was asked to pledge its security to a very large amount for the purpose of removing a railway monopoly from this very section. This, I believe, is the first charter, since that time, that has been asked to grant power to run a railway in connection with the American lines. Although we pledged our security for \$15,000,000 at that time to remove this monopoly we are now asked, by the very first charter that has come before this House, to place in the hands of another railway company a monopoly over the people of the North-West. I say that there is an inconsistency in the course that we are pursuing in this respect, and it certainly will prove a hardship on the settlers there if we pass the Bill in its present form. We have already made great concessions to this coal company. They have an extensive territory, they have rich mines, and they are now in a flourishing condition on account of the great benefits they have obtained from the country. They have obtained this from the people of the North-West, and if they come to us to ask us to grant them this charter, in order that they may impose on the people whatever rates they choose, I say it is very unreasonable and unfair.

Mr. TROW. I wish to call attention to the fact that the time for Private Bills has expired.

#### SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire, with the permission of the House, to put a question to the Government. I see in to-day's *Empire* the following announcement:—

"The Department of Fisheries has received information that the Canadian vessels seized by the United States in Behring Sea in 1887, and which have been held until this time pending negotiations on the question of disputed right of seizure, have been advertised to be sold in March. Those vessels were seized, it will be remembered, while they were on the high seas, many miles from land, peacefully pursuing the sealing business. They were towed to Sitka, Alaska, by the United States revenue cutter *Corwin*. The vessels in question are the *Caroline*, the *Onward* and the *Hilton*."

I would like to ask the Government whether there has been any correspondence with the Foreign Office on the subject, what is the nature of the communications, whether the Canadian Government has asked the British Government to send a cruiser to Behring's Sea for the purpose of preventing Canadian vessels from being maltreated, what answer has been received, what is the present state of the correspondence between the American Government and the Foreign Office, and what representations have been made by the Canadian Government with the view of protecting Canadian interests from depredation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid we cannot give the information to the hon. gentleman this evening. There has been some correspondence, and if the hon. gentleman wants to know what it is, he had better put a notice on the paper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask whether the Government will bring down the correspondence as a matter of course without a motion, because if I put a notice on the paper it might never be reached, and I think everybody in the House is anxious to know how the matter stands.

Mr. TUPPER. I may say that all the correspondence that could be brought down before this Session was printed and brought down; and it is a question whether the correspondence which has occurred since can be brought down. Now that the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, it has to be considered how much more can be laid on the Table of the House.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Expenses in connection with Health Statistics..... \$10,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister having charge of this item will explain what has been done during the past year, what success he has met with, and for what purposes the moneys have been expended.

Mr. CARLING. The same system that has been in vogue for the past few years was carried out last year of obtaining from the different cities and towns the returns which the hon. gentleman will find in the annual report. There has been no change since last year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Have any new cities or towns been added?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say positively, but I think three or four towns have been added to the list since last year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman carefully reads and thoroughly examines his reports in order to satisfy himself of their truthfulness and correctness before he allows his name to be attached to them. But I find in his report that instead of there having been three or four towns added, there has been only one, and that is St. John's, in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman also says we can find full particulars in his annual report. If hon. members will turn to that annual report in regard to health statistics, they will find that it amounts to about half-a-dozen lines; and this is the explanation he offers to us when he asks us to appropriate \$10,000 for collecting these statistics. I will guarantee that the hon. Minister himself will hardly be prepared to say that he actually believes that there has been any material advantage derived from the expenditure of this money. It is true, there are a number of men in different parts of the country where there are boards of health who make a little money out of it, but I think I can challenge the hon. gentleman to state what material benefit the public derives from this expenditure. I think it is a waste of money. It may not be a large amount, but whether it is large or small, if the expenditure is to be continued, we out to have fuller explanations of the reason we are asked to make this appropriation. I can see no good in it; perhaps the Minister can. He may have some friends to benefit by it. I cannot understand in what way we are benefited in the least by the report coming down in the form in which it does, or by the money expended.

Mr. CARLING. This matter was discussed very fully last Session by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) and other hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think it was admitted that the information procured from the different cities and towns in the Dominion was of great benefit to the country; and I think the House and the country will be satisfied with the information which has been obtained by the expenditure of a very small amount of money. We are adding to the number of cities and towns. There have been applications in my office by two or three other towns wishing to have medical men appointed to take the statistics. I am quite sure that the people are in favor of having statistics of this kind published so that they may know the general state of health in all our important centres.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have no objection if the hon. gentleman wants to expend a certain amount of money, that those appropriations should be expended in the way that will be most beneficial. I called the hon. gentleman's attention a few years ago to the fact that in Ontario at

least, almost every municipality had boards of health, and that if he felt disposed to unite with those boards his expenditure might prove of some material benefit. The hon. gentleman did not see his way to do that, because in some of the other Provinces there might not be similar boards of health, but if he will now adopt the system of utilising those boards of health he might find great benefit from that system. In Ontario those boards of health are rendering useful service.

Mr. CARLING. This money does assist the boards of health in the different cities and towns. The doctor who collects the statistics for us is a doctor appointed by the municipality. They pay him a salary, and we pay him so much for collecting the statistics, and I am sure that is of assistance to those boards of health.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is a very strange assistance. It may assist the doctor.

Mr. CARLING. He is the officer of the municipality.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He is the one who profits by it. Is that the assistance you desire the public should have—merely putting more money into the doctor's pockets? The hon. gentleman says, that he is assisting the boards of health. But these boards are established by the municipalities on their own responsibility, and their officers are paid by the municipality. If I should happen to be a health officer, I should like the Minister of Agriculture to come to my assistance by adding to my remuneration.

Outlay towards the establishment and maintenance  
of Experimental Farms ..... \$70,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Some explanation is due with respect to the amount of money spent on that farm. There is a sum of \$20,816 for drainage and labor. I have looked over this very carefully, and I think we are entitled to some explanation of the amount of drainage that has been done, and the amount expended in improving the farm. I find there is a very large amount of drainage made over six miles, and making a liberal allowance for the cost of the different items, I find that the drainage to this extent ought to have cost about \$900. I put the figures at 40 cents for cutting the drain, 5 cents for putting the tiles, 5 cents for putting in the earth and covering up. But taking the statements of the cost of drains on other farms, I find that 40 cents per rod for two inch tiles would cover the whole expense of cutting the drains, putting in the tiles and covering up. I am astonished at the large sums expended on this farm. Besides this, I find for men with teams at \$3 a day, \$3,015 were expended, and for men with carts at \$2 a day \$2,346. Now, when we take these items and the amount for labor expended during last year on this farm, we find the total amount to be the nice little sum of \$60.80 per acre during the present year on 450 acres of land. This is certainly an enormous sum of money to have expended on that farm during the year, for labor, for drainage and for teams. I would ask the hon. the Minister how many teams belonging to the farm are employed on it? I find that 18 horses have been bought since the farm was purchased, to be used on the farm. I expect those horses are still employed there, and that their labor has been put on the farm last summer, but not included in this item. During the year, the large sum of \$242 commission has been paid for the purchase of horses to go on the farm. I maintain that if the foreman is at all capable, he ought to be able to go out into the country and purchase the necessary horses himself. If he is not, he is not fit for his position. A farm of that description ought to be carried on in pretty much the same manner as would be that of a successful farmer. In the matter of drainage, I would say there is almost no farming operation carried on in which the country at large requires so much

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

information. I was engaged during last fall for a length of time attending Farmers' Institutes, and I found in almost every part of the country one of the questions put was: What will be the cost to put in a drain two or three feet deep? I think that the depths of the drains on this farm should be given, the cost of cutting them, the cost of putting in the tiles, and the cost of covering up, so that the country may be benefited by the experience of those carrying on the Experimental Farm. Details of all the operations should be given to the country. Then, with respect to the keeping of horses. I say that all the feeding on this farm, however it may be conducted, ought to be conducted on an experimental basis. During my visits to the Farmers' Institutes I was continually asked the question: What is the best method of feeding horses? Should all the grain be crushed or fed whole? If crushed, should it be fed with crushed hay or straw? I hold if the work is to be of benefit to the farmers, every operation carried on should be experimental and be mentioned in the annual report, and I am sorry we have not had the annual report, such as it is, given in the appendix to the report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I was only anxious that we should have the report before the subject came before the House. I would also like to ask the Minister whether they have experimented during this last summer in regard to green corn, and in reference to ensilage. I have found at every Farmers' Institute that I have attended that these are questions which excite great interest, and I think that experiments in reference to these subjects should be carried on every experimental farm in the country. I would also ask whether they have grown corn for green fodder to cattle; if more than one variety has been sown what are the varieties and what have been the results? These are all matters of great interest. I find also that a great amount of money has been spent for arbitrations and valuations, and I can hardly understand why. I find that 16 individuals have been engaged at the Experimental Farm in arbitrating and valuating, and their remuneration has varied from \$356 to \$22. There are two Mr. Cunningham's and a Mr. Masson employed. I understood from a conversation last year that these were farmers who were called in, and I would like to know if they were all employed at the same time, what were the services they rendered, and what is the reason for the difference in their payment. A sum of \$1,164 was spent for arbitrations and valuations last year, and \$493 was spent for the same purpose the year before, but I understood it was the Government arbitrators who were called in then in respect to some difficulty in purchasing the land. There is another matter to which I called attention last year, and that is the large sum paid for manure taken on the farm. In 1887, the amount was \$1,682, and in 1888, \$1,379 was spent. It may be necessary that manure should be taken on the farm at the commencement, but it should be experimented with very carefully, and I think the particulars in regard to this should be given, especially as I see that some fertilisers have also been used. This is the only money which the Government has set apart for the benefit of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, and, unless the farm is conducted very carefully and economically, and the experiments are carried on in such a manner that the whole results can be given to the country, the expenditure will be of no benefit to us. One of the first things which the farmer has to study to-day is cheap production, how he can make a farm produce the greatest amount for the least outlay. If these large sums are necessary to be spent on this farm, it will put the farmers of the country or those who have the intention of engaging in farming out of the idea of going into agriculture. If it is necessary that these large sums should be expended in order to put a farm in order for experiments to be made, what is the general farmer to do? I think a strict account should be given of the expenditure of these

large sums of money. I have every belief that the Minister of Agriculture and the manager at the farm are doing everything they can to make the farm a success. I believe that is their earnest desire. But I now desire to put a straight question to the Minister: How many men are engaged permanently on that farm at the present time?

Mr. CARLING. I can hardly answer that question at the moment, but I am sure there are not more than 25 all told.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Are there men specially set apart to look after horses? I see they are experimenting with cows, and I should like to know if they are testing the feed, and what are the results?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member has asked me a great many questions, and it would be almost impossible on the spot to answer them all, but I have every desire to give the hon. gentleman all the information he can possibly wish, and, if I have not all the information now, I shall be glad to furnish it to him at a later date. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) I am glad to know, is a practical agriculturist, and is also one of the directors of the Agricultural College at Guelph, and he must have some idea of the cost of keeping up a farm like that. The Guelph farm has been in operation for the last 15 or 16 years, if I am not wrongly informed.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Fourteen years.

Mr. CARLING. I am sure there are a great many improvements to be made yet on that farm. I am sure that they have not arrived at perfection in managing the farm at Guelph. We have only had the Experimental Farm at Ottawa for two seasons, and during that time we have cleared 150 acres of rough land. All the underbrush, stumps, boulders, &c., have been cleaned off and the land brought under cultivation within a year or fifteen months. Then we have put in something over ten miles of tile drains. The hon. member says he can get drainage done for so much a rod. I dare say he can in the county of Huron, and perhaps on his own farm, but you cannot get drainage put down so cheaply were there is rough land, perhaps part of it rock, two feet below the surface, and where you have to put large main drains to run your side drains into, and perhaps have to blast a considerable amount of rock for that purpose. I assure the hon. gentleman that every dollar that has been expended on that farm has been expended with a view to economy, and, were it to be done again, it could not be done at a less expense than it has been. The farm is an experimental farm, and hon. members on both sides of the House have given a generous support to the votes which have been asked for carrying it on. I am satisfied that, when the chief director and the officers have the opportunity of making the experiments that will be made, they will give entire satisfaction to the country. In regard to the information the hon. gentleman has asked for, I can state to him that we have experimented with different kinds of manures. We have experimented with so many different varieties of wheat, so many different varieties of barley, of peas, of oats, of fruits and vegetables. All these experiments have been made, and the results will be given in the report prepared by Prof. Saunders. I am sorry the appendix to the report has not yet been laid before the members of the House. It is not the fault of the department nor the fault of Prof. Saunders, but it is because the printing could not be done as rapidly as we expected. The hon. gentleman will understand that the report of the Department of Agriculture is made for the calendar year, and not for the financial year; the report is made up from the first January in each year, it is now only the middle of February, so I think we have done remarkably well in bringing down the annual report, and I hope to be able to lay the appendix to the report on the Table of the House next Wednesday. I can give the

hon. gentleman the quantity of oats, wheat, barley, rye, peas, fall wheat and fruits, and all the different articles that have been grown on the farm, and I will be able in a short time to give him the results, to show on what kinds of soil the wheat, or the barley, or the oats, were put, what kind of manure was used, and with what results. That is the information I believe that the hon. member for Huron wishes to obtain, and I shall be only too glad to give it to him, and I am sorry I cannot do so to-night.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would say that my experience at Guelph has, perhaps, caused me to be a little more particular with respect to the questions I have put here. I have found that in respect to a public institution like this, it is important that it should start on a right basis first. When the employes of an institution get into a false system of carrying on the operations, it is very hard indeed to introduce a reform. That is one reason why I ask whether experiments were being made in feeding cows. I saw two or three hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches laughing at that question; their conduct only showed me the knowledge they have got of agriculture as a pursuit. That is one of the most important questions to-day engaging the attention of farmers—how can we succeed in feeding cows so that we can get the very best results; because the dairy interest is second in importance to no other, for the farmers in the Province of Ontario at least. I believe that every animal kept upon such a farm should be fed upon an experimental basis, and the produce of the animals, as compared with the feeding, should be given to the country. There is another question I would put—hon. gentleman may laugh at it—it is one with which we have had considerable difficulty at the farm at Guelph. It is this: Whether those employes who live upon the farm have any perquisites besides salary and the house they live in?

Mr. CARLING. No perquisites whatever are given to the officers of the farm. We pay them salaries and furnish them with houses. That is all.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am happy to know that is the case, because some difficulty has been experienced at Guelph in that respect. There is another question. I find but little revenue has been derived from the farm. I would like to know from what source that revenue comes?

Mr. CARLING. It was from the sale of some of the produce, wheat or barley. I think much more than that has been paid credited to the Receiver General. According to law all moneys received for fruits sold are paid to the Receiver General, and I think at present there has been ten times that amount paid in; coming from the sale of a horse, perhaps, or a cow, or of grain.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.) Can the hon. gentleman tell us how much revenue has been received from all sources?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will readily understand that we could not expect to have much revenue, as it has been really the first year that we have been in full operation. We cleared 150 acres of land last year, and have put in some ten miles of drainage, and are just commencing to get the farm in good working order. I will be only too glad to give the hon. gentleman all the information he asks in regard to how much money we have received for what has been sold up to the present time. I know that we sold this year some 2,000 quarts of strawberries of different varieties, I think some 50 or 60 varieties, also raspberries and fruit of different kinds. These are sold and the money is paid to the Receiver General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of the farm? It amounts to 400 acres, as I understand, and the hon. gentleman mentioned just now that 150 acres were in a rough state and required to be put in order at a considerable cost.

Mr. CARLING. The original cost of the farm, I think, was considerably over a hundred dollars an acre. We purchased from Mr. Booth something like 140 acres, at \$100 an acre, and it was necessary to negotiate with some of the owners of adjacent property, and as we could not come to terms we expropriated the land and the matter was referred to arbitration. The arbitration was conducted in the Department of Justice, witnesses were called, and the arbitrators decided against the Government, and we had to pay the costs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the whole farm costs?

Mr. CARLING. I think the original cost of the farm was between \$70,000 and \$80,000 for the land, exclusive of other expenses, such as for procuring title.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is the Minister prepared to lay before the House an account of the results of the experiments with the new kinds of Russian wheat that were distributed last year in Ontario, the North-West Territories and Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. The report and the bulletins are now in course of preparation, and I expect to give the hon. gentleman full information some time next week.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), has referred to a matter which I also intended to take up. I entirely approve of the action of Parliament in establishing experimental farms, which I hope will prove successful, and that the House will not be unduly economical in helping on towards their success. Whatever will tend to their success will no doubt receive the support of every hon. gentleman. Having reference to the item of spring wheat, I venture to say that the superintendent of the experimental farm should be extremely cautious in issuing with his recommendation any samples of grain of any kind whatever. Unfortunately, in this particular case, we have a superintendent of the farm here, and on all the Dominion Government farms an officer who is not himself a farmer. He is a theorist like many other good men, but he is not a practical man, and what makes the matter still worse, is the fact that the hon. gentleman who is Minister of Agriculture, happens to be very much the same kind of farmer as is the superintendent. Had it been different I think the reputation of the farm would not have suffered in the way it has suffered in the last year. A short time before the incident to which I intend to refer, a number of letters appeared in the Toronto press, and perhaps elsewhere, speaking somewhat favorably of what was called a Russian wheat, and the result was that the superintendent of the farm, I assume, led on by what he had read in the press, sent to Russia and obtained a large quantity of the wheat referred to in the press. Having got it to Canada he sent out notices to the public that the wheat was now ready for distribution and that such as applied for it could obtain it, I presume in small quantities. The wheat got more or less into distribution, and a quantity of it was submitted to the grain men of the Toronto Board of Trade. With what result? That this wheat issued by the superintendent, as what he calls Kubanka, turned out when examined by experts to be nothing but our old familiar wild goose wheat.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the name of the wheat. Kubanka was not the wheat distributed by Professor Saunders, it was Ladoga wheat. Although the Board of Trade of Toronto made an unfavorable report with regard to that wheat, the Board of Trade of Montreal took a different view and reported favorably; and I may add that the greatest care has been taken with respect to the distribution of that particular kind of wheat. I think the House will agree with me that if we can introduce a particular kind of wheat from Russia or from any northern country in Europe, and that wheat proves equal

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to the Red Fyfe wheat in the North-West, and it will ripen from ten days to two weeks earlier than the Red Fyfe, we have accomplished a great deal for the country. Professor Saunders, as I have said, has taken very great care in sending out these samples of wheat, not in five, ten, fifty or a hundred bushels, but in three or four pound samples all over the Dominion, to leading farmers recommended by members of this House. Wheat has been sent, I believe, to Prince Edward Island, to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and we have returns from the farmers to whom the samples were sent telling the department that they received the wheat, that the wheat was sown and harvested at particular times, the particular kind of soil and the yield. Professor Saunders has all these returns in his possession at the present time. In addition, this wheat has been thoroughly analysed by an expert, the chemist of the farm, and he pronounces it as good in quality as the Red Fyfe, that it contains the same quantity of gluten, that he has had some ground and made into bread, and the bakers pronounce it as good quality of wheat, although not quite so white in color as the Red Fyfe, but equal in every other respect. I think, as I have before said, if we have been able to bring out a sample of wheat from northern Russia suitable for our North-West, and which will ripen from ten days to two weeks earlier than the Red Fyfe, we have accomplished a great deal which will not only be advantageous to the North-West but to the whole Dominion, even if it should not be quoted on the market at quite so good a price as the Red Fyfe.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to receive the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture, although I hardly think it meets the case which he has sought to anticipate. I care not whether the wheat which he says was the Ladoga was that variety or not, but what I wish to say is this: that the superintendent distributed a wheat—I am informed by a practical man, a grain man, and a leading member of the Toronto Board of Trade—called the Kubanka, which proved to be only the old wild goose. I am unable to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, honestly made as it no doubt is. The samples of wheat to which I refer were, I presume, issued by his department. They went to the Board of Trade, Toronto, and the grain section of that Board declared that this wheat brought out by the department from Russia was nothing more than the old wild goose wheat, which we have had in Canada for years, and which is very deficient in the most valuable element of wheat, namely, gluten. In fact, I am told to-day that the kind of wheat grown from this seed recommended by the department would not have been worth in the North-West within forty cents a bushel of the hard Fyfe variety.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that the hon. gentleman had been misinformed. No such wheat has been distributed by the department.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I can only say that the Board of Trade of Toronto will have to settle that point with the Minister. They issued their warning to the farmers and to the public to have nothing to do with the hon. gentleman's wheat. I suppose he saw that notice?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. MULOCK. It was published in the press of the day, in all the Toronto papers, and a warning was issued, similar to that given in regard to \$15 a bushel wheat, that it was a dangerous article for farmers to experiment with. It is extraordinary that the report of such an important section of the Toronto Board of Trade is unknown to the Minister of Agriculture. It was his duty to have seen it, and to have called the attention of the superintendent to that report. If the report was incorrect he should have published a correct report; but until enquiry was made and an

investigation held, and the public correctly informed, the statement made must be accepted. I sympathise with every movement that will assist the North-West in the development of that country in the growing of grain; and the hon. gentleman must not assume, because I have called attention to these matters, that I would disapprove of any effort in the direction that has been made. But, again, I repeat that the grain section of the Toronto Board of Trade examined samples of wheat which came to them. They said that this wheat came from the Experimental Farm, or, at all events, from the Government. I believe it came down from the North-West. Would the hon. gentleman say whether it was sent from the farm here or from one of the agencies?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. They stated in their report that it was the wheat issued by Professor Saunders, and they condemned it, for the reason that it was said to contain too little gluten. The hon. gentleman is aware they made such a report, because he says that the Toronto Board made an unfavorable report, and that the Montreal Board of Trade made a favorable report. When did the hon. gentleman get information that there was an unfavorable report in regard to this wheat, for he says that he did not see it in the press? Since it came to his knowledge that a responsible body of men had condemned the wheat it was his bounden duty to have the analysis made, that he says has been made now, and to give to the public the benefit of that analysis. Was it not manifestly his duty to correct any misapprehension that may be created in the minds of the farmers of the country, through their thinking that the wheat was not sound on account of the report of the Toronto Board of Trade? The hon. gentleman tells us that he took the precaution to get an analysis to disprove the statement of the Toronto Board of Trade, but he has kept that report secret in his own bosom, and allowed the public to be misled up to the present time.

Mr. CARLING. I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. What I stated to the House was that the particular kind of wheat he mentioned was not the kind of wheat we distributed as having been imported from Russia, but a sample of Kubanka wheat obtained from Manitoba, which was sent with the Ladoga to the Toronto Board of Trade; and although I have every respect for the members of the Toronto Board of Trade, as business men, understanding the different kinds of grain, yet they, like the hon. gentleman and myself, are not practical farmers. I think the hon. gentleman is a farmer, and I have heard of his farming on a very extensive scale, but I do not suppose that he claims to be a practical farmer. I was told by Professor Saunders that a report had been made against the Ladoga wheat by the Toronto Board of Trade, and that a report had also been made by the Montreal Board of Trade in its favor. I asked Professor Saunders to enquire into the particulars with regard to this kind of wheat, to make experiments that he could rely upon, to have it thoroughly analysed, and to have reports from practical farmers to whom he had sent samples. This wheat has been grown on the farm at Indian Head in the North-West, it has been grown in Nova Scotia, and it has been grown on the central farm here; and, as I said, an analysis has been made of it by the chemist who has reported to the director of the farm that this wheat is equal to the Red Fyfe wheat.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the name of the chemist?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Shutt.

Mr. MULOCK. A very capable man.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this the Ladoga wheat?

Mr. CARLING. Yes. It is only a few weeks ago since that analysis was completed, and in the reports of Professor Saunders and Mr. Shutt, which will be laid before the

House, the hon. gentleman will get all the information he is anxious for.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough also to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Board of Trade of Toronto, the report of the Board of Trade of Montreal and the analysis in question?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that this analysis was made from the original seed or from what has been grown from it?

Mr. CARLING. I think, if I am correct, that it was wheat grown from the seed brought from Russia. I shall be happy to give the hon. gentleman all the reports that have been received and all the information in my department.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman tell when he learned that the Toronto Board of Trade had condemned this wheat?

Mr. McNEILL. We all heard that long ago.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot recollect exactly.

Mr. MULOCK. Was that immediately referred to the chemist for analysis, or is it for the first time that this analysis has been made?

Mr. CARLING. The chemist was instructed to make an analysis some two or three months ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Will there be a report on the original seed, and on what has been grown since?

Mr. CARLING. I think the report is on the wheat grown in the North-West and on the farm.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman sees now what he has done? This seed wheat was distributed long before the analysis was made, and the hon. gentleman does not wake up to have an analysis made until after a whole season's growth. It was the product of the seed in question, and not the original seed that he analysed. He lost a whole season, and I don't think that this is properly discharging the duties of his office.

Mr. CARLING. How soon does the hon. gentleman think that an analysis can be made of wheat grown last season?

Mr. MULOCK. Well, the hon. gentleman imported three hundred bushels—

Mr. CARLING. Why does the hon. gentleman say "three hundred?"

Mr. MULOCK. I have been informed that. How many bushels did you get?

Mr. CARLING. One hundred bushels. There is no use exaggerating this matter. It is my object to get at facts and I want to give the truth to this House, and I hope the hon. gentleman does not want anything but the truth.

Mr. MULOCK. I want the facts, and the facts brought out now are that when this hundred bushels were distributed to be used as seed he must have known that a very important body of men had condemned the seed, and a body of men whose opinion is entitled to respect.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman know at what time they condemned it?

Mr. MULOCK. At the time of its distribution.

Mr. CARLING. What time was that?

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman ought to have the information in his department. My friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) says it was in March. It was the original seed wheat that should have been analysed before it was

grown, and the Minister admits that he neglected a whole season in this matter, and only a short time ago awakened to the fact that he ought give attention to it. I call that negligence of his duty to his department. If not I hope that he will clear it up by letting us know when he distributed the seed wheat, when the Board of Trade made the report, and when he had the analysis made.

Mr. DALY. I regret very much that this House should be treated to the kind of bosh and ignorance that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is guilty of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh!

Mr. DALY. I can call it nothing else, with all due respect to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think that when the Minister of Agriculture replied as he did to the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and gave him all the facts in connection with the case, he should be satisfied. This Ladoga wheat—not Lagoda as the hon. gentleman terms it—was distributed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the year 1887. I had the honor of distributing it among my constituents within two weeks after I came to Ottawa in 1887. This wheat was sent to a number of farmers in Manitoba and the North-West, who sowed it and made their reports to the Minister of Agriculture in the ensuing fall. Those reports were very satisfactory. As the hon. gentleman has stated, the Board of Trade of Toronto did make an adverse report; but, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture has stated, the Board of Trade of Montreal made a report favorable to the wheat. It may be that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not paid that attention which he might have done to a report from such a body as the Board of Trade of Toronto; but no doubt he considered that the report of the Board of Trade of Montreal had as much weight as that of the Board of Trade of Toronto. I know, and the hon. member for North York will bear me out, that when we met the Boards of Trades of Toronto and Montreal in the Tower Room last year in connection with the grading of our wheat, the Board of Toronto were opposed to a reduction of the grade, and the only opposition offered to the Board of Trade of Winnipeg was offered by the Board of Trade of Toronto. Therefore, as one coming from the Province of Manitoba, I cannot place any reliance on the report of the Board of Trade of Toronto with regard to the grade of wheat. The people of Manitoba have been desirous of obtaining some grade of wheat which would overcome the difficulties which the farmers in that country have to endure. We were very much pleased when the Minister of Agriculture sent to Russia for this wheat. It came from a latitude almost the same as that in which we grow our wheat. The experiments made there were satisfactory; but the grinding of the wheat was to be the crucial test. It was ascertained that it ripened as early as the Red Fyfe and in some cases earlier; but the question was whether when ground it would turn out as good an article of flour. As I have not seen the report of the grinding, I do not know what the result was, and we shall not be able to form an opinion as to the quality of the flour until we see that report. But I know one thing, and that is that the farmers of Manitoba are satisfied that the Red Fyfe is the best wheat they can possibly grow. I do not think this Ladoga wheat is equal in quality to the Red Fyfe; but if it is shown on experiment that it will ripen earlier, that it is equal to the circumstances surrounding farming in Manitoba, and that it will produce as good flour, then we may be satisfied to adopt it. But I hope the hon. member for North York will not rise in his seat and accuse the hon. Minister of Agriculture of dereliction of duty in not paying attention to the representation of the

Mr. MULOCK.

Board of Trade of Toronto, when the hon. gentleman has stated that the Board of Trade of Montreal presented a report directly opposite.

Mr. MULOCK. Since this discussion began a memorandum has been placed in my hand which I will take the liberty of reading to the House. It is from a person who is an authority on this subject; I do not feel at liberty to mention his name.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. MULOCK. Well, he is a competent man. He is a member of the Board of Trade of Toronto. The memorandum has been sent down to me from the gallery, and I will read it:

“Two samples of wheat were submitted to the board, Ladoga and Kubanka. They are quite different in character—”

I did not refer to the Ladoga wheat, but the hon. Minister has attempted to direct this discussion to it—

“The former was considered by the Toronto Board a fair average spring wheat—”

That confirms what the Minister said—

“while the Kubanka was nothing more than wild goose.”

That is what I stated in the beginning. This memorandum is by a grain man, a responsible person who knows what he is talking about, and I suppose there are a dozen in the gallery at this moment who know the truth of what I am saying. I repeat, relying on information which I received, that Kubanka wheat was issued by the department, and was found on examination to be wild goose, which has been cultivated in this country for years, and which would not be worth more than 60 cents a bushel at Brandon to-day; and had the farmers of the North-West turned their attention to the growing of that wheat instead of Scotch Fyfe or some other suitable wheat, a very great blow would have been given to the farming industry of the North-West. That is the point which I made in the beginning, and which I adhere to until the Minister clears it up.

Mr. CARLING. I can safely say that the Kubanka wheat was not the wheat distributed throughout the country by Professor Saunders as Russian wheat. He may have had samples of both Kubanka and Ladoga wheat and sent them to the Board of Trade of Toronto for inspection, but I know that Ladoga wheat was the wheat which was distributed to the farmers throughout the country to experiment and report upon, and that is the wheat that has been analysed by the chemist, whose report will be sent down to the House in a few days.

Mr. MULOCK. Did you bring in some Kubanka with it?

Mr. CARLING. I do not remember. Prof. Saunders may have obtained a small quantity of Kubanka wheat, but I have heard him say over and over again that it was what is called goose wheat throughout the country. I know that the wheat distributed was the Ladoga and not the Kubanka.

Mr. DALY. For the information of the hon. member for North York I may say that a man named Johnston, the manager of a farm near Winnipeg, was the man who imported this Kubanka wheat and distributed it, and not the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DAVIN. There is evidently some slight confusion in the mind of my hon. friend from North York about the wheat. He is anxious about the North-West. I have only to say that, so far as I know, no Kubanka wheat was sent to any of the farmers of the North-West. I happened to travel around among the farmers of the North-West last summer, and the varieties of wheat I found them using were Judkett, Red Fyfe, Ladoga and White Fyfe. Now, Sir, I can bear my testimony to the good the Experimental Farm is doing in the North-West. It is making every farmer there who is a man of

enterprise and intelligence an experimenter, not only for his own sake but for the sake of the country. Now, Mr. W. C. Sanders—he is nothing to the Professor—lives near Moose Jaw, and is a very intelligent farmer. He experimented last year with Juddett wheat, with Red Fyfe, with Ladoga and with White Fyfe. He found that the Juddett ripened 15, and, in some cases, 19 days earlier than the Red Fyfe. I saw, the day after the Moose Jaw Agricultural Show, that wheat in the presence of leading agriculturists of that district, and they pronounced it fully equal to the Red Fyfe, just as hard as flint, with a fine kernel, and in fact very like the Red Fyfe. The experiment my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) speaks of had not been made, namely, manufacturing it into flour; but the opinion of these men, who were experts, was that the Juddett, which had ripened 19 days earlier than the Red Fyfe, and had produced a very large amount to the ratio of the quantity sold, was destined to be the wheat of the North-West. With regard to the Ladoga, Mr. Sanders and Mr. Smail had also experimented on that. They found the Ladoga, while producing a kernel just as fine as the Red Fyfe, apparently as hard, had ripened from 10 to 14 days earlier than the Red Fyfe. I need not tell the House that if you have a wheat that will ripen 10 or 12 days earlier than the Red Fyfe and will give you a kernel as full, a body as large, and with as much gluten as the Red Fyfe, you have a wheat that will be of incalculable advantage to the North-West, for 7 days is a great gain in the North-West, the race of our farmers being with the frost. If we can outrun the frost, we have a country the most fruitful in the world to deal with. The results of the farms that I visited were most satisfactory. In fact they took a few bushels of grain, and in a few months the fruit thereof shook like the cedars of Lebanon. Now, we are only speaking of the Experimental Farm here. It is in touch with the farmers of the North-West Territories. Bulletins are sent to the leading farmers and published, and in this way all the farmers of the North-West Territories are instructed by means of this farm; and I was very glad to hear the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), who is always so fair, say he hoped these farms would not be starved. While on the subject, I will say a word about the Experimental Farm we have in the North-West. There experiments are being made in tree planting. Every kind of tree that would be supposed to have the best chance has been brought from Russia and elsewhere and planted there, and the most vital experiment to the North-West, to its prosperity, its comfort, and what will please the eye in that country is being made by Mr. McKay in the planting of trees. He is also planting apple trees and various fruit trees which are not yet grown in the North-West. We are not badly off for fruit. We have raspberries, strawberries, currants, wild cherries, and the Saskatoon berry, but we have not apples yet, and that is one of the things which is experimented on in the farms there. He has also experimented on various kinds of oats and wheat, the different times for sowing these and the different ways. He has experimented on fall wheat, and the result cannot fail to be of the greatest possible advantage to our farmers. Those gentlemen, who might be inclined to carp at a little expenditure in this matter, must remember that our farmers are not in a position like that of the tenant farmers of England. We cannot make a history such as the tenant farmers of Scotland made—the Midlothian farmers—whose example was imitated in England and Ireland, until you had regularly established, so to speak, an agricultural university, teaching the farmers in the old country how best to farm, and to drain, what manures are best, what portable manures can be used and so on. We cannot expect that. Yet even in England the people have called on the Government to take some action, and one of the most

eminent writers has blamed the Imperial Government for not spending more money, and taking more interest in the development of agriculture in Great Britain; so that with the evidence we have before us in regard to the experiments in growing wheat and the experiments that have been made in other portions of agriculture and forest culture, I hope that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Agriculture Department will receive the strong support of this House in trying to do something for our farmers all over the Dominion. It must be remembered that it is a common cry that so much is being done for capitalists, so much for railway people, so much for the manufacturers, but nothing for the farmers. It would look very bad therefore if when an expenditure, which is so palpably and directly on behalf of the farmer, is proposed, we should cavil at it and show ourselves ungrateful in sustaining the means of knowledge, for knowledge in farming is power as in other walks.

Mr. WATSON. This is rather an interesting question to representatives from the North-West, and, as stated by the hon. gentleman, there cannot be too much attention given to the different varieties. We are glad to know that the Experimental Farm is experimenting in that direction. I hold to some extent the view expressed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) when he said that an analysis should have been made of the wheat when it arrived from Russia. That wheat, the Ladoga, was pronounced by judges of wheat to be not so hard as Red Fyfe wheat and not of as good a color. This wheat, which was received from Russia, was worth in the markets at least 10 cents less a bushel than the Red Fyfe. It was claimed by Professor Saunders at that time that it would harden for climatic reasons in our North-West Territories, and that all wheat would be hardened by being grown there. I think Mr. Saunders should at that time have made an analysis of this wheat, and then from the proceeds of that seed have made another analysis and found out whether that wheat was improving in quality or not. The Government have been asked to bring down the report of the Board of Trade of Montreal. I should like to ask them to bring down the report of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. They also reported on that wheat, and their verdict was that it would grade about No. 1 Northern. Well, as the hon. gentleman knows, that is a third class wheat in the Manitoba market, and worth about eight cents a bushel less than the Red Fyfe. The hon. gentleman for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) supported the Minister in his pretension that this wheat was good and reported favorably on by the Board of Trade at Montreal. The hon. gentleman had a memorandum placed in his hands by some gentleman, no doubt a good judge of wheat, who stated he would consider this Ladoga wheat a fair sample of spring wheat.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," as if a fair sample of spring wheat is a good sample of wheat. He is in error. There is No. 1 Hard, No. 2 Hard, No. 1 Northern, No. 2 Northern, and No. 1 Spring. That is the fifth grade of wheat. Surely that is not to be considered a good grade of wheat, or to be compared with the Red Fyfe we grow in the North-West. I believe, as a rule, that any new variety of wheat which is forwarded for experimenting gets rather a better chance than ordinary wheat. If there is a good place for it in the corner of the field, it is put there, and I have not heard of much difference in the ripening of this wheat and Red Fyfe. The best variety of soft wheat we have in Manitoba which will ripen early is the Golden Drop. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaks of Juddett as a hard wheat, but he is not an experienced judge of wheat. There is the Red Fern wheat, and there is no harder wheat grown, but the millers will not purchase that if they can get the Red Fyfe.



Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Ogilvie's man pronounced this Judkett wheat equal to the Red Fyfe.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to hear it, but you will get no wheat as good as the Red Fyfe which will ripen earlier. It takes time to mature good wheat. Anything that matures earlier will be a poorer quality of wheat. It is a controversial question in the North-West, in the race between the farmers' wheat crop and the frost, whether it might not be better to grow the softer quality of wheat and get a surer crop. I am glad the Experimental Farm has been testing the qualities of these wheats, and it may be able to solve the question as to what is the best quality of wheat to grow in the North-West. I do not think it is worth discussing what is called the goose wheat. I would have desired that we should have had the report of the analyst on the different qualities of wheat, because that is what we have to rely upon. If the North-West at present is not fitted to grow a wheat that will command more than the average prices in the eastern markets, our country is no good, because the long hauls and the freights are such that we have to produce a wheat that will command a higher price in the markets of the east than the wheat which is grown in the east. I hope these experiments will be continued. There has been an experiment made in regard to the usefulness of frozen wheat for seed, and I know, from the experiments which have been made here, that they are about right. Several farmers in Manitoba have experimented with the frozen wheat, and the result of their experiments in their own soil has been about the same as that of the experiments made by Prof. Saunders on the Experimental Farm. Such experiments are of great value, because, without some authority as to the injury that might result from sowing wheat which has been injured to some extent by frost, the farmers might sow the grain and might have bad crops. Those tests are of great benefit to the country, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture will see that all these experiments are carried on and that there shall be no prejudice to any variety of wheat. It often happens that there is some prejudice in favor of the new varieties, but the plain facts and the results of the experiments should be stated to the public. The Board of Trade of Winnipeg is composed of men who are well qualified to judge of wheat, and they made a report which I hope the Minister will see fit to lay before the House.

Mr. CARLING. Professor Saunders is a very careful, cautious and judicious man, and he would hesitate very much in making any report in reference to this or any other kind of wheat until he was thoroughly satisfied of the accuracy. If this is not a hard wheat but a soft wheat, Professor Saunders will tell the public that it is so. If it is a hardy wheat, after obtaining reports from all parts of the country, after making an analysis of it, after it is ground and after bread is made from it, he will state its quality. He is making all kinds of experiments in order to be thoroughly satisfied that he is right before he makes his report, and when that report comes down, which will be, as I have stated, in the course of ten days, I will be only too glad if the hon. gentleman will make any possible criticism; but I am satisfied that Professor Saunders will send nothing to the public which is not in the public interest.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman opposite remarked that I said "hear, hear." When the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was corrected by a stranger in the gallery and was put right, he had been endeavoring to suggest that the Minister of Agriculture was negligent of his duty and was allowing Professor Saunders to send out an inferior quality of wheat. I knew at the time that it was not an inferior kind of wheat which was distributed from the Experimental Farm, but that it was the Ladoga wheat. As a member of the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation, I knew what kind of wheat was being distributed, and its probabilities of success. It had been grown in a

Mr. WATSON.

climate very similar to that of the North-West, and in a country where the season is even shorter. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was evidently talking of what he did not understand, and I think he should admit that he was not properly informed in regard to that, because he was misrepresenting the facts after the Minister had stated that he was not distributing Kubanka wheat, but Ladoga.

Mr. MULOCK. I stated in the beginning what my informant afterwards confirmed. I stated that I was informed that the department had issued Kubanka wheat, and that the Toronto Board of Trade had pronounced against it. The Minister of Agriculture transferred the discussion to the subject of what he calls Ladoga wheat, and we went on that line for some time, and then came back to the other wheat. I am informed that the department issued to the Board of Trade two samples of wheat, one being the Kubanka and the other the Ladoga, and that the former was found to be nothing but the old goose wheat. That is what I stated, and that is what my informant tells me.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman was good enough, when he was corrected from the gallery by a gentleman who was a member of the Toronto Board of Trade, to admit that he was mistaken in saying that the Ladoga was a very inferior wheat. Now it was the goose wheat which has been condemned, but which was not being distributed by the agricultural farm; a small quantity, no doubt, had been procured for the purpose of testing it, but it was not distributed. I, myself, distributed some portions of the Ladoga wheat, and I had the best reports of it. I think the Minister is doing all he can, and hon. gentlemen are asking, perhaps, a little more information than he can possibly carry in his brain. We shall get all the information needed when the rest of the report comes down.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think I can give the House some information with reference to this Ladoga wheat. I got a sample of it from the Minister of Agriculture last spring, a small package, I think three pounds. I sent it home to one of my neighbors, and he sowed it beside a small strip of White Fyfe wheat. I am aware that it was a fortnight earlier than the White Fyfe, and that the three pounds produced one bushel of solid hard wheat. I think I can confirm the statement of the Minister of Agriculture and the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia, that it is the best wheat so far that I have seen, and that it can be raised profitably in our Province. We do not raise as much wheat as they do in the North-West or the Province of Ontario, but still we can grow wheat in our Province; and if we can find a kind of wheat that will ripen a fortnight earlier than that we have been sowing, it will prove a great advantage to the Province of New Brunswick. I am a farmer and have raised as many as 800 bushels of wheat in a year; consequently I am in a position to speak with knowledge on the subject.

Mr. McMILLAN. Last year I had a sample of barley and I consider it one of the best varieties I have seen, and I reported my experiment to the manager of the Central Farm. Let me say of Professor Saunders that I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance for a number of years, and I do not believe a more reliable man can be found in the country, or one that will give more correct results from the experiments. I am convinced that if there are any mistakes in the report they will be unknown to him. I would say also that the experiments in grain will be beneficial to every Province. I think they have got a variety of oats also that promises very fair, although they were only a moderate crop the first year. But there is one industry that has not been named yet; and that is the egg industry. I see that \$100 has been spent in purchasing fowls for

the Experimental Farm, and \$75 in caring for them. The egg industry comes, I think, sixth in importance among the agricultural products of the Dominion, and we export over \$2,000,000 worth. There are only five articles of which we export more in value than of eggs. I think, also, that we should go into very careful experiments in this direction, because these Government farms are able to make experiments that the average farmer has no opportunity of going into. The reason why I asked the amount of revenue derived from the farm was this: I found there had been 5,000 fruit baskets purchased, and if all these baskets had been sold with their contents for the small sum of 5 cents a piece, they would have yielded more than the whole revenue derived from the farm, which was only \$207.37. I expected the Minister would have been able to give us more details; for instance, the amount expended on fencing, the amount expended for drainage, and the amount expended for clearing the land, because all these are items of importance to the agricultural community. However, I hope we shall have this information a little later.

Mr. SEMPLE. In regard to the barley, some of it was sent to my county—it was the two-rowed variety—and although it was found good for feeding, it was not suitable for malting purposes, and would not command a high price. I think the Minister of Agriculture ought to have been able to give us some information concerning results to-night, considering the large amount that has been expended on the farm. When we consider that from \$70,000 to \$80,000 has been spent in purchasing land and putting up the buildings afterwards, also paying the professors, and then \$26,000 for labor, we should have had at least several satisfactory experiments made for the benefit of the public, whereas we have no account of a single experiment. I think there should have been an experiment made on one, or two, or ten acres, to show what amount of income could be derived from a certain portion of land in proportion to the expense laid out upon it in tilling, manuring, &c. For my part, the first time I saw this farm I thought it was a great mistake to purchase that land for an Experimental Farm. In the first place an enormous sum had to be paid for the purchase of the land; then 100 acres had to be cleared and drained, and after all that has been done the soil is of a poor description, and I do not think it will prove of good quality to grow crops. Another idea occurring to me the first time I saw it was, if the land was good why it was not cleared, being so near the city. I wondered why the owners of the land had not considered it of sufficient value to clear and cultivate it. The only thing I saw to recommend it was the nearness to the city, and I desired to see the experiments which I mentioned tried, because we hear it continually stated by those who are not engaged in the occupation that farming is a very remunerative business, and it is only by experiments and practical tests that it can be shown whether this assertion is correct or not. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he intends to make an experiment with the fertilisers that we were discussing the other day?

Mr. CARLING. Experiments have been made this last season, and I think we shall find the results stated in the appendix to the report.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In looking through the Auditor General's Report, I find that in the matter of trees, vines and bushes, nearly \$800 worth were purchased in the United States and only about \$250 from our own nurserymen. I should like to know if that is to be taken as the proportion of purchases of trees and other products as between the United States' and our own nurseries, or are they purchased simply for experimental purposes? If for experimental purposes, would it not have been more fair to our own nurserymen to have bought about an equal share

of their products and have made an even test in that way? What is the explanation of purchasing three times the quantity from United States' nurserymen as compared with the quantity from our own nurserymen?

Mr. CARLING. I can hardly at the moment give an explanation to the hon. gentleman, but I know that trees were purchased in the United States, Canada and Europe, and different trees have been obtained for experiment in Ontario and at the different branch farms. With respect to trees purchased in the United States, I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman full information at a subsequent period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No one can object to any reasonable expenditure in establishing these experimental farms, but it appears to me that the course of the Government in regard to this farm at Ottawa has been marked, to say the least of it, by very great extravagance, for which no proper explanation has been made either last year or this year. If I understood the Minister of Agriculture aright, this farm of 400 acres at Ottawa cost originally between \$70,000 and \$80,000. In addition to that amount of prime cost we find the Government have been obliged to spend \$65,000 in one year's work. There may be reasons for a portion of that expenditure, but to tell me or to tell this House that it is necessary to expend \$145,000 for fitting up 100 acres of an experimental farm is to tell me what I can hardly believe, and what the hon. gentleman has not satisfactorily explained. I cannot for the life of me see why such an experiment as we desire to carry out should not have been done, and exceedingly efficiently done at probably one-third or one-half the money already expended. There is no doubt we are in very great danger, in all these experiments, of injuring the cause we desire to serve, not of benefiting or promoting practical agriculture, but of expending money from which little benefit accrues, on account of the manner in which experiments are conducted. The Minister offered no explanation to my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), for the enormous charge of \$26,000 for labor, for drainage and other purposes. The only thing he did say was, that of the 400 acres, which cost between \$70,000 and \$80,000, 150 acres were in such a condition that a very large sum, almost equal to the fee simple, had to be expended to get them into proper order. Although I do not pretend to be an authority as to the value of lands in Nova Scotia, yet I think on the Nappan Farm something of the same kind of extravagance has been manifested. There we see thirty-two acres bought at \$140 an acre, and twenty acres more at \$100 an acre. These are pretty stiff figures. I do not know where Nappan is, I regret to say. I understand from some hon. gentlemen that it is in the County of Cumberland, where, perhaps, land may have attained, for various purposes, exceptionally high figures, but in regard to all these figures the Government have shown little regard to the public purse in engaging in such large expenditures. No doubt, this Ottawa Experimental Farm, costing \$145,000, has cost a great deal more than the value of any results we are able at present to obtain from it.

Mr. CARLING. With regard to the Nappan farm, hon. members from Nova Scotia will understand that marsh and dyke lands there, that is to say lands which are flooded with tides at certain seasons of the year, are worth from \$100 to \$140 an acre.

Mr. KIRK. In what part of Nova Scotia are they worth those sums?

Mr. CARLING. The dyke lands or marsh lands are considered to be of extra value; but the whole farm has not cost more than \$53 an acre, although we did pay for about 30 acres of marsh land something like \$140 an acre, which was considered a fair price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. \$140 an acre.

Mr. CARLING. I believe in Nova Scotia those dyke lands are valued very highly. With regard to the large expense in establishing the Experimental Farm near the city of Ottawa, I may say that the Government of Ontario have established a farm of 400 acres or 500 acres near the city of Guelph, and they paid for that farm originally \$75,000, while the capital account up to the present time is something like \$400,000. I fancy that farm has been conducted with all possible economy.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The Minister must be mistaken. Up to last year the entire cost of the farm at Guelph was \$280,000.

Mr. CARLING. I have it from a gentleman in whom I have every confidence, that the total cost up to the present time is over \$400,000, the original cost being \$75,000 for 500 acres. The land itself near Ottawa, with all the money that has been expended on it up to the present time, could be sold by the Government for an amount sufficient to cover the whole expense, including the cost of clearing and draining. I believe it to be of great advantage to have the farm so close to the city, so that the representatives of the people and the public in general can visit it and obtain all possible information in regard to experiments and other matters from the officers. The situation is a very good one, it being within two and a half or three miles from the centre of the city. I can assure the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that there has been no extravagance in the expenditure of money with regard to this farm. The land was purchased as cheaply as possible, and when we could not agree with the parties as to the price, arbitrators were called in and we obtained it at the lowest price possible. Everything that it was possible to do to keep down the expenditure has been done; but in obtaining a farm of nearly 500 acres we did not want to allow the clearing of 150 acres to spread over five or six years. The public expect results, and we thought it better at once to clear it up and place it in good condition, commence the experiments and give the results to the public. I am satisfied that when we have the farm in good working order and have conducted the experiments, the results will be entirely satisfactory to the public.

Mr. DICKEY. I know nothing about the farm in Ontario, but I hope the comments of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are more accurate with respect to the Ottawa farm than they are with respect to the farm at Nappan. I can testify from personal knowledge that the farm which he speaks of has been bought at \$140 an acre was well worth that, and in fact was cheap for the price. I may say that the particular portion which he selected for condemnation was really the cheapest part of the bargain. The total price paid for the farm is a fair price, it is not too much nor was it a bargain, but the adjoining farm which he did not mention, and which was purchased for \$1,200, was bought at a great sacrifice. The Government got a great bargain in buying it at that price, for it was worth nearly double, but it was under mortgage and they got it through the mortgagee. I can testify that so far as the farm at Nappan is concerned there has been no disposition to extravagance, and the mode in which the farm is conducted is meeting with the approbation of the farmers in that neighborhood and is of immense service to them. Of course it is not taken hold of as rapidly at first as one might hope, but it is one of the things which begins at the top among intelligent farmers and has to work down. The intelligent farmers have become interested in it, they visit it, it is a constant object lesson to them, and they learn from it information which they could never obtain from books or pamphlets. It is doing a work which I believe cannot be done in any other way. The superintendent, who is a thoroughly practical man, has organised excursions to the

Mr. CARLING

farm, and by this means four or five hundred farmers have visited it and spread the knowledge they obtained there through the whole length and breadth of Nova Scotia. Without referring to the Ontario farm I am quite satisfied that every cent spent on the Nappan farm has been amply justified.

Mr. KIRK. How many acres in the Nappan farm?

Mr. CARLING. 310 acres.

Mr. KIRK. And that has cost \$13,338.

Mr. DICKEY. Over \$15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears in the returns that there are only 200 acres, of which seventy-five acres appear to be of very little value as they were valued at only \$13. That is what I presume my hon. friend refers to as the second farm. There were 100 acres purchased at various prices, averaging from \$70 to \$140 an acre, in all \$10,000.

Mr. CARLING. I can state to the hon. gentleman that there are 300 acres at all events, and I think ten acres more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not included here.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister must be mistaken, because if he will refer to page 147, he will find a voucher given by Mr. Saunders, the director, in reply to an enquiry from the Auditor General, giving a voucher to Mr. A. R. Dickey for \$1,218. The quantity of land secured was a hundred acres and it now forms part of the Experimental Farm; the original purchase was 202 acres for \$14,000, and the Dickey farm, \$1,218. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that \$140 is not an excessive price for some qualities of land in Nova Scotia, but the hon. gentleman ought remember that there is a great difference between what is called dyke land and marsh land. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the farm to say whether this was a dyke or farm or marsh land.

Mr. DICKEY. It is dyke land.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is also a very great difference in the value of the dyke land itself. The hon. gentleman is aware that some land reaches as high as \$200 an acre in the Annapolis Valley.

Mr. DICKEY. Part of the farm is English dyke which was bought at \$140, and part of it is salt marsh dyke which was bought at \$100 an acre.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At the time the purchase was made, the opinion of those who live in the neighborhood, and who are familiar with the value was that the price was excessive. Be that as it may the purchase has now been made. I observe that about \$20,000 has been spent on this farm up to the present time. That farm was acquired in the early part of the year, and I presume the stock was not placed on it at a time when they would require to be fed with hay. I notice here a charge of \$50 for hay; it is not a large amount to be sure, but I supposed that that dyke marsh would produce hay enough to feed stock.

Mr. CARLING. The farm was taken up very early in the spring before we could cut grass, I suppose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the Minister whether it is his intention to make experiments on that farm as he has done at the Central Farm, and whether he proposes to make experiments in trees and fruit culture as well as with wheat and other grains? Also, whether the expenditure which has been made is sufficient to carry on those experiments and whether the farm is ready to be utilised for the purpose for which it was originally intended? A good deal has been said to-night with reference to the advantage of these farms, which I admit; but in order that this should be

of benefit to the country, the information gained from them should be distributed generally. If this information as to the results from experiments in grains and fruits is confined to blue-books it will at best only reach very few people. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that as soon as he is in a position to give any reliable information on which the farmers throughout the country may base their expectations in future with reference to the different classes of grains and fruit, some cheap edition of the reports should be issued, and be very generally circulated throughout the Dominion. Without that I think we should lose very much of the advantage we hope to gain by these experimental farms, which in themselves are objects very much to be desired, and which I hope will be attended with the very best results.

Mr. CARLING. I would just say to my hon. friend that we are doing just what he suggests. Prof. Saunders issues bulletins, and over 12,000 farmers in the Dominion are now receiving them; and we shall be only too glad if hon. gentlemen will send in the names of prominent farmers in their constituencies, who take an interest in these experiments, with their post office addresses, and these bulletins will be regularly sent to them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). To what extent would the hon. gentleman be disposed to send them? Of course, if we gave him a list of 4,000 or 5,000 farmers, it would be rather a heavy undertaking.

Mr. CARLING. I should think the hon. gentleman would have some regard to the expense, and would not wish them to be sent to that extent; but if he selects twenty or thirty or forty prominent farmers, and sends their names and addresses direct to Professor Saunders, the bulletins will be sent to them. An hon. member has just asked me whether they will be issued in French. I may say that they are distributed in both languages, and any names which may be sent by hon. members to me, or the secretary of the department, or Professor Saunders, will be promptly put upon the list.

Mr. MULOCK. Similar bulletins are issued by Cornell University, and it has a very good system. A note accompanies the first bulletin issued, asking the receiver to acknowledge its receipt and to state whether he desires to have it continued, and unless he does so the bulletins are not again sent to him. Perhaps it would be well, as a matter of economy, that Mr. Saunders should do the same thing.

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made the suggestion.

Mr. KIRK. Hon. gentlemen have spoken to-night of the benefits the farmers of the Dominion will receive from these experimental farms, not only that at Ottawa but those in other parts of the Dominion. To my mind the advantages to be derived by the farmers are yet to be ascertained. I am sorry the hon. Minister is not able to present the report of the superintendent of the farm at Ottawa before he asks us to vote this sum. Up to the present time members of the Opposition have been very ready to vote the money asked by the Minister without very much discussion, and I do not think that the hon. Minister can complain of the manner in which the discussion has gone on to-night. But, in looking over the expenses which have been made on account of these farms, and not knowing very much of the advantages the farmers have received from them up to the present time, it strikes one that a vast amount of money is being expended with very little return. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, we do not expect much benefit from any importation of wheat, unless you can bring a better quality of wheat for the farmers of the west, and one which they can grow more cheaply, as we may in that way get

our flour cheaper. But in looking over the accounts, it seems to me that the Experimental Farm here has been carried on in a rather extravagant manner. Apart from the cost of the Department of Agriculture, under the head of Civil Government, we have paid for salaries \$25,939.40. Besides that, we have paid for farm laborers and drain diggers, \$20,861.43. It does appear to me that this is a vast amount of money to pay for labor for one farm.

Mr. CARLING. It is not for the ordinary labor of carrying on the farm, but it is for clearing the farm and preparing it for the experiments.

Mr. KIRK. If I understand this amount of \$25,939 was not paid for labor on the farm at all, but to scribes for writing, and I notice that the salaries paid range from \$1 a day to girls up to \$2,400 a year.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is certainly reading from the wrong page, for we have no scribe there except one.

Mr. KIRK. I am reading from page C 126, of expenditures of the Agriculture Department, in connection with Civil Government. Then I notice that horses appear to be very high in price. I notice on page C 135, \$550 entered as paid for a pair of horses, \$250 for a dark chestnut and \$235 for a light chestnut, and \$500 for a span of heavy draught horses. These are very high prices to pay for farm horses. I notice also for the Nappan Farm that five horses were purchased at a cost of \$1,025, or more than \$200 each. I know something about the price of horses in Nova Scotia, and I know that there we can get a very good horse for less than \$200; and it seems to me these are extravagant prices.

Mr. WATSON. What amount of land is under cultivation at Brandon this year, and how much will be under cultivation next year?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot answer that at present, but I will be glad to give the information, as I expect the agent in charge of the farm to be here in a day or two.

Mr. WATSON. Has he not made a report?

Mr. CARLING. The report is in the Appendix to Mr. Saunders' report and will be distributed to the members.

Mr. McMULLEN. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that these experimental farms and other places appear to be used as a means of recompensing political supporters. Take, for instance, Major's Hill Park. That place appears to be a kind of pasture ground for political hacks, as there is an enormous amount of money spent there that is absolutely useless. I also notice in connection with the Experimental Farm that no less than 19 valuers have been engaged at amounts running from \$350 down to \$50. What necessity was there for engaging valuers? Were they employed to value the horses and other purchases made? Was not Mr. Saunders capable of doing that work?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Saunders did not employ the services of any gentleman to value any of the articles he has bought. These valuers were necessarily called in, in connection with the official arbitration, and by both sides. None of the charges the hon. gentleman refers to were contracted by Mr. Saunders for valuing horses or anything used on the farm.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it absolutely necessary to have no less than 19 valuers?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say. We had to expropriate, and we had to take this course. We left the matter in the hands of our solicitors, as did the claimants, and when the decision went against us we had to pay the costs.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I see that Pinhey & Christie were paid \$1,000 on account of costs and outlay. Was that their whole bill?

**Mr. CARLING.** They were employed on behalf of the department to look after these arbitrations. That includes the costs in connection with their part of the work. These arbitrations were made in the same way as in all other appropriations.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** It is a large amount of legal expenses.

**Mr. CARLING.** I cannot help that.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I quite admit that in the establishment of an experimental farm expenses may have accrued over which the Minister had no control. There are always expenses at the outset, but now when we have everything we require I can see no reason why expenses of that character should again appear in the list. The House is quite willing to grant any sum necessary to advance the agricultural interest, but it would be highly unwise on our part to sanction the passing of items for useless expenditure. I hope that in future these expenses will not be run up to the enormous sum they have reached this year.

**Mr. STE. MARIE.** Will the hon. gentleman explain the charges for freight, \$169.88 to the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, \$878.38 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, making \$1,048 for freight during the year?

**Mr. CARLING.** This is freight on material for the farm, drainage tiles lumber and other things, and it is not in connection with the ordinary working of the farm.

**Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).** Then I find there is paid to Ferguson \$726, to O'Gara \$312 and to L. A. Olivier \$176; so that the total amount which it cost on that farm for arbitration and law costs was \$3,879. When the Minister brings down his statement, will he also bring down a statement of the services rendered by these valuers and arbitrators, and of the amount paid for law costs? Of course, I understand that there must be a certain amount spent for examining titles and things of that kind.

**Mr. CARLING.** Mr. O'Gara was not employed by the Government at all, but by the owners of the land, to contest the purchase, and make us go to arbitration and bring forward the witnesses, and to put us to all the trouble he could. The decision was against us and we had to pay all his expenses.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** It was a rule with the old black-letter lawyers that it was a disgrace to hold a piece of property that cost less than the patent, and it seems to me that we are getting back to that view when it costs so much to investigate the titles.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** I suppose the Minister of Agriculture will publish the experiments which he has made with valuers and lawyers with the other experiments?

**Mr. CARLING.** I will speak to the professor about that.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** I hope they will not use any more hand-spikes on this farm. I see they cost \$1.50 each. In my time we used to make them ourselves.

Census and Statistics, including preliminary preparations for Census of 1891 ..... \$15,000

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** What gentleman has charge of that? I suppose the Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. CARLING.** Yes.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I am afraid it is rather late to make the suggestion, but it has appeared to me that it would be for the benefit of the public service to alter the

**Mr. CARLING.**

date of our census taking. In England, the United States, and other countries, the census is taken at the same period—1880, 1890, or 1870, as the case may be—and it would be of great advantage if we could make our decennial period agree with that. I am not certain that the British North America Act does not stand in our way, but it would not be very difficult to have that changed, and the advantages are obvious. For purposes of comparison, it would be very advisable that we should have our census taken at the same time.

**Mr. CARLING.** The census is taken in Canada in the same year as in Great Britain and all her colonies, that is, not in 1880 and 1890, but in 1881 and 1891. The census year is uniform throughout the British Empire.

**Mr. MULLOCK.** That is a conclusive answer to the remarks of my hon. friend, and I think it would be highly undesirable to make any change.

Committee rose and reported.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN** moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 25th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 70) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Amyot.)

ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

**Mr. SHANLY** moved the third reading of Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

**Mr. WATSON.** When this Bill was last up for discussion on the third reading, I desired to move an amendment, which was ruled out of order, and I gave notice that I would move it when the Bill next came before the House. The amendment was as follows:—

"That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole in order to insert a clause providing that the maximum rate of coal carried over the company's line shall not exceed one cent per ton per mile."

In talking over the matter with several gentlemen connected with the carrying of freight, I found there was a difference in opinion as to whether I should embody a maximum rate in my amendment or not. With the consent of the House I will drop the words referring to the rate of a cent per ton per mile, and move simply that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, so that the committee can fix a maximum rate. I, therefore, move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to insert a maximum rate per ton per mile.

**Mr. SHANLY.** I trust the House will not accept this amendment. I object to it upon general principles, because it would be entirely new legislation for Parliament to undertake to fix the tariff of railways. The general Railway Act provides a mode of appeal if railway rates are considered unjust. We might as well undertake to fix the tariff of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, and all the other railways of the Dominion, if we are to interfere,

as in this instance, with an already chartered railway. I object to the amendment on general principles, because the legislation suggested would be novel and unjust. I object to it particularly because this railway, I repeat, is not seeking a new charter, it is a chartered and working line. I hold that it would be an interference with vested rights to take the opportunity, now that the company applies to Parliament to obtain power to expend more money and extend its road to the frontier, to try and impose a parliamentary tariff, as I may call it, on this road, which is already subject to the general provisions of the Railway Act, and in regard to whose tariff an appeal can be made to the Governor in Council if it should be considered onerous or unjust.

House divided :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Amyot,	Ellis,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	Perry,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Innes,	Rowand,
Brien,	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Burdett,	Landerkin,	Scriver,
Casey,	Laugier,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Somerville,
Charlton,	Lovitt,	Trow,
Chcquette,	Macdonald (Huron),	Turcot,
Colter,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Daly,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Davin,	McMullen,	Wilson, (Elgin),
Edgar,	Mills (Bothwell),	Yeo.—49.
Eisenhauer,		

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Archibald,	Foster,	McNeill,
Audet,	Freeman,	Madill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Geoffrion,	Mara,
Baird,	Gignault,	Marshall,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bell,	Grandbois,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Guillette,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Perley,
Boisvert,	Hale,	Putnam,
Bowell,	Hall,	Riopel,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Robillard,
Brown,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Bryson,	Jameson,	Rykert,
Burns,	Joncas,	Shanly,
Cameron,	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Cargill,	Kenny,	Small,
Carling,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Carpenter,	Labelle,	Taylor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Landry,	Temple,
Chisholm,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thérien,
Cimon,	La Rivière,	Thompson (Sir John),
Cockburn,	Laurie,	Tisdale,
Colby,	Lepine,	Tupper,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace,
Curran,	Macdowall,	Ward,
Daoust,	Mackenzie,	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	McDonald (Victoria),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Renfrew),
Dessaulniers,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wilmot,
Dewdney,	McKay,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickey,	McKeen,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright.—97.
Ferguson (Renfrew),		

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

## SECOND READINGS,

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Central Counties Railway Company."—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the St. Helen's Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company."—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate "The Calgary, Alberta and Montana Railway Company."—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 45) to revive and amend the Acts relating to "The St. Gabriel Léeve and Railway Company."—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate "The Lac Seul Railway Company."—(Mr. Daly.)

## ONTARIO LOAN AND DEBENTURE COMPANY.

Mr. CARPENTER (for Mr. MONCRIEFF) moved second reading of Bill (No. 48) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorise them to issue debenture stock.

Mr. LISTER. This Act ought to be explained. Under the law as it now stands those loan companies have the right to issue debentures for borrowing money.

Mr. CARPENTER. Perhaps it will be better to let the Bill stand until Mr. Moncrieff arrives.

Mr. MULOCK. Before doing so I would venture this suggestion. There are a great many loan companies in this Dominion now, and it appears to me it would be better to formulate a set of powers for loan companies, so that they would all have uniform charters. I remember at one time when the banks all had different charters and different powers, and the result caused great confusion. The staff were constantly changing from bank to bank, mistakes were liable to occur, and in questions arising before the courts each charter had to have a separate construction. Ultimately the Banking Act was adopted, and I believe that the change was found to be a good one. When we consider the amount of capital invested in loan companies, I think the Government will see that the money involved in those companies is sufficient to justify them in bringing in a uniform Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a great deal in the hon. gentleman's suggestion. It would be well to have a general law for all those loan, debenture, and investment companies, so as to have certain general clauses to apply to them all, and if any particular corporation applies for special powers these should be included in the Bill. I think the suggestion is a valuable one. However, I do not suppose that we can get up that Bill this Session, but in the meantime I do not think we ought stop any Bill of this kind from going to its second reading.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Two other companies have this power now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) says that two other companies now have the power asked for by this company.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what this company asks for.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nor I.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish, therefore, to be understood as objecting to it, but I think in order to make a beginning it would be wise if the Committee on Banking and Commerce would insert in this and other Bills they may report upon, a clause that those companies shall be liable to be brought under the general Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. We did that, I think, in regard to railway Bills before we adopted the general clauses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Some years ago I had occasion to suggest to the House that all those companies should be incorporated under a general law. This sort of special legislation has been done away with in the States, and in the State of Michigan all special Acts are abolished except for municipal corporations. They are all organised under a general law with this exception, and I think that a measure of that description should be adopted here. A moment ago I heard a couple of Bills ordered to stand because the Minister of Justice had no opportunity to look into their provisions. This is rather a cumbrous duty to impose upon the Minister of Justice, and I repeat what I have said on former occasions, that all those private Bills ought to be printed and circulated at the opening of the Session, so that all the members of the House could, if they liked, consider their provisions. The simplest mode would be to pass a general Act under which all those companies could be incorporated, and it would settle the question once for all. That is the suggestion I made some years ago, and the propriety of it is admitted to-day. It is not indispensable, but it is necessary that we should do this, and I do not see why we should not adopt such a course.

Motion for second reading allowed to stand.

#### QUEEN'S COLLEGE, KINGSTON.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved second reading of Bill (No. 46) to amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman ought to give the House some information with regard to this measure. I see it is a Bill relating to superior education, and it has to do with an institution which, I think, by the British North America Act, is placed exclusively under the control of the Provincial Legislature. I do not see upon what ground the hon. gentleman is asking this House to legislate on the subject. I do not think this House has anything to do with the subject of education, except as specially provided by the British North America Act. When the Provincial Legislatures encroach upon certain denominational rights by their legislation, then the parties have the right to come here and ask the protection of this House against such encroachment. But this Bill does not disclose anything of that sort; it does not disclose any attempt on the part of the Legislature to take away from any denomination any right that has been secured by the provisions of the Constitution. So far as I know, there are but two instances in which this House has undertaken to deal with the subject of education at all. The one is in regard to the establishment of a military school as an incident to our power to deal with the volunteer and defensive force of the country; and the other, in regard to the examination of parties who are to be employed as masters on board of ships. Whether in the second case we have exceeded our authority or not, it is not now necessary to discuss. But in this Bill

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

it is proposed to deal with an institution which, by its Act of incorporation, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario, within which it is situated. Its Act of incorporation, I believe, was passed years before the Union, but in the division of powers it would fall within the control of the Ontario Legislature, and that Legislature would have as much control over that charter as if it had been granted subsequent to the Union.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Queen's College at Kingston is, I contend, not a college of a provincial nature; its influence extends over the whole Dominion. It is an institution in connection with the Presbyterian Church of Canada, which extends from one end of the Dominion to the other, and its subscribers and supporters are found in every part of the Dominion. Moreover, the Royal charter under which it was founded gives it the right to carry on its work in all the Provinces of British North America. This Parliament has recognised its jurisdiction, because we have already passed an Act in reference to Queen's College at Kingston; and if my hon. friend will read the preamble of this Bill, he will see that its purpose is to amend the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 123, an Act passed here in the year 1882, establishing a university council, and changing some of the provisions of the Royal charter. Surely it comes within the jurisdiction of this House to pass an Act amending one of its own Acts. The Provincial Legislature at Toronto, or that at Quebec, could not pretend to amend an Act of this House. The present Bill provides that the university council may have the right to prescribe certain religious tests to the trustees. I submit that this question would be more easily and fairly discussed before the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 93 of the British North America Act provides that "in and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This Bill does not relate to education. It only relates to the domestic affairs of this corporation, which carries on a work throughout the whole Dominion, and it is as much an Act under the jurisdiction of this House, as an Act relating to an hospital, or an Act relating to incorporated religious bodies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is rather an important one as brought up by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and it must receive full consideration before this Bill becomes law; but my hon. friend who promotes the Bill, says very truly that, rightly or wrongly, the Dominion Parliament has passed an Act relating to Queen's College, and the Act which he now lays before this House is an amendment of the Dominion Act. Of course the objection of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) applies to the Act proposed to be amended, and as we have committed ourselves to that Act, of which this is merely an amendment—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is more.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—I would suggest to my hon. friend to allow this Act to go to the Committee on Private Bills. Of course, I do not agree with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) that the Committee on Private Bills can discuss a constitutional question, but as this is an amendment to an Act we have already passed, they can decide whether it ought to be adopted or not, and then, when their report comes up, we can discuss the question of constitutionality.

Mr. CASEY. I differ from the right hon. First Minister in his opinion that the time to discuss the constitutional question is on the third reading. The right hon. gentleman says we have already affirmed the principle of interference with those educational institutions, by a former Act. It does not at all follow that our action then was justifiable. We

have often, as the right hon. gentleman knows, passed Bills which were found afterwards to have been beyond our power. He must have a lively recollection of that. The time to consider the constitutional question is now, and the fact that such a Bill was passed before, shows only that its passing must have been due to inadvertence or to the absence of some who take a special interest in educational matters. It seems to me most extraordinary that this Parliament should have assumed—I was not aware of it until just now—to legislate on the subject at all. I do not see that there is even room for concurrent legislation in the matter. The British North America Act provides distinctly that education is to be within the control of the Provincial Legislatures; and we would be endorsing an utterly vicious principle if we were to assume to amend an Act which we had, in the first place, no right whatever to pass. This is a Bill which nobody who takes any interest in the colleges in Ontario can allow to pass without protest. Should it pass, it will be just as competent for this House to interfere with the management and the constitution of the University of Toronto, as it is to interfere with the University of Queen's, the one being just as much a Dominion institution as the other. In fact, neither of them is a Dominion institution; and if we have the right to meddle with the affairs of Queen's, we have an equal right to interfere with the affairs of the University College of Toronto. We would have the right just as well to say how the Senate of the Toronto University shall be elected, and to meddle with its affairs in every respect, for, although endowed by the Province, it is an educational institution like every other, and might be declared by this House to be a Dominion educational institution, just the same as Queen's College. The hon. member for Frontenac tries to bring the question within our powers by saying that this college operates in all parts of the Dominion. Of course, that is an unintentional inaccuracy of statement. The college only operates in Kingston, but no doubt draws its revenue and students from all parts of the Dominion, and even the United States. The University and College of Toronto draw students from all parts of the Dominion, and are to that extent as much Dominion institutions as Queen's. Take Victoria College, now at Cobourg, but shortly to be removed to Toronto under provincial legislation. Victoria is in exactly the same position as Queen's. It is supported by the Methodist Church throughout the Dominion, draws subscriptions and students from all parts of the Dominion, and is, therefore, entirely independent of provincial aid. It would be just as much in our rights to interfere with the management of Victoria College as with Queen's College. I am sure my right hon. friend would be the last to interfere with the concerns of a church college like that of Victoria. I do not think he could have been cognizant of our interference in the affairs of Queen's College, or he would not have permitted it. When he looks into this question, he will see it is improper to go on in the vicious line we have taken, and I would suggest that the Bill should stand until he has time to look into the constitutional question, and we should also have time to look into that matter, and the constitutional question should be argued on the second reading, and not before the Committee on Private Bills, or on the third reading, because then we are supposed to have settled all constitutional points with regard to the measure. We could only settle then whether the Bills were in a proper shape to pass. The right hon. gentleman will see this is opening up a very large subject, unsettling the bases of all the colleges in Ontario and Quebec—of the Ottawa College, or the Laval University—and will interfere with the appropriation which has been voted for Catholic education in Quebec in connection with the Jesuits' estates. The hon. gentleman is opening up the whole question of interference with provincial education, and the revenues of provincial colleges. I call

upon all those who are interested in maintaining the independence of educational institutions, of whatever denomination, to insist that this House should not interfere with the independence of those institutions, and the rights given to Provincial Legislatures by the British North America Act.

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK.** This Act does not propose at all to interfere with education. It does not interfere with the right of giving degrees or the manner of granting them, or anything of that sort, but the Queen's College, Kingston, is an institution under the Presbyterian Church of Canada. That church, when it was formed, under the name of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, applied to the different Provincial Legislatures, and obtained Acts incorporating it, and it was then believed that the temporalities would be regulated under the various Acts of the Provincial Legislatures. You will remember a suit which was taken by some clergyman in Montreal and was carried to the Privy Council, and there those Acts were declared unconstitutional. In consequence of that decision of the Privy Council, the Presbyterian Church had to come here and get the Act passed, chapter 124, 45 Victoria, relating to the temporalities fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. Now, the Queen's College of Kingston, was managed by this church; and the church authorities had obtained an Act from the Provincial Legislature giving them authority to constitute this council, but grave doubts were cast on the legality of the Act, and to remove all doubts they came to this House in 1882, at the same time that the Presbyterian Church of Canada came here and obtained the Act which it is now sought to amend.

**Mr. LAURIER.** Was it discussed at length?

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK.** Yes; the judgment of the Privy Council was then before every hon. member, and it must have been the opinions of hon. members that this House had jurisdiction in the matter, since they passed the Act to which I refer.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** It is the Bill you have now introduced which proposes to amend the Act of 1882.

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK.** Yes, and to allow the council then established to appoint certain trustees and to prescribe the religious tests which those trustees shall take.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman for Elgin (Mr. Casey) should be adopted, because, if the Bill is read a second time we have adopted the principle of the Bill, and the committee will not be able to interfere with that principle. They cannot go back on the opinion of the House after the Bill has passed the second reading.

**Mr. WELDON (St. John).** This is a very important matter, because the Bill which was passed in 1882 was one which was intended to remedy a supposed defect in the Ontario Act, and the preamble contains a declaration that:

"Certain powers were by the said Act conferred upon the said council, and it is desirable to confirm all Acts and proceedings of, and connected with, the said council, done and taken under the said Act, and to confirm the constitution and the powers of the said council as set forth and provided by the said Act."

So it would seem that, on that occasion, the Dominion Parliament assumed power over Queen's College, and passed an Act to ratify the legislation of the Ontario Legislature.

**Mr. CASEY.** There was Ontario legislation on that subject.

**Mr. WELDON (St. John).** There was Ontario legislation, and the preamble refers to it in this way:

"Whereas an Act was passed by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, in the 38th year of Her Majesty's reign, and chaptered 76, intitled 'An Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston,' and whereas doubts have arisen regarding the validity of the said Act, it is desirable to confirm all things which have been properly done relying upon the validity thereof."



It would seem, from the cursory attention I have been able to give to those measures, that, after the Presbyterian Church in Canada was united and became the general church for the whole country, Queen's College was anxious to become co-extensive with the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and the first section of this Act is evidently intended to make Queen's College the Canadian college under the Presbyterian Church. It was therefore brought under the control of the Dominion Parliament, but it seems to be very important that we should consider carefully the Act which was passed at that time, particularly when it was passed in order to give validity to a doubtful Act of the Province of Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend opposite as to the gravity of the question. My suggestion was that, in order to expedite business, as we had, rightly or wrongly, passed a Bill connected with the college, and this Bill is intended to amend the Dominion Act, we might, in order to expedite business, send it to the Committee on Private Bills in order that they might investigate the question of jurisdiction in regard to these amendments. On the report of the committee we may discuss the question. I need not say to an old parliamentarian like my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that it has been the practice for years that the second reading of a Bill of this kind might be understood to take place *pro forma*, and the discussion might take place at a later stage of the Bill. That is my proposition, and if the House agree that we have jurisdiction, then, on the subsequent stage, the Bill may be thrown over until the end of the Session; but I quite agree with my hon. friends, that, if we send the Bill to the committee, it must be with the understanding that the whole question of jurisdiction may be brought up at a later stage.

Mr. LAURIER. Under the circumstances I suppose we may adopt the plan suggested by the First Minister, that the Bill should be read to-day *pro forma*, and the question will come up at a later stage.

Mr. CASEY. If no question of jurisdiction is admitted, that is all right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### TORONTO SCHOOL OF CAVALRY.

Mr. LOVITT (for Mr. LANGELIER, Montmorency) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish another School of Cavalry this year in the Province of Ontario; and if so, whether the officers forming part of the Quebec school will obtain promotion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Estimates which have been brought down show the amount of money which is placed for the purpose of the School of Cavalry in Toronto. When the school is organised, the officers of the Quebec school will get promotion according to the ordinary regulations.

#### HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, 1st. In what ports of the Dominion does the Government collect hospital dues on ships? 2nd. What amount was collected in each of the said ports during last season? 3rd. How many seamen were under treatment in each of the said ports during the season? 4th. How much did the Government pay to the hospitals of the several ports during last season?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government collects hospital dues in all ports in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. In reference to the second branch of the question, the accounts are made up for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, and are to be found on page 85 of the Auditor General's Report, which is now

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

on the Table. In regard to the third and fourth sections of the question, I would suggest that, with the consent of the House, the hon. gentleman should change that into a motion for returns, as the information required in reply to the question is very lengthy.

Mr. CASEY. It might be laid on the Table.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Did I understand the Minister to say that the information is ready if the motion were to pass now?

Mr. TUPPER. No, but it will be ready in a day or two. It is very lengthy.

#### DREDGE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Are the repairs to the dredge *Prince Edward* completed? If so, what is the cost of the same? In which of the harbors of Prince Edward Island is the dredge to commence work, and at what date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The repairs were completed in November last. The whole cost was \$12,693. I am not in a position to say in which harbors the dredge will commence work, because I will have to cause a list to be made so as to see which is the most pressing.

#### FISHERY OVERSEER FOR ARTHABASKA.

Mr. TURCOT asked, Whether the Government have received from P. C. Bourke, since his appointment as fishery overseer for the district of Arthabaska, any money derived from fines; if so, what amounts have been collected from that source each year up to the date of the opening of the present Session, and from what persons?

Mr. TUPPER. No money has been received for fines from P. C. Bourke up to the present time. There has been no return of fines collected.

#### WHARF AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. FISET asked, Who are the parties who tendered for the repairs now being made to the wharf at Rimouski by the Government? What is the amount of each tender? What is the name of the party to whom the contract was awarded?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The names of the parties who tendered, with the amounts of tenders, were Connors & McDonald, \$14,373.30; Dussault & Beaulieu, \$10,004.10; James Brown, \$10,440.20; R. R. Call, \$14,554.60; J. C. Plante, \$17,627.40; Charles Velleux, \$11,859.30. The contract was awarded to Dussault & Beaulieu.

#### ST. CHARLES BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. The total cost of the St. Charles Branch Railway, including stations, storehouses, and all accommodations, up to the 1st of January, 1889. 2. The length of the line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The total cost of the St. Charles Branch Railway, including stations, storehouses, and all accommodations, up to the 1st of January, 1889, was \$375,895.75. Length of line, 15 miles.

#### PICTOU BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The total cost of the Pictou Branch Railway, including stations, storehouses, and all accommodations, up to the 1st of January, 1889?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. \$535,603.56.

## CAYUGA POST OFFICE.

Mr. COLTER asked, What is the cost of the Cayuga post office up to the present time? To whom have the different payments been made, and the amount of said payments?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site was purchased from Messrs. Humphrey & Murray for \$450. There were professional services (C. G. Sander), amounting to about \$43; survey and plans (Henry Lowe), \$13; contractors (Draper Bros.), \$8,380; travelling expenses, superintending architect's, &c., \$73.30; foundation (A. Trudel), \$6.30; blue prints (D. A. McLaughlin), \$6.30; box fronts (E. Chanteloup), \$536.15; advertising, \$211.79; printing (Government printing office), \$9.94; total, \$9,735.03.

Mr. COLTER asked, Who has acted as superintendent of works in the construction of the Cayuga post office, and what remuneration has been paid or promised to such superintendent or inspector by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no special superintendent, or clerk of works, appointed. The superintendence was made by officials of the department.

## SUMS PAID TO W. A. WEBSTER.

Mr. COLTER asked, What sums of money have been paid by the Government to W. A. Webster during each of the financial years, 1887 and 1888, and since the first day of July, 1888, and for what services was he paid?

Mr. CARLING. If my hon. friend will put this in the shape of a motion, I shall be very glad to bring the information down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It will not be reached.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. O yes, it will. I will undertake that it shall be reached.

Mr. COLTER. If the hon. gentleman will consent, I would now move that the return be ordered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Carried.

## BREAKWATER AT SUMMERSIDE, P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Department of Public Works received a petition praying for a breakwater at Summerside, Prince Edward Island? If so, is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to order a survey of the contemplated work immediately?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A petition has been received from the Hon. Mr. Lefurgey and others, praying for the construction of a breakwater. Authority has been given to make an examination, which will be done at the proper time.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 71) respecting corrupt practices in Municipal Affairs (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 72) to make further provision respecting enquiries concerning Public Matters (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACCIDENT TO MR. NOEL FORTIN.

Mr. Fiset moved for:

Report of enquiry and correspondence between the Government and Mr. Noel Fortin, of the Parish of St. Fabien, respecting an accident which happened to him on the Intercolonial Railway in April, 1887.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The return was made in answer to an Order of the House last Session. There is no subsequent correspondence.

Motion withdrawn.

## RETURNS ORDERED.

1st. In what ports of the Dominion the Government collect hospital dues on ships? 2nd. What amount was collected in each of the said ports during last season? 3rd. How many seamen were under treatment in each of the said ports during the season? 4th. How much the Government have paid to the hospitals of the several ports during last season?—(Mr. Lépine.)

Return showing what sums of money have been paid by the Government to W. A. Webster during each of the financial years, 1887 and 1888, and since the 1st July, 1888, specifying the services for which he was paid.—(Mr. Colter.)

Return showing public buildings erected in various places throughout the Dominion from 1st July, 1867, to 1st January, 1889; giving date of first appropriation made for same, locality in which erected, and total cost to date of 1st January, 1889.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return showing the date at which Mr. Speaker received the certificate of the Judge in each of the following cases—in the Election trial of Halton, Shelburne, Northumberland (East), Haldimand, Joliette, Laprairie, Maskinongé, Cumberland and Kent; the date of the Speaker's warrant, and the date of the writ for a new election.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Department of Railways and Canals on the subject of the late break in Cornwall Canal, and of all plans and suggestions by Civil Engineers and others for the prevention of the recurrence of such break; also there part of Mr. John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, thereon.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, or any of the members of the said Governments, respecting the northern boundaries of the said two Provinces.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, and other documents respecting the disallowance of Acts passed by the Province of Quebec in 1887.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, and other documents respecting the disallowance of the Act respecting the Bar of the Province of Quebec, passed in 1883; in which Act the *Batonnier Général* was granted precedence over all other lawyers.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, and other documents respecting beach lots in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, and other documents in relation to the disallowance of the Act respecting magistrates.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, and other documents in relation to the disallowance of the Act for the conversion of the debt.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Return of Customs buildings in cities and towns of less than 20,000 population, built or now under construction at the public expense; showing date of construction, cost to date, revenue derived during the last financial year, and population of the city or town in each case.—(Mr. Casey.)

Return of the number of deserters from the North-West Mounted Police for the ten years ended the 31st December, 1888; the number of the whole force in each of the years from 31st December, 1878, to 31st December, 1888. The number of recruiting parties sent out in each of the years of the ten ended on the 31st December, 1888, and the cost of the same.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return showing the amount of money paid on account of work performed or material furnished for opening or improving public roads or streets in the city of Ottawa, from the 1st of July, 1888, to the 1st of January, 1889. The names of the party or parties to whom paid, for what paid, and the amount. The name or names of all parties in charge as inspectors or superintendents, and the amount per day or month paid to them.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the total amount of expense incurred and moneys paid up to 1st January, 1889, on account of the preparation, publication and completion:

1. Of the various lists under the Dominion Franchise Act upon which the last General Election was held; and stating—

- (a) The total amount paid for printing;
- (b) The total amount paid to revising barristers;
- (c) The total amount paid to revising barristers, clerks and bailiffs;
- (d) The total amount paid for all other expenses in connection with preparation, publication and completion of the said lists;
- (e) Whether any claims against the Government in connection with the preparation of the lists are yet unsettled.

2. Showing the expense incurred up to 1st February, 1889, in connection with the preparation of the second voters' list under the Dominion Franchise Act, and stating—

- (a) The total cost of type used, or to be used, in setting up the lists;
- (b) The amount paid for composition in setting up the lists;
- (c) The cost of paper and presswork in preparation of the lists;
- (d) The cost or rental of plant used in connection with the preparation of said lists up to the above date;
- (e) Amount of all other expenses incurred in connection with the preparation of the said lists up to 1st February, 1889.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all correspondence respecting the awarding of the contract for carrying the mail between Becancour Station and Ste. Julie de Somerset, and between Inverness and Ste. Julie de Somerset, awarded in or about the month of April, 1888; also of all tenders connected therewith.—(Mr. Turcot.)

Return showing:—

1. The number of immigrants that have arrived at the several ports of entry in Canada each year, from 1st July, 1867, to 1st January, 1889, distinguishing their several occupations, with the number in each.
2. The number reported as having settled in Canada, and number that went to United States, in each year.
3. The number received at the several immigration offices in each year during same period.
4. The amount of money expended annually for immigration purposes.—(Mr. Brien.)

Return of all evidence, papers and correspondence relating to the liability of the Government to construct, or to aid in constructing, a bridge across the Grand River, at the village of York, in the county of Haldimand.—(Mr. Colter.)

Return of amount of export duty collected or paid on sawlogs and other lumber in the year 1888, specifying at what custom house such duty was paid, and the respective amounts paid at each custom house.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return of the report of Henry F. Perley, Esq., upon the harbor of St. John, N.B., and the improvements recommended by him.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing the amount of duty collected upon baskets and boxes containing fruits admitted free of duty since May 1st, 1888.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return of report of Engineer Crawford in 1877-78 and all subsequent reports made on the Beauharnois Canal; also, reports of Engineers made on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence between Lakes St. Francis and St. Louis. Also, resolutions, letters, &c., of boards of trade, corporations, and even from individuals, regarding such works.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all the correspondence with the Department of Railways and Canals in connection with the opening of the canals of the Dominion for Sunday traffic. Also a statement of the number of steamboats and vessels passing through the several canals between the date of the order permitting the same and the close of navigation in the year 1888. Also copies of all instructions to the superintendents of the several canals.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Copies of all reports of the engineers and other officers employed by the Department of Railways and Canals on the subject of water power in the new Welland Canal.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Copies of the several tenders and all papers, letters and contract for the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., between the officials of the Intercolonial Railway and Mr. Louis Fortin, of St. Octave de Metis, in relation to the killing of a horse by the cars in October, 1888.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Return of all sales made of Indian lands on the west side of the Grand River, in the village of Cayuga, in the county of Haldimand; copies of all instructions given to the valuers of said lands the reports of said valuers, and all correspondence and papers relating thereto.—(Mr. Colter.)

## HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

On the Order, Resolutions on the subject of granting a measure of Home Rule to Ireland.—(Mr. Cook.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose these resolutions will not be opposed. If not, I will move them, in the absence of Mr. Cook.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend can argue this case so well as the hon. mover of the resolutions, and therefore they had better stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not propose to argue them. I submit them as an undiscussed motion.

Resolutions allowed to stand.

## 9TH BATTALION.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all official correspondence between the Government and the commanding officer of the 9th Battalion, "Voltigeurs de Québec," during the North-West campaign of 1885, and respecting the same. 2nd. Copies of the various reports furnished to the Government and the military authorities by General Strange, respecting the part he took in the North-West campaign of 1885; as well as those respecting the dividing up of the force under his command. 3rd. Copies of the report furnished to General Strange by the commandant of the 9th Battalion, V.Q., respecting the operations carried out by the said 9th Battalion during the said campaign.

He said: When I last had the honor of addressing this House on this subject, I showed that the 9th Battalion had not volunteered its services, but did not think it would have been proper to refuse to serve when called on. The telegrams I quoted showed that they were very prompt in answering the call, for in a few hours we were ready to start. We went as fast as we could until we reached Winnipeg, where we went into camp, and there we remained a rather long time. I will read to the House the correspondence in the Winnipeg papers and telegrams, and explain how it was we succeeded at last in being sent further west. In the Manitoba daily *Free Press*, of 17th April, 1885, under the heading, "City Gossip," appeared the following:—

"Since the delay of the 9th Battalion of Quebec in this city, and the 65th of Montreal at Calgary, rumours have been circulated to the effect that they have refused to fight against the French half-breeds. The officers of the battalions wish to contradict the rumours, and say that they have come here armed and desirous of assisting in putting down the rebellion. They discountenance every act of violence, and the fact that they are here prepared, if need be, to shed their blood for the preservation of law and order speaks volumes for their loyalty to Canada. The feelings of the men have been deeply wounded by these false reports, as they are anxious to go to the front."

In answer to that the following appeared in the same paper under the heading, "The Quebec Battalion":—

"SIR,—When these unfortunate troubles broke out in the North-West, I was residing in Montreal as an ex-telegrapher. I volunteered to accompany the troops in connection with military field telegraphic operations. Here I was detailed to the 9th Battalion of Quebec. I would like space in your journal for a few words of vindication respecting an item in your issue of this morning, headed "City Gossip," being rather hard on the bravery of this command. As a British Canadian, not having previously known the personnel of the regiment, I can solemnly affirm, since my attachment to the corps, and in camp, I have freely mixed with the rank and file daily. As one who speaks French fluently, I have no hesitation in stating that no more patriotic, loyal and brave men, from Colonel Amyot down to the humblest private, have entered this town, prepared to do their duty, irrespective of creed or nationality, whether called from their peaceful homes to the far North-West, or to the lower Gulf Provinces. On the way here in crossing the gaps they are said to have made the fastest marching time and to have arrived without a single man on the sick list. They are miserably camped on a low marshy ground, daily waiting orders to proceed further west, but until these are given by General Middleton (who, by the way, is married to a French Canadian lady), they are reluctantly forced to remain 'squatters' in the outskirts of Winnipeg, a city that, to my eye, has before it a great future. These men are not even now fully equipped. It should not be forgotten either that the 65th of Montreal and this regiment were the first to proceed at a day's notice from the Province of Quebec to this far distant west, while nearly all that have followed and passed on since have had more time to fully equip and prepare.

"WINNIPEG, April 17, 1885."

"JOHN HORN.

To this communication the editor added, as a note:

"Mr. Horn seems to have misapprehended the remarks made in the paragraph to which he refers. They were not calculated to reflect on the men of the Quebec Battalions, but rather to contradict the disagreeable rumours circulated with regard to them."

On the 20th April, the following appeared in the *Winnipeg Daily Sun*:—

"The 9th Battalion is now in camp on the old Driving Park grounds, having removed from the camping grounds north of the trench. Their present location is much more comfortable. Col. Amyot, the wholesome French gentleman who is in command of the battalion, says the boys are all eager to go to the front. They do not like the idea of coming so far without doing some fighting. The colonel himself is anxious to go to the field."

We were then camped in a very bad place, and there is an idea which seems to have prevailed in the minds of the officers in command there that it would be well to discuss. I did not then publicly state that this idea prevailed among them, but I stated it privately to the Minister while doing in public my best to support the Department of Militia. This idea was that when men became volunteers they became merely animals, and should be treated as such—that they should be crowded together in a swamp and be made to endure every possible privation and hardship. In Winnipeg there were any amount of large buildings unoccupied in which the volunteers could have been accommodated, yet they were made unnecessarily to endure hard-

ship which caused us the loss of two of our men. I do not believe the hon. the Minister is responsible for that, though at the time I wrote privately to him about it. I am sure, however, he could not find sufficient time to devise a remedy. As we were so long a time in Winnipeg I took upon myself to write the Minister of Militia the following remarks:

"Obtain, if possible, that we go further west than Winnipeg. It would have a good effect on the battalion and the public. Our loyalty is suspected because we remain too long here. Many other reasons, as the health, discipline and sobriety, necessitate our departure. We, though, entirely submit to orders.

In reply, I received the following:—

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Commanding 9th Battalion.

"Use J. Wrigley's cipher. I am anxious to get your news. I think I can manage if you keep quiet and not let known that I am interfering. You are doing first-rate. (Ciphered.)

"A. P. CARON."

The day previous I had received the following telegram from the Minister in answer to a letter of mine, of which I have no copy, for it is a private letter, though I have no objection to its being placed on the Table of the House:—

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Commanding 9th Battalion, Winnipeg.

"Your letter received. I thank you for it, and it has given me great pleasure for the good news you give me of your battalion. I place implicit confidence in you and in your command. Write me as often as you can and give me news. I take note of what you say about other matters in your letter.

"A. P. CARON."

On receiving the Minister's telegram, promising to do his best to obtain that we should go further on, I gave the news immediately to our men, who cheered heartily on receiving it. On the 23rd April, I received the following telegrams:—

"To Col. AMYOT.

"I telegraphed to General to do what you asked. He replied he had ordered you to Swift Current. Thanks for telegram. All friends are delighted to hear how well you are getting on.

"A. P. CARON."

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"9th Batt., Winnipeg.

"Acted immediately on your desire expressed, and telegraphed General who immediately replied on 22nd: Have already removed Ninth from Winnipeg to Swift Current some days ago. To-day he telegraphs me: Find Ninth have not yet left Winnipeg; have asked for explanations myself; telegraphed to Winnipeg to-day to ask what this means.

"A. P. CARON."

In answer to these telegrams, I sent the following, again in cypher:—

"Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia.

"Use Wrigley's cypher. I put in orders of battalion and it is known that no one but General Middleton can direct our movements and that Ottawa cannot interfere. Seventh infantry and all cavalry arrived after us are leaving to-day. We are humiliated. Please send us to Calgary. I send you a telegram for use before the House if you judge opportune.

"G. AMYOT."

We were complaining repeatedly that we had been forgotten in Winnipeg, and in fact we were. I do not want to throw blame on anyone for that, but, as a matter of fact, we were left in Winnipeg so long that it was only through my repeated telegrams and my repeated exertions that we were able to leave it. I do not remember exactly why we desired to go to Calgary, but I heard that the 65th Battalion of Montreal had gone there, and I was anxious to meet them somewhere during the campaign. On the same day that I received those telegrams, I telegraphed to the Minister:

39

"WINNIPEG, 23rd April, 1885.

"Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"Weather being unusually bad, we have been put into barracks. My men generally well. Authorities do their best for us, and have been doing all the time. Do not believe contrary statements by hostile press. Awaiting orders to go further. We are all cheerful.

"G. AMYOT,  
"Lt.-Col. Commanding 9th Battalion."

This telegram was sent, accompanied with another in cypher, in which I told the Minister he might use it before the House if he thought proper. I was then a friend of the Minister, and I thought he was a friend of mine. I did my best for him, and, while I was endeavoring to serve him, I was also trying to do the best I could to get comforts for the men who were with me. I received an answer to that on the 25th April:

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"9th Battalion, Swift Current.

"Telegram received. You will have heard news which assures part of your telegram. You are doing splendidly.

"A. P. CARON."

Before leaving Winnipeg, I saw the following article published in the *Winnipeg Sun*, on the 22nd April, 1885:—

#### "VISIT TO THE CAMPS.

"A reporter visited the camps this morning to see how the men had passed the night under canvas. Wading through the mud near the provincial jail, the writer finally reached the camp of the 9th, which is on the old Driving Park. Approaching the camp the sounds of vocal music were heard. Mark Tapley like, those Frenchmen can be jolly under all circumstances, notwithstanding that the rain had poured down all night, notwithstanding that they had procured but little sleep, and despite the fact that they were wet through, still they were 'jolly,' and as they sang with gusto many well-known French songs, the reporter who had been mentally cursing the fate that condemned him to such a tramp, relented and 'went out' in admiration towards those poor fellows who, under such adverse circumstances, could sing and make merry in their hearts. Colonel Amyot's tent was soon found. The colonel too, was in good spirits. He had slept in his tent all night. Cold? Yes, he had been very cold, but what of that? My men sleep in their tents, and what better am I than they? No, I must set the example. A good-hearted man Col. Amyot appears to be. He took the reporter about the grounds, glanced into the camps, pointed out the hardships the men had to endure, spoke kindly to his men, laughed heartily over a passing joke, and in fact carried sunshine about with him. But it was not upon the question of Col. Amyot the writer intended to dilate, but upon the hardships the men had to endure last night. Some of the tents had been pitched in lower portions of the ground than others, and these were completely flooded before midnight. The men had to turn out and seek shelter in tents more dry than the ones they had left. These Frenchmen are a very accommodating lot of fellows, and so the dry tents were crowded, and the joke and song passed around, and the boys laughed in very defiance of the elements. It was a miserable morning, but the breakfast was good, and the men 'tucked' in an unusual quantity and felt better. The announcement this morning that they would be removed during the day to the old Board of Trade Hotel, where proper shelter would be afforded, was received with pleasure, and at an early hour the men were all dressed and ready to start. The tents will be left standing until they dry, as it is against orders to strike wet tents."

The same paper, on 24th April said:

#### "DEPARTURE OF THE 9TH.

"Yesterday evening the 9th Battalion left for the front, and another stirring scene was enacted at the Canadian Pacific Railway depot. If ever soldiers were pleased at being ordered to the front, the men of the 9th were. Ever since they have been kept in the city they have had to put up with the most unbearable insinuations and charges of disloyalty, and their being ordered to the front convinced them that the Government had not lost confidence in the regiment from Quebec. It was nearly half-past six o'clock when the boys got ready to start, but by that time everything was in shape, and they fell in for the march to the depot. Along the line of route hundreds of spectators accorded them encouraging cheers, the men of the 9th responding with a number of rollicking French songs, which they sung quite lustily. On the platform of the depot the battalion formed into fours, and while the train that was to convey them to Swift Current was being made up, they were kept engaged shaking hands with friends, and receiving their good wishes. As usual, the agent of the Myrtle Navy Tobacco Company put in an appearance with a pound of tobacco for each man, and was given three hearty cheers for his acceptable present. About seven o'clock the men boarded the train, and a very few minutes afterwards it moved out amidst the hearty cheers of the vast concourse of people assembled to witness the departure. Before leaving, Col. Amyot expressed to a *Sun*

reporter his great delight at having been sent to the front, and said that, while his men had been charged with being disloyal, he was certain they would give a good account of themselves if ever they met the rebel forces. The colonel anticipates that upon reaching Swift Current he shall be ordered to proceed to Battleford."

And then we left for Swift Current. I am happy to have been able to lay my hand on those documents, emanating from impartial and disinterested writers, who witnessed our conduct and heard our utterances in Winnipeg. You will remark that it is due to my own exertions if we were not forgotten any longer in Winnipeg, and if were sent at all to the wide prairies. Arrived at Swift Current, I had the advantage of meeting with General Laurie, now a member of this House, who kindly took me to the Saskatchewan landing and explained to me the whole method adopted for the war and the transport. It struck me that the march of the infantry, at that early season, would necessitate an immense outlay on teams, an immense expense, each horse eating his own load during the voyage, and that the pursuit of mounted enemy by the infantry, in a country where no fence nor ditches prevent the running of horses for thousands of miles was altogether a mistake. All the way from Swift Current to the landing, I saw teamsters were without protection, and carrying heavy loads of provisions. In the evening some of them gathered near a tent the light of which was a good target and indication to the enemy. Any amount of mischief might have arisen from that single cause. It was, perhaps, a presumption on my part, but seeing that I was not alone in my opinion, being entirely convinced that I was right in my appreciation of the way the war was conducted, I thought it my duty to communicate my views privately to a friend who had invited me repeatedly to do so. No harm and some good might result from that step. So I wired in cipher, to Sir A. P. Caron, in the following terms:—

"SWIFT CURRENT, 25th April, 1885.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON,

"Ottawa. (Cyphered.)

"Use Wrigley's slater. Arrived here all right. Found General Laurie a perfect soldier. Advance of Middleton troops too hurried, consequence being immense useless expense. Volunteers should be used for garrisons and protection of places and ammunitions. American scouts, and Indians and half-breeds doing the same kind of fight as rebels; should do the fighting and attacking part. Middleton force exposed to be slaughtered. Troops here hearty. Rely upon the Ninth.

"G. AMYOT."

A few days after that we left for Calgary. I wired our arrival to the Minister, and he answered me thus:

"OTTAWA, 29th April, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT.

"Glad to hear of your safe arrival. We are all delighted with the manner you have got through your work.

"A. P. CARON."

And again on the 2nd May:

"OTTAWA, 2nd May, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT.

"I was glad to hear from you. Sorry to hear of Quimet's illness. You are doing well. Keep me posted.

"A. P. CARON."

On the 3rd of May I was informed by telegram from Major-General Laurie that Private Theodore Marois, of the 9th Battalion, had died in the hospital that morning. Private Marois had been left by us sick at Swift Current. The General wired me:

"We would have the funeral to-morrow unless you have special wish for other arrangements."

Well, as I had Marois' brother with me at Calgary, another of my soldiers, I thought it was due to him to have his brother's body brought to Calgary, and to give him a funeral service; and so I wired to General Laurie asking him if he would kindly send the body to Calgary. On May 4th, General Laurie wired to me in the following terms:—

Mr. AMYOT.

"SWIFT CURRENT, 4th May, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT,

"Will send body at 6.30 Monday morning, on train going through to Calgary. I much regret did not receive earlier notice hence arrangements are not as complete as desired. M. Morton, 9th Battalion, accompanies body.

"J. W. LAURIE"

I beg to thank Gen. Laurie for the kindness he showed me on that occasion. Besides, during all the campaign he did his best to help us in every way. I can repeat all that I said the first day I saw him. I found him to be a perfect soldier in every respect. I had left other parties sick in Winnipeg, and I wired to Doctor Kerr:—

"CALGARY, 4th May, 1885.

"To Dr. KERR,

"House Surgeon, Winnipeg.

"What became of the two who left hospital? What have you done with Blais' body. Why did you not wire me his death before.

"G. AMYOT."

I also wired to Col. Lamontagne, who was then in Winnipeg:

"CALGARY, 4th May, 1885.

"To Col. LAMONTAGNE,

"Winnipeg.

"Not hearing of five sick men left in hospital at Winnipeg, I telegraphed yesterday to surgeon. He answered that Blais died on the 13th, and does not say what he did with his body; he says two have left and he does not say where they are. This is a most atrocious negligence about Blais, and the whole concern."

The next communication I received was a telegram asking how much was due for the burial of Blais. I did not then give any of these facts to the public, as I might have done, because I was a friend of the Government, and because I thought the Minister was not responsible for what occurred; and my intention to-day is not to criticise him on these points, but it is well that the facts should be known in order that the department may avoid similar errors in case similar circumstances should ever arise again. This is what occurred in respect to Blais. His pockets were searched, and they took the money out of his pockets to pay funeral expenses. I have got letters and telegrams to establish that fact, if need be. I think this is wrong, it is unworthy of a great country.

Mr. MULOCK. Who did it?

Mr. AMYOT. Some of the officers in command at Winnipeg. Now about Marois. I was commanding the military district of Alberta, a district many hundred miles in extent. I was senior officer, and I thought I was justified in giving him a military funeral. I had a coffin made in Calgary, and we had services in a church. A grave was dug and we formed a military procession in which a great many of the citizens of Calgary took part. The population there was indeed most hospitable to us, and rendered us much service. I say again that I do not hold the Minister responsible for these things, but it is my duty to inform him of these facts. The expenses connected with this funeral amounted to nearly \$50, and I got the Hudson Bay Co. to pay them, because they were paying all the expenses incurred there. I was authorised by General Strange to incur expenses generally, to sign the vouchers, and get them countersigned by Major Dowling. I have all those papers with me. I ordered those accounts paid, and they were paid, and since then I understand the Commission refuse to recognise them, and consequently nearly \$50 were charged to poor Major Dowling, what amounts to a deduction from his pay. I now inform the Minister of these facts, and I am sure he will agree that this evil ought to be remedied. The funeral expenses of the late Marois are not yet paid, or rather they were paid at the time by a poor officer in the mounted police, and the Government of this country have refused to acknowledge the bill and to refund the money. This is something that I cannot approve, I condemn it, and I am sure the Government will admit that

these expenses ought to be paid. As I said before, I had with me Marois' brother, and I thought it proper to give to the soldiers an idea of the respect the country had for their devotion, for their services and for their good conduct. But, as I said, I do not believe the Minister is cognisant of these facts. I only learned them recently myself; but I hope he will at once see that Major Dowling is refunded the money which has been withheld from him. The following is the letter sent by Major Dowling:—

"DONALD, B.C., 2nd December, 1888.

"Colonel AMYOT,  
"9th Battalion, Quebec.

"SIR,—You will remember, during the North-West excitement, one of your soldiers died at Medicine Hat. His remains were brought to Calgary. The articles required for the sad occasion were furnished by the Hudson Bay Company. They refused to furnish unless I initialed the order, which I did at your request. After your regiment left for home I was called upon by the Hudson Bay Company to pay the amount, which I did, and then sent the order, receipted, with explanation, to the Hon. the Minister of Militia. My letter has not yet been answered. I have no copies of amount or letter. The expenditure was under \$50. Will you please have this matter looked into and amount sent to me here.

"Yours truly,  
"T. DOWLING,  
"Inspector N.W.M.P."

When we arrived at Calgary, we found the public mind considerably agitated. The following correspondence will plainly show the position of affairs:—

"CALGARY, 4th May, 1885.

"To Major WALKER.

"SIR,—When Gen. Strange left here for the north, part of his instructions to me were that you would have charge of what is known as Home Guards, comprising the outlying district of Pine and Sheet Creeks and High River. In view of the present state of affairs, with a prospect of the Indians moving south, I would like to know what you have done in the matter, as I wish to report to Gen. Strange.

"I am aware that before the General left here, he talked matters over fully with you, and, if it is possible, I would like to forward your report by the courier leaving here at four o'clock p.m. to-day, as to what has been done in the premises.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,  
"Your obedient servant,  
"T. W. DOWLING,  
"Insp. Comg. Post."

On the same day, at Calgary, I wrote to the Minister, as follows:—

"To Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"CALGARY, May 4, '85.

"I learn by a telegram from Winnipeg, that Achille Blais, left sick in Winnipeg, died on the 30th. Was not informed before. Private Marois, left sick of pericardite at Swift Current, died there yesterday.

"Eighty men of my battalion gone to McLeod to relieve two companies of Osborne Smith, who wants to send 50 more of my men to Gleichen to relieve the rest of his battalion.

"Father Lacombe and Major Dowling, Dewdney's confidential agents, want rest of my battalion to stay here and want more troops, because it is a dangerous point. Please refer to Dewdney if necessary, and advise Middleton not to divide further the Ninth, and even to reinforce us here. Qu'Appelle, Swift Current and Calgary are key and basis that must be strongly defended. They command south and west and form reserve for the north. Provisions must go north from those points. I express you the views of Father Lacombe. The only one wanting to separate the Ninth in three parts, each of which would be useless, is Osborne Smith, who wants to have his own corps together. I have only 120 men left here. General Strange refused to shake hands with Indian Chiefs at an interview arranged by Father Lacombe. Indian rising may suddenly come. We have to be on the alert. You will have, at all events, to keep a force of over 2,000 in the North-West. War may last all summer. It will depend on chance of the fight. Every day, some Indians, afraid of what they have done, join the rebels.

"G. AMYOT."

On the same day, Major Dowling wired to Governor Dewdney, as follows:—

"CALGARY, May 4, '85.

"To Lieut.-Governor DEWDNEY,

"The great want here now is mounted men. There are here, in the company of W. L. Infantry, dozen men available as mounted men. I can purchase horses here, but great difficulty is saddles and suitable rifles. No revolvers or revolver ammunition in place.

"The officer commanding here has telegraphed Minister of Militia that what I have telegraphed to you should be carried out.

"T. DOWLING."

I was then in Calgary, and on the following day I wired the Minister of Militia, as follows:—

"CALGARY, 5th May, 1885.

"Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia.

"Pressing necessity that an experienced officer be appointed here with power to superintend despatching of supplies for Edmonton. General Strange report just arrived, says troops at Edmonton wanting supplies, though lots here. Ouimet, who cannot leave now, might be appointed. Strange appears to have left without arrangements. (Ciphered.)

"G. AMYOT."

On the 6th of May, I received the following:—

"EDMONTON, 6th May, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT, Omdg. 9th.

"SIR,—My orders are distinct that you relieve detachment 91, with two companies 9 at McLeod, and that detachments at Gleichen, Langden and Crowfoot are to be relieved by same strength of your regiment. I have endeavored to point out to you importance of post at Crowfoot and Gleichen.

"Men of 91st will be sent forward with first convoy of supplies. I have given authority to Steamston to raise corps. You will assist him.

"T. B. STRANGE,  
"Major-Genl. Cmdg. Alberta Force."

On the 7th of May, I received the following communication from Major Dowling:—

"CALGARY, May 7, 1885.

"Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Commanding Post.

"SIR,—I have the honor to report to you that telegrams which have passed through my hands on their way from Major General Strange to Major General Middleton, reported that there was nothing in the way of provisions at Edmonton, except flour and barley, and in view of this I would respectfully suggest that the Company of W. L. Inf. 7 now here, be ordered to proceed as escort with a large amount of supplies that are going to Edmonton to-day.

"There will be other supplies leaving here in two days which the Co. of W. L. Inf. 2, now at Gleichen, might be used to escort.

"There will be a third train shortly after, which the company relieved from McLeod might escort.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,  
"Your obedient servant,  
"T. DOWLING,  
"N.W.M.P. Commanding Post."

On May 7th I wired to General Laurie:

"CALGARY, May 7, 1885.

"To Gen. LAURIE,  
"Swift Current.

"Want advice. Am senior here. Lots of provisions to send north. General Strange wires to General Middleton that he is short of provisions. My instructions from here are to relieve one company at McLeod, one at Gleichen, and one here, and to send the three together as an escort to the first convoy of provisions at Edmonton. But it will take seven days before I have those three companies together, and it is a great delay for the teams ready to start. Can I, under circumstances, take upon myself to send the company here numbering forty-one with fifty armed teamsters as an escort to the first convoy of ammunitions. I think it would be safe.

"G. AMYOT."

On May 3rd I received the following from General Strange:—

"EDMONTON, May 3, 1885.

"Three companies Winnipeg Light Infantry to be relieved by 9th Battalion. Voltigeurs will be used to escort supply train to Edmonton. 20,000 rounds of Winchester ammunition has been telegraphed for, which requires strong escort on arrival.

"T. B. STRANGE,  
"Major General Cg. Alberta District.

On the same day there was addressed to me a long communication from General Strange which I think it is important I should read to the House, in order that hon. members may thoroughly understand the subsequent correspondence. Hon. gentlemen will observe that I was frequently addressed as commanding officer of the district of Alberta. The circumstance that the Militia Department here never acknowledged it does not alter the fact. The communication received by me was as follows:

"EDMONTON, May 3, 1885.

"To Colonel AMYOT,  
"Commanding Force at Calgary.

"SIR,—Yours of 29th April just received. I am glad once again to have the services of the 9th, and I feel sure that you and your officers and men will do their utmost.

"I left orders with Colonel Osborne Smith that on the arrival of next battalion, two companies were to be sent to Fort McLeod to relieve a company of W. L. Infantry, also one company to Gleichen, with detachments at Crowfoot and Langden. You do not state how many companies your battalion is composed of. I judge five, by the number of officers. The remaining companies of the W. L. I. coming from McLeod, Gleichen and Calgary will be sent forward to rejoin their battalion escorting the first convoy of provisions for Edmonton. Please put yourself in correspondence with Hudson Bay Co. (Mr. Hardisty). They have been appointed to supply troops and act as paymasters on my signature. In any emergency, you can sign for transport or supplies, and I would countersign afterwards.

"I wish to impress upon you the importance of watching the C. P. R. station at Crowfoot. It is on the trail leading from Sounding Lake, where bad Indians are collecting. They will go south if pressed from north. As your companies seem weak numerically, you had better station one company at Crowfoot, another at Gleichen, with two at McLeod. That would leave you one company at Calgary, but there are home-guards there, under Major Walker. Please put yourself in communication with him: he will give you every local information. Get maps for yourself and officers at Land Office and study them and the situation and make your officers do the same. I know you will take every opportunity to instruct and drill the men. They are happier employed, especially at aiming drill and extending for attack. You will find Father Lacombe a wise and brave man who will tell you all about the Indian situation.

I may say I did meet Father Lacombe, and he proved indefatigable in rendering us help. If those Indians did not join the rebels it was due in great part to his exertions. I saw him frequently and benefited greatly by his advice as well as by the advice of the citizens of Calgary.

"You are in a very responsible position and must learn all you can about the situation as regards Blackfeet, Sarcees, and Blood Indians. You will be assured they are perfectly loyal. So they are, because there are too many troops for them to be otherwise. You will pretend to trust them, but watch and be prepared. Any news of difficulty anywhere would make the Indians join against us. They are to be made to see that we are strongest and know it. They will try to steal cattle and horses, pretending all the time to be loyal; this, if permitted, will show them that we are afraid of them. Full instructions for guidance of detachments at Crowfoot, Gleichen and Langden will be handed over to your officers by those of W. L. I. they relieve. I am informed there are eight lodges of Crees camped near Gleichen; they are there for no good. If you have to move your men you can hire wagons through the Hudson's Bay Company. You can visit your posts by rail to Langden, Crowfoot, Gleichen. Please warn the officer commanding at Gleichen that a man whose name I need not mention, had in his possession ammunition for sale to Indians and half-breeds. He is to be watched. He will exercise a bad influence over your men if allowed. I left directions to have his action enquired into by Colonel McLeod. Will you please inform me what steps have been taken in this matter. Major Dowling will give you information and assistance on many points. Please remind him that I am trusting to him to keep up communication by courriers as far as Red Deer. The man at McPherson's Coulée, Dickson, was no use. I have provided for rest of road. He will also keep up courriers on McLeod Road. Major Cotton, North-West Mounted Police, commands McLeod District. You will communicate with him about your men. I want the ranges of objects round McLeod and all your posts marked. The order was given to the detachments of W. L. I. you relieve, they should tell relieving detachments. You should be on the lookout that such marks are not moved by evil persons. If you do not keep your officers and men's minds busy with preparations to do their duty, they will become demoralised by the dulness of doing nothing. Unless you are altered, you have lots of intelligence and energy and can understand and see the importance of every word I write.

"T. B. STRANGE,  
"Major Gen. Comg."

[I wish to be informed what punishment was inflicted on constable Beaudoin, N. W. M. P., who threatened to shoot an officer of 65th.—T. B. S.]

On the 7th May, I wired to the Hon. Minister as follows:—

"CALGARY, 7th May, 1887.

"Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"Instructions received from Strange permit me to help. I send a detachment with provisions. Everything will go all right, so do not be anxious. Will wire if necessary. Quimet going to Edmonton tomorrow.

"G. AMYOT."

On May the 8th, I wired to General Laurie in the following terms:—

"CALGARY, 8th May, 1885.

"To General LAURIE,  
"Swift Current.

"Telegram received. Thanks. Have sent escort. Please tell me how many men at Swift Current, and if a detachment of 50 men could be sent to Gleichen.

Mr. AMYOT:

On the same day, I received the following reply:—

"SWIFT CURRENT, 8th May, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT,  
"Calgary.

"Seventh Fusiliers leave here to-morrow, and only half battalion, Halifax regiment left at Swift Current, so that could not furnish any detachment for Gleichen.

"J. W. LAURIE."

On the 11th May, General Strange wrote me as follows:—

"11th May, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT,  
"Commanding 9th Battalion, and Alberta District.

"Sir,—I got your letter saying that you thought best to send on detachments W. L. I., in detail as they arrived. It is dangerous, but you have done for the best. \* \* \* The proper way to secure peace is to send large detachments of troops along the railroad, especially at Crawford and Gleichen, also at Fort McLeod. The Bloods and Blackfeet dare not then stir.

"If the young bucks choose to run away and join the Crees, they should not be allowed to return to their reserves.

"The old people and women should be kept on their reserves as hostages, but fed and treated kindly. \* \* \* You should impress on the Minister what I have already represented to Gen. Middleton, that it is desirable immediately to send up troops and start a column from Crowfoot towards Sounding Lake, which is a rendezvous. The column from Crowfoot should be turned so as to meet Otter's column from Battleford, and mine from Fort Pitt, converging on Sounding Lake, where we could probably crush all that remained of rebellion before it supplies itself with renewed life, by devastating the cattle country with the aid of Blackfeet and Bloods.

"The country from Crowfoot to Sounding Lake is open, and easy. Here are fresh fields for you and the 9th Battalion.

"I am very sorry to hear that Major (so-and-so) has no home guards. He is terribly slow. Try and shove him along.

"Yours obediently,

"T. B. STRANGE,

"Major-General Commanding Alberta Field Force."

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

### After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. When at Calgary, seeing that the news from the war was far from being good, that Gen. Strange badly wanted some men, provisions and ammunition, that the Indians about us were far from looking quiet, and that the people in the surrounding country were all rather in a scare, after consultation with the principal citizens of Calgary, I sent a telegram to the Hon. Minister of Militia in similar terms to the one I had sent from Swift Current. That telegram was as follows:—

"CALGARY, 12th May, 1885.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON, Ottawa.

"General Strange badly wants supply of arms and ammunition applied for. Scouts wanted here. Ninth protects McLeod, Crowfoot, Gleichen, Langden and Calgary. All is quite smooth. For your private information, I persist in saying that this war should be made by men fighting in the same way as rebels. Volunteers more specially garrisoned. Our volunteers are being slaughtered. 500 scouts worth 2,000 volunteers. Men full of courage.

"G. AMYOT."

The words, "for your private information," were suppressed when part of this telegram was read to this House in 1886. I received the following telegram in answer to mine:—

"OTTAWA, 14th May, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT.

"Your suggestion noted, but is a matter of policy which I cannot alone decide, but will submit matter. Apply to General or Brigadier for scouts."

"A. P. CARON."

The next day the following telegram came to me:—

"OTTAWA, 15th May, 1885.

"To Lt.-Col. AMYOT.

"You have done too well for me to boycott you. Don't understand. Have answered all your despatches."

"A. P. CARON."

I presume I had sent a telegram complaining of something which had been unanswered. These telegrams were in cipher. They were designed to privately communicate

to the Minister of Militia my impressions upon the way the war was conducted. He had invited me to do so. A letter of his said :

"MY DEAR AMYOT. Be sure that you need not fear in any way, when you write me privately. I keep your letters for myself"

I trusted him ; I trusted his sense of honor, his avowed friendship. I thought then that it was not judicious to bring 4,000 men of infantry to ruin, in an immense field unparalleled in the world as to its size, after a few mounted half breeds and Indians whom they might be years and years in reaching. Those enemies had the reputation of being excellent riders and sharpshooters, able to fly daily hundreds of miles. It was the easiest thing for them to capture immense unprotected convoys of provisions, and make any amount of prisoners. Some instances have shown that I was not wrong in my apprehensions. In fact, if Riel had not been a madman, if Dumont had seriously meant war, if they had followed the example of others and led the war in intercepting provisions, in capturing isolated men, instead of concentrating their small band at Batoche, if they had used the advantage which their full knowledge of the country gave them over the Canadian army, they would have obtained many successes which would have emboldened the Indians who might all have joined in the rebellion, putting in danger the lives and properties of all the white population spread over the North-West. That was what had to be feared. My last telegram was on the 12th of May ; two days later, on the 14th Poundmaker captured a large transport train, and made about 25 prisoners. How easy and with what disastrous effect it would have been for the rebels to frequently repeat the experience ! I thought then that 500 mounted men, skilful riders, sharpshooters, with perfect knowledge of the country as the cowboys had the reputation of being, would be worth, for a war of that kind, more than 2,000 infantry soldiers, a great part of whom knew not how to use a rifle nor to mount a horse. Gen. Middleton had himself to rely upon cavalry to run after Big Bear. Personal bravery has nothing to do with that. Whoever doubted the bravery of any of the divers nationalities of the northern continents ? Do not the French know that the English are brave ? Do not the English know that the French too are brave ? They met often enough, for and against each other to be mutually convinced of their respective and undisputed merits. Enough of them have died beside each other on all points of the globe to deserve mutual respect. But personal value and strategy are two different things. It is upon strategy, upon the plan of campaign that I was communicating with the Minister as he appears to have understood it himself, by using in his reply, the words : "It is a matter of policy." Whether I was right or wrong in my appreciation, is not the question to day. How did the war end ? Look at the *Manitoba Daily Free Press* of 8th June, 1885 :

"The 150 men under Major Hughes who went to reinforce Strange returned to-day. It has been decided to follow the Indians with the mounted men only."

In a despatch to Governor Aikins, of the 6th June, General Middleton says :

"Yesterday, on my way to Fort Pitt, I received information from Gen. Strange that Big Bear's Band had broken up virtually into 2 parties, and as he has still the McLeans and other prisoners, I am going to follow both trails with all my mounted men, and hope to catch him."

But the question is not whether I was right or wrong. I am not making the history of the campaign. It will doubtless be made in due time, and will contain curious details. But the question is : Was the Minister right in making public part of those private telegrams, in curtailing them, isolating them from surrounding circumstances, from answers and invitations to them, so as to make the public at large infer from them an evidence of cowardice on my part. We were, when he made those public, discussing the question of Riel's hanging. What had those private com-

munications to do with that, I could never find out. By throwing contempt on me, personally, the Minister expected to diminish the value of my arguments. He, moreover, wanted to lower me so as to himself appear higher. If I judge by the constant attacks of a salaried press, he has succeeded to a great extent amongst those who are never so happy as when they make a point against a French-Canadian. But now that these events have long passed and years have elapsed, let us see what kind of a weapon the hon. Minister used on that occasion. As I said already, as the telegrams said (their being in cypher evidenced it) those communications were essentially private. What right had he to make them public ? He says : You had put upon the papers of the House a notice of motion asking for the correspondence. That meant official correspondence, but that did not entitle him to publish private correspondence, and to curtail it so as to give the same a false bearing. He could not publish it without violating the secrecy of friendship. He has shown by his action to what degree he may be trusted as a friend. You will remark, Mr. Speaker, that I am entirely on the defensive. I have to protect my reputation as a commandant of a volunteer corps, and I have to defend my battalion. Here I might at once declare that none in my battalion is directly or indirectly responsible for those telegrams. They were written by myself, upon my own responsibility. They were the result of conversations I had with experienced officers of the Canadian army, and with the civil authorities where I was located. I will give no names, because I do not want to implicate any one, or to enlarge the area of the discussion. I take my exclusive responsibility of the whole. As to the soldiers of the 9th, a set of men more devoted, brave, intelligent and competent could scarcely be found. Never did I find them hesitating to obey any order. One night, at Calgary's Fort, a report reached us that Indians had arrived and were surrounding and attacking the village, every one of the eighty men I had at the fort rushed to his rifle and wanted to go and meet the enemy at once. The trouble we had was to keep a few at the camp to mount the guard and protect it, as we were bound to do, against any surprise. I did, Sir, feel proud of such men. Now, Mr. Speaker, if my telegrams were wrong, if they exposed me to an attack of cowardice, why did the Minister encourage them, why did he ask for more and approve of the same ? Was it a trap he was setting ? If it was, that is a poor recompense for my devotedness to him personally and for all the steps I took to help him personally and politically. As Minister of Militia, he was representing the Government and the country. I leave both to judge of such treatment of a soldier who could have entrenched himself behind his parliamentary duties and not join his corps, but who preferred sacrificing every thing to help his country, and to prove that French-Canadians are as loyal as any other nationality to the Dominion flag, and were ready, at the peril of their lives, to work, with all the others, in the interest of the Canadian nation at large. I leave it to my fellow-countrymen, unbiassed by party feelings or passions, I leave it to history, to appreciate that way of acknowledging the services of a soldier who never contemplated anything else but the honor of his country and the maintaining of law and order. The hon. Minister and his friendly press will doubtless persist in misrepresenting me as they have done already. That I cannot prevent, but the ultimate result will not prove in their favor. Public opinion will be sufficiently enlightened to set matters right. It will be known and understood that what I wanted was to avoid immense expenses and loss of lives, and to adopt a judicious way of carrying out that war. I might apply to those who saw me at the head of my battalion and ask them if they did not find me up to my duty. I may ask what order did I ever



receive which I did not immediately comply with? What is the thing I have done wrong? Where is there any act of mine worthy of blame? In what circumstance have I lacked in bravery? I have insulted the volunteer force, exclaims the ministerial press, by saying that 500 scouts would be worth 2,000 volunteers for that kind of fight. Well, Sir, I still contend that I was right in that. Let every captain of a company say how many of his men had not yet fired one single cartridge before going to the North-West. The single fact of putting a military jacket on one's shoulders is not sufficient to teach how to drill and fire a bullet. Scouts would have been more competent because they would have been mounted, and could have followed the mounted enemy over the immense prairie, and because they were accustomed to rifle shooting. I never experienced more than then how wrong we are, in Canada, not to devote more of our efforts to rifle shooting. In the North-West, drilling was only secondary in importance. Skirmishing, extended drill and firing were the essential parts. Our population is as apt to learn as any population in the world, but it is too late to learn on the eve or on the day of the fight. And, now, as to the protection of forts and convoys of provisions. Those who have been to the North-West know of what importance it is. Those who understand anything about war, know of what importance it is generally. In the Franco-German war, one of the elements of success for Germany was the organisation of *étapes*, for the purpose of supplying the troops regularly, with food and requisites of every kind. "The securing of these communications in the war of German armies, was of the highest and most vital importance," say those who wrote about that war. The great Napoleon used to say: "An army marches on its belly." In the North-West hundreds, nearly thousands, of heavy teams were daily employed in the transport of provisions and ammunition. Millions of dollars worth of the same were concentrated in what we call forts, but which were really composed of a few wooden stores, with no protection; we were not in an ordinary country, where at every mile's distance, even at every acre, there would be plenty of houses and barns, and where we would find ample provisions to feed the troops. On the contrary, hundreds of miles had to be traversed before we could reach one single house, and provisions had to be obtained from immense distances. If I insulted the volunteer force in saying or insinuating that they were not ready for actual fight, I am not alone in the deed. At the last meeting of Dominion Rifle Association, General Middleton is reported to have spoken as follows:

"In the course of a subsequent discussion General Middleton declared himself a disbeliever in the so loudly praised efficacy of rifle shooting. He made the same statement at Wimbledon. Lying down on one's stomach and taking careful aim was a different thing to shooting amidst the noise and smoke of an action. Some of the men who made bull's eyes at targets would find themselves made bull's eyes of in real war. He grudged the money given to the association, because he could not get enough for the militia. It would be noticed that very few privates won prizes at these competitions. The prize-winners were the officers and sergeants. The General said it was necessary that more money should be spent in instructing the rural battalions. Amongst the country corps he had found that seven or eight out of every 25 men had never pulled a trigger." (*Globe*, Feb. 21.)

Moreover, I find in the *Mail* of the 22nd instant the following editorial remarks:

"While on this subject, the question of the shooting abilities of the entire militia force naturally suggests itself. The Major-General observed the other day that if 30,000 of our 37,000 defenders were placed in a field, with instructions to shoot at a haystack, the probability is that the haystack would escape without injury. This speaks well for the remaining 7,000 militiamen, who, it is fair to presume, are well able to strike a haystack when they try. It is a special compliment to this remnant because, as everybody knows, the very last thing that is taught a volunteer in this country is the use of the weapon he is required to carry. Light is thrown upon this subject by the reports of the musketry instructors regarding the performances at the various annual camps. The men are for the most part recruits, and the instruction they receive in shooting is, as a rule, brief and summary. They come

Mr. AMYOT.

forward in squads and pop away at targets at various ranges, and then return to their corps efficient defenders of our country. Some of the instructors plainly hint that the entire business is a farce. One explains, in his report of last year, that with few exceptions the men know little or nothing of firing exercises, and another declares that some are armed with rifles that are positively dangerous to the firer, a circumstance which naturally discourages the marksman, however brave he may be. At one camp 1,062 men shot, and but 205 or twenty per cent. were what are called first-class shots. At another, 1,249 men shot, and only 275 were first-class. The proportion of efficient men, it will be observed, is remarkably small. But the fault does not lie with the men. It lies in the system that withholds instruction from them."

"What the Government does not do in the way of encouraging shooting the Dominion and kindred rifle associations are designed to do. But they too fail when they pay so much attention to officers who are already efficient, and so little to the rank and file and to the men who really require encouragement. No excuse is deemed necessary for plain speaking on this matter. It is absolutely necessary that combatants should learn how to shoot. If they do not we shall have to fall back upon the Dominion Rifle Association exclusively in the hour of danger. Or, failing that, it will be prudent to allow the officers to do the shooting, and the men, who cannot shoot, to give the word of command."

Large quantities were spread in convoys extending, with considerable interruptions, for hundreds and hundreds of miles. Had my opinion prevailed, had scouts been provided to run after the enemy, what better use could have been made of the volunteers who were then in the North-West than to charge them with the protection of those forts and convoys, with protecting and securing the line of communication. Such was then and still is my opinion. I frankly communicated it to a man who had invited me to do so, encouraged me to go on doing so, whom I thought a true friend, a man of honor. I leave it to you and to the country to judge whether I was right or wrong in my appreciation of the hon. Minister's character and aptitudes. But let us go on with the narration of events, based upon the documents which I have partly in my hands and of the whole of which I ask the production. I want to quote these documents to show that the presence of the 9th Battalion and the 65th Battalion in the North-West was not useless, especially in view of the direct danger of a rising of the Indians, and that those two battalions did their duty as well as the rest of the army, which did its duty so well during the rebellion.

"RIVER SASKATCHEWAN, 15th May.

"DEAR STIMSON,

"I have cut myself adrift at last after every sort of damnable detention? Am too far for you to wait for orders from me. Use this as authorising to get from Colonel Amyot rations and use your men as you propose. They will be paid as home-guard. I have done what I could to help. Colonel Amyot will do the same if you go to him.

"T. B. STRANGE."

"To Captain STIMSON.

"You are hereby authorised to order 24 saddles for use of troops to be sent by express from Chicago. Better order by telegraph to save time.

"T. B. STRANGE."

You must not forget that there were two armies there—General Middleton's army and General Strange's army. The first was concentrated near Batoche, while the other had gone to Edmonton to join Middleton by going down the Saskatchewan. Here is another letter from General Strange.

"RIVER SASKATCHEWAN, 15th May.

"To Major WALKER.

"I am too far for you to wait for orders from me in emergency. Colonel Amyot is authorised to authorise expenditure for me, and Major Dowling to countersign orders on Hudson Bay Company for money payments. Col. Amyot reports you have not one home guardsman. There must be an error. You can get Winchesters for you if you apply to him. When home guardsmen are employed as scouts they can get their rations, or an equivalent in money. I cannot be incessantly altering orders as to pay. The Alberta Rifles, scouting at the front, get only \$1 75.

"T. B. STRANGE."

You will see that this authorised me to sign for General Strange, and so I did from that moment. I acted as quartermaster, paymaster, or commissariat officer, call it what you will. I had to examine the papers and sign these documents, and I was engaged in that from morning until night. Perhaps the Minister does not know that, but, if he sends for

the papers, he will see the immense amount of work I had to perform. There is here, in following the ver telegrams, a question in reference to the scrip, but as I am afraid to take up too much of the time of the House, I will not now enter into it. You, Mr. Speaker, were also engaged in this war, and you wrote to me from Edmonton on the 15th May, as follows:—

“EDMONTON, 15th May, 1885.

“MY DEAR AMYOT,—We are starved here. Send us provisions in abundance, arms, ammunitions and saddles. The General earnestly asks for all that. A letter from Lake LaBiche informs us that the Hudson Bay Company's store has been sacked by the Indians of Beaver Lake, incited by ten emissaries from Big Bear's band, and the Catholic mission is in great danger. The sisters have fled to an island on the lake. We want reinforcements here, and you must insist with Caron so that he obtains some for us. Roads are good. We would be charmed to have you to come here to relieve us. This country is magnificent. We have seen Bishop Grandin this afternoon. He is in deep distress on account of the way events turn.

“Have you any news from Middleton? What is he doing? Write me what he is about.

“Entirely yours,

“J. ALD. OUIMET.

“P.S.—Send us help in men, ammunition and provisions.”

Then another letter, which, like the last, is translated:

“FORT EDMONTON, 16th May, 1885.

“MY DEAR COLONEL,—General Strange writes to me and wants me to ask you to do your best so as to induce Walker and Stimson to immediately raise their scouts and he gives you power to authorise every expense for that. Don't you believe that everything goes very slowly? Decidedly we will spend the summer here. The great news here is that the Blackfeet are rising. What news have you got about that? Write to me.

“To you,

“J. ALD. OUIMET.”

The news was very bad. We received news from Gen Strange that he was lacking in provisions, ammunition and men, and we had no good news from Gen. Middleton's army. All around us there seemed to prevail great excitement, and we had information that the Indians were preparing to rise here and there. I sent a telegram to Col Evanturel on the 16th May, as follows:

“LT. COL. EVANTUREL,  
“Gleichen.

“CALGARY, 16th May, 1885.

“We received telegram that ammunition coming by trail from Montana for Riel. Do your best to have trails watched and get information. Riel is captured and prisoner in Middleton's camp.

“G. AMYOT.”

On the same date I applied to Gen. Laurie:

“CALGARY, 16th May, 1885.

“GEN. LAURIE,  
“Swift Current.

“Had to give ammunition to detachments. Forty rounds each left. Could you send me some and how much? We are surrounded by many tribes here.

“G. AMYOT.”

I must say here that the only orders I received at Calgary were to divide my battalion into four companies, of which I had to send two to Fort McLeod, 100 miles away, and the other two to Gleichen, Crowfoot and Langden. I received no directions as to what I was to do in any emergency. One of my officers, who was at Fort McLeod, Colonel Roy, a very valuable officer, wrote me on the 15th May, in the following terms:—

“MCLEOD, 15th May, 1885.

“LT.-COL. AMYOT,  
“Commanding, Calgary,

“DEAR COLONEL,—We have just learned that a convoy of ammunitions has to-day been seized by the Indians; that causes much anxiety here, the rumor having spread rapidly. Major Cotton tells me it would be very proper to increase the contingent at Gleichen, that is to say to reinforce Evanturel or to call him back to you, rather than to leave him with such a small force, the place being more exposed than any other on account of the Blackfeet. We consider here, and for good reasons, that the Blood and Piegan are not to be trusted—far from it. We have now to beware of the redskins as they have succeeded once. There are many of them here and in the surroundings.

“It would be very important, even of the highest importance that Major Stewart would not leave Medicine Hat, or at least would not go too far from it, so that we could get him to come here (to McLeod) at

the first signal. He is strongly inclined to remove further, which would be inopportune in the present time, as he would become entirely useless. The place the most exposed, I believe, with Gleichen and McLeod, is undoubtedly Calgary, so I believe that Evanturel's return to you would be most efficacious. I am told here that the Blackfeet may easily make a mouthful of Gleichen, and as there is nothing to be protected there, it is much better to go away from it than not to be stronger, than not to place there a strong force. We must not forget that there are here and in the surroundings large flocks of animals of all kinds to be protected, and that we are only 77 of the 9th and from 30 to 40 of the Mounted Police, so that Major Stewart must not go far away from Medicine Hat, and be ready to come to our rescue at the first signal. To these points are to be noted:—1. Re-inforce Evanturel or call him back to you; 2. Re-inforce yourself; 3. Prevent Stewart from going away from Medicine Hat, so that he may come to our rescue; 4. Protect the large flocks of animals near McLeod; 5. Not to trust the Indians more than necessary, more so after what has just occurred.

“A special courier takes this letter to you.

“THOMAS ROY,

“Lt.-Col. Commanding 9th Batt. V. Q., McLeod.”

Under the circumstances, after having received that telegram, after having received news from the north, from Gen. Strange, I wrote to the Minister of Militia in the following terms:—

“CALGARY, 17th May, 1885.

“HON. A. P. CARON,

“Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

“There are over 6,000 Indians surrounding Calgary. Up to now they have been peaceful, but many things indicate their joining Northern Indians in rebellion. Strange left when they were peaceful. Ordered the 9th, the only troops here for hundreds of miles, to be distributed in five detachments \* \* \* and left authority to nobody to modify according to emergencies. In case of Southern Indians rising each of these detachments would be valueless and destroyed. Here I have 50 men, forty rounds of ammunition, no gun, no cavalry, no scouts to protect the most important place, the key and protection of immense territory. Cotton, left in charge of McLeod, sends me a special courier urging the necessity of getting back my men from Crowfoot, Gleichen and Langden, where there is nothing to protect, and where they are of no use, and to bring them here, or myself go there to gather an effective force. Father Lacombe wants that also. But I have no authority, I must send to Strange, 300 miles north; he sends back by Calgary to Middleton, who sends back to him and him to me; delay, three weeks. I can easily, without expense, get scouts here, ammunition, artillery and guns from Winnipeg, and move troops so as to check and even defeat Indians, but am fatally condemned to inaction and absurd danger, useless to country. Sorry to disturb you, but you must help me, and organise at once defense in south-west section, so as to shorten delays of action. War in the north and in the south will be two different things, with no time to communicate between the two seats of war. Prevention of war here would be better than cure.

“G. AMYOT.”

I find in the *Manitoba Daily Free Press* of 13th May, a telegram in the following terms:—

“Reports have reached here that hostile Indians from Sounding Lake are on the war-path and making for Calgary. Reinforcements of troops are absolutely required here. After to-morrow there will only be three companies of the 9th. Quebec, here. More scouts are also required. Colonel Amyot is taking steps to supply the need. A portion of Major Hatton's mounted rangers will patrol the country between Edmonton and Red Deer. Indians are now on the Swift Current trail to intercept provisions.”

The Minister of Militia answered me in the following terms:—

“OTTAWA, 18th May, 1885.

“To Lieutenant-Colonel Amyot, 9th Battalion.

“Telegram received. The communication to General Middleton will inform you of result as soon as I hear from him.

“A. P. CARON.”

The same day I received from General Strange the following despatch:—

“VICTORIA, 18th May.

“Colonel Amyot.—I am informed 100 Snider and 50 Winchesters and 100 revolvers for this force arriving at Calgary. Don't send them without escort. None of 9th Battalion can be spared to go north unless other troops take their place. Ask for other troops. I have done so.

“T. B. STRANGE.”

While General Strange was forbidding me to send anything without escort, I received from General Middleton the following:—

“PINN'S CROSSING, 18th May, 1885.

“Lieutenant-Colonel Amyot, 9th Battalion.

“Hardly seems worth while to raise 20 scouts for such a purpose now.

“FRED. MIDDLETON,

“Major-General.”

The two generals held different opinions. General Middleton was far away from Calgary, while General Strange was in that section and knew that there was the great danger, and that it would be neither wise nor safe to send provisions or ammunition without an escort. If we refer to the Calgary press of that date we will see that the fears of the general were entertained by the people of that section. I received the following letter from General Strange:—

"VICTORIA, 19th May, 1885.

"DEAR COLONEL AMYOT,—Thank you for your kind letter. Your gentleness is a rebuke to my hastiness. You see I have a good deal in my hands and a good deal of obstruction from people it should not come from. Letters cross each other. I see now you have done all I ordered, and your judgment in sending on one company was correct. I am very much obliged to you for your energy and ability. I am sorry Mr. \* \* \* is so indolent but as I could not get him to do anything, I can't expect you to do so. I would dismiss him and appoint some one else, only I know no one fit.

"Yours truly,

"T. B. STRANGE."

"P.S.—I think it very important you should have the twenty scouts. If you can get no other arms for them, you might retain twenty of the Winchesters ordered for this force, using this as your authority. Of course, if you can get others I would rather you did not take them, but now the Indians will be raiding everywhere in small bands. Don't pay any attention to O \* \* \* people's rumors you will soon find out. They do nothing but talk; they will do nothing for their own defence, only try to rob Government by charging enormously for everything supplied to troops. I would be glad to see your battalion get a chance and am sure you and they would do your duty. Now you have sent forward supplies, you enable me to go on. The supplies have not yet reached me, but I advance to-morrow.

"T. B. S."

Then on 19th May, 1885, I sent the following telegram to the Minister of Militia:—

"CALGARY, 19th May, 1885.

"HON. J. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"Telegram about Middleton received; will wait. Strange and Oumet implore reinforcement of troops and arms and ammunition. Saddles ordered by Strange from Chicago are detained in Winnipeg for custom duties. Southern Indians still quiet; all well yet south and south west. Father Lacombe visiting Indians. No question of half-breeds here and Edmonton joining rebels.

"G. AMYOT."

The Minister answered me by telegram:

"OTTAWA, 20th May, 1885.

"Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Calgary.

"Know nothing about saddles; ammunition ordered from Chicago.

"A. P. CARON"

A few days afterwards I received a telegram from Winnipeg about the saddles:

"WINNIPEG, 20th May, 1885.

"Col. AMYOT,  
"Calgary.

"Eight packages saddlery all here for General Strange, given up by Customs and forwarded 14th instant.

"W. R. MINGAY."

On 21st May I telegraphed to General Middleton in the following terms:—

"CALGARY, 21st May, 1885.

"General MIDDLETON,  
"Clark's Crossing (to be forwarded).

"Colonel Oswald wires he is at Winnipeg, and anxious to go to the front. General Strange wants absolutely provisions that are here, ready to be sent, but I have no escort to send and cannot prudently send them without. Please send Oswald here. All is quite here and I will keep it so if you assist me to protect road to Edmonton.

"G. AMYOT."

The general answered me from Prince Albert:

"PRINCE ALBERT, 21st May,  
"via CLARK'S CROSSING, 21st May,  
"via QU'APPELLE, 22nd May,  
"22nd May, 1885.

"To Lieut.-Col. AMYOT, 9th Bat.

"Have just heard that you have telegraphed to the Minister disputing the disposition of your regiment. This is contrary to military discipline and you will refrain from doing so again.

"FRED. MIDDLETON,  
"Major General."

Mr. AMYOT.

I need not say that I was rather surprised to receive that telegram. I then prepared an answer to Gen. Middleton in the following terms:

"CALGARY, 22nd May, 1885.

"GENERAL MIDDLETON,  
"Commanding Her Majesty's Army, North-West.

"DEAR SIR,—I have just received your telegram of the 20th instant, by which you condemn my having telegraphed the Minister of Militia 'disputing the disposition of my regiment.'

"The telegram in question, sent by me to Mr. Caron, read as follows:

"There are over 6,000 Indians surrounding Calgary. Up to now they have been peaceful, but many things indicate danger of their joining northern Indians in the rebellion. Strange (General) left when they were peaceful and ordered the Ninth, the only troops here for hundreds of miles, to be distributed in 5 detachments not far from his ranche and left authority to nobody to modify according to emergencies. In case of southern Indians rising each of these detachments would be valueless and destroyed. Here I have fifty men, forty rounds of ammunition, no gun, no cavalry, no scouts, to protect the most important place, the key and protection of immense territory. Cotton, left in charge of McLeod, sends me a special courier urging the necessity of getting back my men from Crowfoot, Gleichen and Langden, where there is nothing to protect and where they are of no use, and to bring them here or myself to go there to gather an effective force. Father Lacombe wants that also. But I have no authority, I must send to Strange, three hundred miles north; he sends back to Middleton who sends back to him and him to me; delay three weeks. I can easily, without heavy expense get scouts here, ammunition, artillery and gun from Winnipeg, and move troops so as to check and even defeat Indians, but am fatally condemned to inaction and absurd danger useless to country. Sorry to disturb you, but you must help me and organise at once defense in south-west section so as to shorten delays of action. War in the north and in the south will be two different things with no time to communicate between the two seats of war. Prevention of war here would be better than cure."

"This telegram, in my mind, was not intended as a criticism, but as a report as to facts and suggestions which I thought my duty to make. You pronounce the sending of the same to the Minister contrary to discipline, and in the name of discipline I at once submit to your decision and will act accordingly in the future. I am surprised though by the turns events take. These telegrams were essentially private, in cypher, sent to comply with the Minister's request that I should keep him posted on my views about the campaign.

"I have done my best, up to now, to fulfil my duties to the best of my ability without ever grumbling or complaining. Some commandants have bitterly complained of their battalions being sub-divided, and have that way succeeded in getting them together again. I do not want to follow that example, and would feel sorry to embarrass my chiefs.

"Allow me please to add, as I now speak to you—and not as a complaint but as an information—that I find myself in a peculiar position here. When General Strange—a most worthy officer, a true soldier—went to Edmonton, he left the senior officer then here, Lt. Colonel Smith, in command of all troops south of him (so I am told at least). After my stayings at Winnipeg and Swift Current, I reached Calgary. Smith had then gone north to join General Strange, and nobody ever gave me instructions of any kind, save as to the relieving of Smith's detachments by detachments of my own battalion, and the immediate sending of Smith's detachments to Edmonton, to join the rest of Colonel Smith's Battalion. Those orders have been executed. What would be my duty, my power of initiative if circumstances happened to change, has not been defined. I understand: my duty is to await orders, and to defend myself if attacked, but could I order some of the detachments together in case of immediate and great danger? You would exceedingly oblige me by intimating me your wishes about that and the extent of my duties. Please believe that my earnest desire is to worthily fill my humble part in that painful war we all sustain for the maintenance of the British flag. Such was my only object in leaving my parliamentary duties, and I want to give you a support unlimited in its extent.

"I am also embarrassed as to the sending of provisions and ammunition to General Strange. I know he badly wants them, but there is no military escort here for them, and the teams are loaded. But I am reported by Major Dowling that teamsters refuse to go without escort. It is true that I never received instructions about that. But being the senior officer here, I think it my duty to report to you the facts as they are. Lt. Colonel Oumet left in charge of Edmonton also urgently asks for some men and lots of ammunition and provisions.

"Yours very sincerely,

"G. AMYOT,

"Lt. Col. Commanding 9th Battalion V.Q."

When I had prepared that letter I received news of the capture of Batoche and the surrender of Riel, so I refrained from sending it. On 22nd May I received from Lieut.-Col. Whitehead the following telegram:—

"WINNIPEG, 22nd May, 1885.

"Lieut.-Col. AMYOT.

"You command Calgary district, and must exercise discretion in protecting supplies. McGibbon must direct transport, studying economy and prompt delivery.

"E. L. WHITEHEAD,  
"Lieut.-Colonel."

On 27th May, I received from General Middleton the following:—

"Col. AMYOT, Calgary,

"BATTLEFORD, 27th May.

"Just heard from General Strange that he expects provisions from Calgary to Edmonton escorted by companies of Winnipeg Light Infantry and had directed Col. Onimet to send up company of 65th to Lac La Biche on being relieved by wing companies. Whose are these companies, and what troops have you got at Calgary? As far as I can make out there is no danger, either at Calgary or Edmonton, and now that the affair is nearly over, not likely to be. If you have not already done so, send them escort or no escort.

"FRED. MIDDLETON,  
Major-General."

On 27th May I received from General Middleton, at Battleford, the following communication:—

"Lt.-Col. AMYOT, 9th Batt.

"BATTLEFORD, 27th May, 1885.

"If all is quiet at Calgary, as it is here and everywhere else, as far as I know, since Riel's defeat, it will be quite prudent to send teams to Genl. Strange. At any rate, you can spare some of your men. Is there not home guard at Calgary? I have ordered Oswald to garrison Regina and cannot send him to Calgary. Beardsy has given in, Poundmaker is my prisoner and I am surrounding Big Bear under pain of giving attack, and with it accompanying scares is pretty near at an end."

"FRED. MIDDLETON,  
Major-General."

That statement was all right so far as that district was concerned where General Middleton was operating, but in our district the same condition of things did not prevail, as the following letter from you, Mr. Speaker, will bear out: (Translation.)

"DEAR CONFÈRE AND FRIEND—

"EDMONTON, 6th June, 1885.

"No news from Genl. Strange since 10 days. We are very uneasy here. If you have any news about him, please send the same to me."

"J. ALD OUMET."

Next, I received the following from the Minister of Militia, dated 19th June:—

"To Col. AMYOT, CALGARY.

"OTTAWA, 19th June, 1885.

"I do not see how you can organise a board, your battalion being alone at Calgary. No objection to your suggestion about Rocky Mountains. I am afraid sergeants' request cannot be obtained as their pay is fixed by Statute.

"A. P. CARON."

On 21st June, General Strange wrote to me as follows:—

"To Col. AMYOT.

"BEAVER RIVER via STRAUBENZIE, 21st June, 1885.

"I have notified Supply Officer McGibbon that no more supplies will be required for Alberta force via Edmonton. Make arrangements for return of 65th Regiment from Red Deer and Battle River. You will be glad to hear that the ladies of the McLean family, prisoners with Big Bear, are out of his clutches. They will soon, I trust, be in our camp. Big Bear himself has turned in his tracks, having, I suppose, got word that we are ahead of him. He has now gone south toward Turtle Lake, where Col. Otter is on the *qui vive*. Middleton has left me with orders to remain here while he moves round to Otter with cavalry.

"T. B. STRANGE,  
Major-General Commanding Alberta District."

On 26th June General Middleton sent me the following from Fort Pitt:—

"Col. AMYOT,  
Calgary.

"CAMP FORT PITT (via STRAUBENZIE) 26th June, 1885

"Take immediate steps to bring in all your detachments to Calgary that are not on the railway, as you pick these up on your way down to Winnipeg, and be prepared to move to Winnipeg by rail on receipt of further orders.

"FRED. MIDDLETON  
Major-General."

Then we began the work of preparing for our return, and by kind permission of the Minister of Militia and General Middleton we made a trip to the Rocky Mountains. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company gave us a free train and we went as far as the railway was built, and I am glad to take this opportunity to thank the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the kindness they showed us on that occasion. I next received the following communication dated 1st July:—

"To Col. AMYOT:

"MOLEOD, 1st July, 1885.

"Many thanks for your aid in courier matter. What we wanted settled with regard to the newspaper is all right. Words cannot convey the regret we experienced in parting with Colonel Roy and your companies. You may well be proud of reputation your battalion has gained throughout the territories. Kindest regards.

"JOHN COTTON."

"Carling P. O."

Before leaving this part of the subject, I think it is my duty to say a few words in regard to the action of the hon. gentleman who fills the position of Postmaster General at that time. The Postmaster General, who is now Minister of Agriculture, treated us in the best possible manner. He was most kind to the volunteers and the whole force appreciated his kindness, and it is nothing but fair that from my place in Parliament and on behalf of my battalion and all the other members of the force I should tender him our best thanks for the way in which he treated us while in the North-West. He afforded us the greatest possible facilities with regard to post office accommodation, he allowed us to send our letters free and he did all he could to alleviate our hardships throughout the campaign. On returning from the Rocky Mountains I received the following telegram:

"PRINCE ALBERT, 9th July, 1885.

"To Col. AMYOT,—Send me soon as possible concise report of steps you took to secure tranquillity of district. General Middleton does not think there was danger of rising anywhere but about Batoche. Also report how you pushed on convoys of supplies and detachment. Address to me, post office, Winnipeg.

"T. B. STRANGE,  
Major-General."

I prepared a report, of which I regret I have not a copy; neither have I a copy of the report of Col. Roy, who commanded the detachment at MacLeod, but I have copy of a report prepared by Colonel Evanturel, one of my best officers, and at this point I think it is due to that detachment to publish that report which has not yet been made public. It is as follows:—

"ON THE TRAIN en route TO WINNIPEG.

"To Lieut.-Col. G. AMYOT,

"Commandant 9th Battalion, P. Q.

"In compliance with a despatch addressed to you on the 9th instant by Gen. Strange, and which requested of you information as to the probability there had been of a rising among the Indians in the District of Alberta, I have the honor to make to you the following report:—

"On my arrival at Gleichen, Monday, 11th May, in command of the three detachments of Gleichen, Crowfoot and Langdon, I found that there was much disquietude and agitation among the white people of these three places.

"The Blackfeet, 2,300 in number, encamped a few miles from the railroad, and the three posts were quiet. Notwithstanding their quiet attitude it was necessary for us to be on our guard and to use great vigilance, because before my arrival the Blackfeet had been visited by certain Cree chiefs, among others, the one who bears the name of Little Pine, who afterwards was made prisoner by Gen. Middleton.

"The Cree chiefs had made all sorts of fine promises to the Blackfeet in order to induce them to make alliance with them. At Crowfoot, where fifteen of my men were stationed, before our arrival, disturbances had been caused by the Indians. The agitation had been so great among the white people of the neighborhood that the guardian of the section-house had thought it necessary one day to make his escape in a hand car, together with his family, such was his fear of being massacred by the Indians. At Gleichen the Blackfeet, peaceful in appearance, were constantly looking out for a quarrel, trying to do something wrong which would give them a pretext for commencing hostilities.

"They held regular and constant communications with the Indians of the North, and learned all the news from the seat of war sooner than we did, and almost as quickly as by telegraph. Moreover, we knew perfectly well that several Blackfeet, especially young men, had gone to join the rebels. We knew one named White Calf, chief of a band in the Blackfeet tribe, who, on his return from the north, paid several visits to us at the camp at Gleichen.

"On two different occasions there arose quarrels between the Indians and white people at Gleichen. It was necessary therefore that I should use the greatest prudence and observe the strictest impartiality in settling such difficulties, which might have resulted in the most serious endings. In every case the Indians who said they were injured rushed to arms and in the course of one of these quarrels an Indian took deliberate aim with his rifle, at close quarters, at a white man.

"I ought to say, that it is my conviction, that the presence of our soldiers in that part of the District of Alberta sufficed to check many attempts at quarrelling on the part of the Indians. Our uniform, differing from that of the Mounted Police, taught the Indians that we were regular troops sent by the Queen, which had the effect of inspiring them

with respect and a salutary fear which we worked to increase by every possible and legitimate means.

"Once more, I may say that but for our presence in the locality, the Indians would not have hesitated or delayed to harass and impose upon the white people and commit depredations.

"I have the honor to be, your humble servant,

"ARTHUR EVANTUREL, Lieut.-Col.,

"Commandant of the Detachment at Gleichen of the  
"9th Battalion Voltigeurs of Quebec."

We went down to Winnipeg, and I am sorry to say we were again encamped in a swamp. We were expecting daily to come back, and we endured our discomforts and did not complain. I take this opportunity to say a few words more of the 65th of Montreal. I think it my duty, Mr. Speaker, while on this subject, to mention your valuable battalion, because, very possibly, it is the last time the matter will come before the House. In going over the *Manitoba Free Press* of Saturday last, I found the following, which seems to be a fair appreciation of the value of our Montreal volunteers. It is from the *Winnipeg Free Press* of 23rd June, 1885:

"No praise is too great for the Winnipeg Light Infantry, and the two companies of the 65th for the cheerful manner in which they have borne all the weariness of the long march from Calgary here. The men have tramped nearly 800 miles without a murmur, and latterly on reduced rations. There is no sugar in camp, no beans, no potatoes, no cheese, no coffee, no barley, very little hard tack, no oats for the horses, no soap to wash with, no chewing tobacco; but we have plenty of tea, plenty of bacon, canned meat and flour, and on we have gone, floundering through water at times nearly up to one's waist, longing for home news, all as sunburnt and black as Indians, but though disfigured still in the ring. The men and officers of the 65th deserve high praise. A great deal has been said and written about the regiment which has been unfavorable. It is untrue and consequently unjust. For nearly seven weeks the two regiments have been brigaded together, have marched together, have been under fire together, and my opinion of the Montreal men is that they have borne their hardships bravely and cheerfully. Last Thursday the column marched 27 miles. There was no chance for any one to ride, for the horses and mules were hardly able to keep up with their regular loads, without the additional weight of weary soldiers, and yet those two companies of French Canadians marched into camp at 8 p.m. having started at 5 a.m., singing as cheerfully and merrily as though marching through the streets of Montreal, and the same is true of the Light Infantry. When ordered to go down into the ravine at Red Deer rivers when and where the bullets were flying lively, the boys in the dark green coats never hesitated for a moment. With the inexperience of young soldiers, they bunched up too much together while going over the uncovered ground and suffered in consequence, an error which Colonel Osborne Smith, with greater experience, took care his men should not commit, and herein is the secret of the casualties to the Montreal men, but never for one moment did they hesitate or refuse to receive their baptism of fire. Montreal may well feel proud of her boys, and it is time that the truth concerning them was known. As many of the Montreal men cannot speak or understand English, and as very few of the men of the Light Infantry can speak or understand French, it is impossible to fraternise together as cordially as all desire. But in spite of this, the two regiments are on the very best of terms and will long remember each other."

I am sorry that you, from your position, Mr. Speaker, cannot speak for the battalion you commanded, but that quotation will make up a little for it. We found it hard waiting so long for General Middleton, and I sent the following telegram to the Minister:—

"Hon. A. P. CARON,  
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"WINNIPEG, 11th July, 1885.

"Detaining troops here for a local circus asked by the hotelkeepers is a most unfair treatment to those who left all their affairs by necessity of war. It is a gross political blunder, useless expense, cause of demoralisation for the troops.

"G. AMYOT."

I received immediately an answer from the Minister of Militia in the following terms:—

"Lt.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Commanding 9th Batt., Winnipeg.

"OTTAWA, 11th July, 1885.

"I congratulate you on safe arrival. You will certainly not be delayed. Your friends all anxious to see you back.

"A. P. CARON."

I give credit to the hon. Minister that he took immediate measures that we should not wait any longer. He ordered the trains and the necessary steamers and we came back  
Mr. AMYOT.

passing Owen Sound, where we had a splendid reception, and in Toronto where the whole people turned out to cheer our arrival. This was, in fact, one of the most pleasant remembrances of our trip. I heard that Parliament was about to close and I telegraphed to the Minister asking permission to stop a short while here and serve as a guard of honor to the Governor General, and I received the following reply:—

"OTTAWA, 18th July, 1885.

"To Lieut.-Col. AMYOT,  
"Will be glad to see you all back, and I congratulate you and your men on what you have done.

"A. P. CARON."

"OTTAWA, 19th July, 1885.

"To Lieut.-Col. AMYOT,  
"With Midland Battery, Union Station.

"All right, will be delighted if you arrive in time.

"A. P. CARON."

We were received very gallantly in Ottawa by the then Speaker. His Excellency the Governor General was kind enough to address us some words of congratulation, and so did the hon. Minister of Militia. There was no question then of anything improper having been done by the battalion. Everything seemed bright, and everybody was satisfied. I am sorry that subsequent political events changed the whole of that. On our arrival at Quebec an immense gathering of citizens was held and an address was presented to us in the following terms:—

"To Lieut.-Col. Amyot to the Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers and Men of the 9th Battalion Voltigeurs de Québec.

"Near four months ago, in the worst season of the year for military operations, you have suddenly been called to take part in a remote expedition.

"Without being stopped by your personal affairs, nor by the supplications of your families, without being alarmed by the dangers which you would have to run, as well from the enemy as from the climate, you have, without hesitation, left your occupations, bid *adieu* to all you held most dear, and heartily throwing on your uniforms, a few hours afterwards, you were on board of the train which was to lead you, from place to place, to the foot of the Rocky Mountains.

"I would be untruthful if I affirmed that we saw you leaving with pleasure. Besides the regrets and anxiety of those who felt the departure of husbands, fathers, sons, brothers, intimate friends, we could not but see with grief that the war in which you were to be called to make so heavy sacrifices, to run so great dangers, was a war against compatriots. With what pleasure we would have seen you going to fight an alien stranger.

"But we were consoled by the ideal that law and public order must be sustained, that insurrection, excusable though it might have been, had to be repressed, and that the danger of excess against the unfortunates who had called to arms was less great when the repression was in your hands.

"To-day, our joy is without mixture of regrets and anxiety. To the pleasure of seeing you safe and sound amongst us is added the pride of finding that your conduct has been to the honor of your battalion, city, nationality and country.

"You have had no occasion to take part in a battle, but you have done something much harder, specially for men new in the military profession: you have, without complaining, suffered cold, hunger, fatigue, miseries of all kinds; you have, during many months, endured the garrison life in places far from civilised centres, deprived of all that may make life agreeable to men accustomed to live in a city as sociable as the old capital of the Province. To fight a battle personal courage suffices, and no man worthy of that name would lack that courage when occasion presents itself. But to endure what you have endured, to do what you have done, more than that is required; it necessitates that patience, that cool perseverance, that discipline which constitute military spirit, and which could not be too much praised in a volunteer corps of recent formation, without experience of active service. If you have shown such qualities in a war to which you were only called by your duty, and which you could not but deplore with every one of us, what could we not expect from you if—which God forbid—you were called to arm yourselves against an enemy from outside, who might invade our country, threatening our firesides? Each of those who proved themselves such good soldiers, when they had to fight misguided compatriots would be worth four men against an enemy for whom he would feel no sympathy.

"In welcoming with joy those who come back, we must not forget those who, having left us full of life and hope, have gone to die far from their families. I may assure the relatives of those last that they have the most ardent sympathies of the whole population of Quebec.

"Colonel Amyot, officers and soldiers of the 9th Battalion, in the name of our city, I tell you: 'You have well deserved of your country; we are proud of you, and we wish you the most cordial welcome.'

"Long live the 9th Battalion.

"F. LANGELEIR,  
"Mayor."

All went well for many months; but when the Riel affair came up, the papers in our section of the country attacked me, because I attacked the Government on the Riel question. My officers and men, all became, and I think justly, indignant at that, and when I was leaving Quebec to attend to my duties in Parliament, the non-commissioned officers and men of my Battalion held a meeting, and passed the following resolutions unanimously—I read them because they are testimony from my men, which I never asked or suggested in any way, but which is the expression of their spontaneous feeling:—

“Resolved, that the non-commissioned officers and men of the 9th Battalion, V. Q., protest with all their might against the dishonest accusations proffered by certain newspapers of Quebec against their worthy commandant and themselves; that they are happy to declare that during the whole of the North-West expedition he has shown towards them a constant devotedness, an indefatigable zeal for their welfare, that he shared their miseries and fatigues and won their sincere admiration and attachment.

“That in many circumstances their commandant has exhibited an extraordinary energy to protect them and to promote the interests of every member of the 9th Battalion.

“That he has guarded their morals and conduct, and it is due to his exertions and those of our superior officers that the 9th has come back without a stain.

“That he has always been encouraging us by his example and urging upon us to work for the pride of Quebec.

“That the accusations proffered against him and us are false, malicious, and it is to be deplored that they are made by compatriots from our own city.

“That we pray for the happiness of our commandant, and that we desire to assure him of our unalterable attachment.

“That these resolutions be communicated to him at his departure for Ottawa, where, we doubt not, he will well know how to vindicate the honor of the battalion, so grossly and so unjustly slandered.

“Sergt. EDWARD LEBEL,  
“Secretary.”

Well, Sir, before that time the hon. Minister of Militia had been knighted, and I felt proud of the fact, because he was a member of this House and a compatriot of mine, and I sent him a letter of congratulation. I have nothing to change in that; I think it was right for the Queen to confer that honor upon him. To that letter of congratulation he replied:

“St. PATRICK, 19th August, 1885.

“To Lieut.-Col. AMYOT.

“Many thanks for your congratulations, which I accept with much pleasure from you.

“A. P. CARON.”

Another letter of his to me says:

(Translation.)

“RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, 10th August, 1885.

“DEAR COLONEL AMYOT.

“\* \* \* I am glad to hear by Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice that you have been admirably received by your friends of Bellechasse.

“Yours truly,

“A. P. CARON.”

This ends what I wanted to say about the 65th Battalion and about the 9th, so far as I am concerned. But there is another part of my motion, which relates to Major General Strange. I do not intend to enter personally into a discussion of that point, though there are some views which I think it my duty to lay before the country. I will content myself with quoting the following letter to *La Presse* of Montreal:—

“MILITARY COLONISATION RANCHE,  
“P. O. GLEICHEN, ALBERTA, N.W.T.,  
“26th July, 1886.

“SIR,—An article in *La Presse*, Montreal, 17th July, called my attention to the report of the Minister of Militia for the past year. I obtained a copy through a friend, as the department did not honor me with one.

“I am pained, but not surprised, to see the extraordinary injustice done to the gallant troops I commanded in the late campaign, especially to the 65th Battalion; though they are not alone, as ‘Steele’s Scouts’ and the ‘Alberta Mounted Rifles’ are absolutely omitted in the list of troops engaged in the campaign, as shown in the statement on the back of the map, from which the locality of ‘Frenchman’s Butte’ has been erased.

“In the Deputy Minister’s report, page xi, no mention is made of the casualties in the action at that place—‘Frenchman’s Butte’—the very existence of which has been so carefully suppressed.

“For myself it does not trouble me that the rank and file of major-general, which Her Majesty did me the honor to confer, has also been suppressed. This occurs in the case of no other officer mentioned in the report. Part of the report in question purports to be based on extracts from newspapers.

“It is a novelty to base official reports of military operations on disconnected and unauthenticated extracts from newspapers, when the official reports of the officers themselves are at hand.

“The singular egotism of the report in question ignores the first advance of the Alberta field force for the relief of Edmonton, and would make it seem that the force having miraculously appeared in Edmonton, commenced operations on the 20th May, the words being: ‘20th May, Strange, Edmonton, with 65th by boat, rest by trail.’ As a fact the 65th did not leave Edmonton by boat, but marched to Victoria.

“The object aimed at is evident to any casual reader of the report, and you will not be surprised to hear that a part of my official report has been omitted altogether. As it concerns the reputation of the soldiers I commanded it is to be regretted that an official report to Parliament must become the basis of history, which it will falsify by its omissions, which answer the same purpose as perversion of facts.

“I thank you for the justice with which you treat me. It is a contrast to the injustice I have suffered at the hands of Her Majesty’s Imperial Government, which has deprived me of my pension for the half year during which I left my home and sacrificed my private business, as did many others, to save this fair province from desolation and bloodshed.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“T. B. STRANGE,

“Major General, late Com. Alberta Force.”

“MILITARY COLONISATION RANCHE,

“P. O. GLEICHEN, ALBERTA, N. W. T.,

“1st October, 1887.

“To the Editor of the *Tribune*, Calgary, Alberta.

“SIR,—I am disinclined to bring forward a disagreeable subject which I have left a long time in abeyance, hoping for some explanation, or at least an answer to my letter to General Middleton, dated 17th June, 1887, asking if he or Sir Adolphe Caron had any objection to my publishing that part of my report which had not been published, despite the statements to the contrary. I have tried to do my duty to Canada as soldier and civilian for 16 years. If I leave her shores in silence, it would imply that I could not substantiate my statement ‘that a portion of my report had not been published and unnecessarily delayed.’ Such silence would moreover be unjust to the force I commanded.

“My despatch reporting the action at Frenchman’s Butte, 28th May, 1885, was in General Middleton’s hands two or three days after the event, as also Major Steele’s despatch to me of the action at Loon Lake, which I forwarded at once to General Middleton, who, moreover, received a duplicate copy (direct from Major Steele). That despatch has never been published.

“The despatch from Frenchman’s Butte was not published till the *Canada Gazette* of 22nd August, 1885, after my personal remonstrance on the subject.

“The bulk of my report was not published for a year after, *i. e.*, in May, 1886, as an appendix to the general report laid before Parliament, and then a portion was omitted, which I now request you will publish, in justice to those I commanded, and the only means left me of proving my statement as to a portion of my report being omitted.

“General Middleton is reported in the *Montreal Herald*, 10th August, 1886, to have stated to a reporter of the *Star*, with reference to the suppression of part of my report: ‘Neither the Minister of Militia nor myself are to blame, for I handed in to Sir Adolphe the exact report furnished me by Major General Strange.’

“In answer to the question: ‘Does the report appear in the Blue Book exactly as you turned it in?’ Answer: ‘Exactly, not a comma has been changed.’

“When last in Ottawa, I saw General Middleton personally on the subject and pointed out to him what had been omitted from publication. He admitted the omission, but said that both he and Sir Adolphe Caron did not consider the omitted portion of any consequence, and that he (General Middleton) did not concur in the conclusions I had made. He also gave reasons (in which I do not concur) for the non-publication of Major Steele’s report. Subsequently, when I saw in the *Canadian Militia Gazette*, 9th June, 1887, that Sir Adolphe Caron had stated in Parliament (in reply to a question from Lt.-Colonel Amyot) that the only written reports received from General Strange were included in the general report published on the North-West Rebellion, and would be found in the appendices D and A, I wrote to General Middleton, as he had been my superior in rank during the campaign, asking if there would be any objection to my making public the unpublished portion of my report. Having waited upwards of three months for a reply, I request you to publish the following:—

“Omitted portion of Major General Strange’s report on the suppression of the North-West Rebellion, exclusive of the report of the action at Loon Lake, where Major Steel commanded, of which there is no copy in my possession:—

“RÉSUMÉ OF RESULT.

“The work done by the force under my command, and the results may be briefly stated as follows:—

“The cattle districts in the heart of the Indian reserves were secured, the frontier patrolled, and Indians and Fenian incursions prevented, and telegraph communication established.

"These results were mainly obtained by the raising of ranche cavalry and home-guards, supplemented by the presence of companies of infantry at Fort McLeod, Crowfoot, Gleichen and Calgary. These detachments secured the country against the rising of Blackfeet, Bloods, Piegans, Sarcees, &c., protected the railroad and prevented its abandonment by the Canadian Pacific Railway officials during the strike and alarm.

"No doubt the feeling of alarm was much exaggerated, but could not be otherwise, owing to the utter absence of arms among the settlers, and the impossibility of getting any from the Government.

"The transport and supply was extemporised, without even the embryo of the establishments considered necessary in a civilised country while our difficulties were increased by the complete absence of army supplies in the wilderness country through which we passed, and the want of road, telegraph, or even mail communication.

"Nevertheless, the rapid march of the 3 successive columns of this force, stamped out the incipient seeds of active rebellion among the turbulent tribes who had already commenced depredations, more of whom would have joined the Eastern outbreak but for the timely appearance and location of troops on their reserves, while a famine was prevented in the districts north of Edmonton by the convoys of provisions brought along the protected line of communication.

"A flotilla was built at Edmonton; a further supply of provisions collected, and the hazardous and delicate operations of moving troops simultaneously by land and river, in open boats, touch being maintained throughout, and a final successful junction effected within striking distance of the enemy.

"Not a day's delay occurred from start to finish, though our base of supply was more than 500 miles from our objective.

"The excellence and carefulness of the scouting almost precluded any chance of disaster, and quickly discovered the position of Big Bear, who was immediately attacked, the result being that although the numerical inferiority of our force prevented the capture of his position, his band was broken up and demoralised, the majority of the prisoners released, and the subsequent pursuit by the cavalry of this force under Major Steel completed the surrender of the remainder of the prisoners, the total dispersion of his band and his ultimate surrender. Not a shot was fired in connection with these results except by the Alberta Field Force, with only a loss of six wounded.

"Plainly drawing attention to these results is a duty I conceive due to the officers and men I feel it an honor to have command. By their patient endurance, sense of duty, courage and steadiness under fire, these results were produced."

"Your obedient servant,

"T. B. STRANGE,

"Major General, late Commanding Alberta Field Force."

I really do not know why this report has been suppressed. I cannot understand the reason, but I believe it was suppressed at the order of the Major General. Well, I do not recognise his right to suppress it; or if he has the right, I say he has exercised it wrongly. There is nothing in that report which does injustice to the troops that fought under General Strange's command, and there is no reason why General Middleton should keep to himself the whole glory of the campaign when Major General Strange earned a large share of it. I communicated with General Strange after he had left for the United States, and he wrote to me from Illinois, on March the 3rd, 1888, the following letter:—

"CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S., 23rd March, 1888.

"My dear Colonel AMYOT,

"I have only just received yours dated 9th March, enclosing No. 9 of Votes of House of Commons, in which I see your motion as regards suppressed report and answer of Sir A. P. Caron, in *Daily Citizen*, which, however, makes a mistake in calling it the excised portion of a letter. It was portion of an official dispatch or report of military operations, over my signature, which no one had a right to alter or excise without my permission. If General Middleton thought I wrote anything untrue, he should have said so in his report or asked me to withdraw it. As it is, he first distinctly denied having omitted any portion, and then, when I spoke to him face to face and told him I had kept a copy of the report, he admitted that a portion had been omitted, but it was of no importance, &c. What Sir A. P. Caron said in the House, you know. If the days of duelling were not passed—I would say the two knights, Sir Fred. and Sir A. P. were liars—publicly; but as public opinion does not seem to be shocked at falsehoods from public men, it is no use to say anything beyond proving that I though not knighted am not the liar. And I send you copy of a letter I wrote which was published in the *Tribune*, Calgary, &c., with it a copy of the omitted portion of the despatch. When I wrote the letter, 26th July, 1886, I did not know exactly how much had been omitted as no copy was sent to me, and I borrowed one for a short time. Nevertheless my letter of 26th July is correct. I suppose my letter containing copy of omitted portion of despatch which was published in *Calgary Tribune*, October, 1887, you did not see. As I said before, I send you manuscript copy. As to any further steps you may take, 'being likely to add in any way to the harshness with which (you say) I have been treated by the Canadian Government,' you are welcome to take any steps you please. The Canadian Government cannot injure me any more than they have done. 'Damning with faint praise,' they have done worse.

Mr. AMYOT.

The absolute ignoring of a general who commanded an army in the field, in a practically independent command is, I think, unknown in the late annals of the British army, and in the eyes of the world condemns a man to a stigma. My friends in England were so much astonished that 3 or 4 letters had not been added to my name, that they enquired at Colonial Office, War Office and Home Guards, why I was ignored. They were told that the Canadian Government had been silent on the subject. Perhaps the Imperial Government would not have taken away my pension, had my services to the Canadian Government been in any way recognised by them or reference made to my services to the Imperial Parliament by the Dominion. In answer to your other questions, I have only received the daily pay and allowance of a colonel (not those of a major general) for the number of days I was employed on the public service. I have received no other compensation or remuneration for my services. I applied for \$500 compensation for the expenses I was put to by having to leave my home and put my family in safety at Calgary—at extra expense as you know also for the loss to my business, &c., and the loss of 5,000 young trees which, having been packed in long cases, some fool thought they were rifles because addressed to me, and they were sent north. The \$500 compensation was refused to me, though \$10,000 would not repay me, for the Military Colonisation Ranche was ruined by my absence. The Claims Commission, however, paid the company for thirteen horses killed by Indians, and about 40 head of cattle driven off. I personally got no compensation. The Military Colonisation Ranche has been made to suffer through the hostility of the Blackfeet, who openly said they would be revenged on me for leading the troops against them, and burn me out of the country. They have done so by burning the ranch, which they could do with impunity. The North-West Mounted Police at Calgary gave no protection. Had there been no police in the country the ranchmen could have taken the matter into their own hands. I am trying to arrange for the sale of the ranche and of my property there. I hope shortly to be on my way to England, so soon as I can settle my affairs."

Further on he says:

"Sir A. P. Caron, in his answer, said I had been paid \$2,000 (which was not even the pay of my rank) but he forgot to mention that his partner in the monopoly of Canadian honors got \$20,000 in addition to his pay as a general! Of course I cannot compare myself to a man who was wounded in the hat! I enclose you cutting to show you that in vote of thanks every one is mentioned, including doctors and commissariat, but not the Alberta Field Force. Please return the cuttings. I mean to keep them as remembrance of the reward of my Canadian service.

"Yours truly,

"T. B. STRANGE."

I am not the only person who takes interest in the way in which General Strange has been treated by his brother in arms, General Middleton. I have here a letter from the Hon. Mr. Joly. I do not know whether he intended it to be published or not, but I think he will forgive me if I read it now:

"LEOLERCVILLE, P.Q., 14th April, 1888.

DEAR MR. AMYOT.

"General Strange leaves for England by the 26th of this month. You know how many services he paid to Canada since he came to Quebec; how he has virtually created our artillery; how many times he has been called upon to maintain order in Quebec; with what courage and moderation he has fulfilled that task; how he behaved in the North-West rebellion."

In fact, I saw him in Quebec during the time of the riots. He was there commanding the Citadel corps. He was in the midst of the firing, and people were killed at his side, but he never hesitated in his duty and in compelling the mob to keep the law. Mr. Joly goes on:

"And now he goes back to England, ruined, discouraged, without even the least mark of gratitude from the country to which he devoted himself for so many years, without the least evidence to show to his former companions in arms in England that he has done his duty. It would be so easy for the Federal Government to recommend him to the Imperial Government for one of those honorary distinctions, such as have been obtained by every one of the English officers who came here to serve the Canadian Government. Do you see any means of obtaining that consolation for a generous man, who deserves the esteem of all generous men? Do you believe I could do anything to help him? Is it better that I address myself directly to Sir Adolphe, or should I write to the papers to awaken public sympathy? Now that the poor General is going for ever, he will no more be in the way of anybody. We may, without fear, judge him upon his own merits and recompense him if he deserves it. That recompense will cost nothing to the Dominion, and for General Strange and his children it would be a precious gift.

"Truly yours,

"H. G. JOLY."

I hope, these facts being laid before the Government, that they will take them into consideration, and will find some way of recognising the services of that brave general, who was perfectly ruined in consequence of the war. He had a

nice business in the North-West, but that was ruined. He had to leave his ranche, and he suffered such losses during the war that afterwards he had to sell everything he possessed. But General Strange is not the only one who has been unfairly dealt with. The country had, in the North-West, the services of another most valuable and distinguished officer, the youngest but not the least of the Major Generals of the British Army, my hon. colleague, the member for Shelburne (General Laurie). By his night and day's exertions, and the benefit of his vast experiences, Canada has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars, in the mode adopted by him for transport of supplies. If that branch of the service had entirely been left to him, we would not have experienced the capture of convoys and prisoners. But he seems to me to have been also a victim of that premeditated plan of cumulating upon one head the whole merit of the campaign. Then, can I forget the able commandants of battalions, some of whom died during a glorious career, including the regretted Colonel Williams, and who were all so very effective in organising their corps and leading them amidst hardships of all kinds, to the benefit and glory of the country? Not one of them has deserved one of the honors or honorable mentions invariably conferred upon the officers of corresponding rank in the British Army, under identical circumstances. No mention of Colonel Otter, who, with the gallant Queen's Own Rifles, a regiment of which any country would be proud, "B" Battery, Ottawa Sharpshooters and Battleford Volunteers, who took so effective a part in the fights; no mention of Major Steele, of Colonels Grassett, O'Brien, Tyrwhitt, Scott, Smith, Bremner, Denison and others. I might speak also—but I know he does not want me to do so—of our brave Surgeon-General; but he forbade me to say a word of him, and I will not do so. It is a well known fact that in England, at the end of every campaign, the title of C. B. is conferred upon every officer commanding a regiment, or any officer holding an equivalent rank. For officers of junior rank, a distinguished service order has been introduced. I might sum up the whole of these lengthy remarks by saying: 1st. In giving publicity to private telegrams, the Minister of Militia has betrayed the secrecy of friendship and lacked the sense of honor. 2nd. In curtailing and isolating them from surrounding circumstances, he has misrepresented them so as to mislead the public and most unfairly charge a soldier with want of courage and bravery. 3rd. In doing so, he has been most ungrateful towards a devoted partisan and friend, most unfair to a commanding officer of one of the two French battalions which went to the North-West, and whose conduct had received general and unlimited approval. 4th. He had himself called for those communications, had encouraged and approved of them, and, therefore, he was either sincerely then approving them or setting a mean trap. 5th. The military authorities have moreover suppressed that part of the official reports which related the share his fellow French countrymen had taken in the suppression of the rebellion, the noble way in which they had acted. 6th. They have treated with deplorable injustice Major General Strange whose past and actual services had been most useful to the country. 7th. They have failed in their duty in not recommending the superior officers who took part in the war, for Imperial honors, as it is usual in similar cases in England. By monopolising those honors upon the Minister of Militia and General Middleton, they have proved ungrateful to the Canadian force at large. Mr. Speaker, I have been defending myself. I might have attacked others—spoiled some reputations; but I do not feel the necessity of lowering any one in order to raise myself. I would have remained silent, perhaps, if the attacks made upon me concerned only myself. But, under the circumstances, it is my honor as a soldier which has been attacked, and as such it belongs to my country, and I would be a coward indeed if I did not defend it. I now with con-

fidence leave the whole case in the hands of this honorable House and of my fellow countrymen.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I always thought, and do so, possibly, more to-night than I ever did before, that life is too short to fight the same battle over and over again. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and who, no doubt, believes, and properly, that he has been contributing somewhat to the history of Canada, in the long speech he has delivered to-night, has, more than once, come before this House, and in different terms, and otherwise than he has done to-night, has laid before Parliament and Canada his interpretation of the events of the North-West. Sir, I shall be brief in the few remarks I intend to address to you in answer to the speech of the hon. gentleman. He states that it has been asserted that the services of the 9th Battalion were offered by him, and he has denied that statement. Mr. Speaker, my memory so far has been accurate in reference to the events which have been so often brought before Parliament. I remember the circumstance well—the hon. gentleman volunteered his services and the services of the battalion which he commanded. Moreover, I think that there are gentlemen still living who know whether I am wrong in making this statement, or whether the hon. gentleman has forgotten the circumstance under which he offered those services. Sir, I never for one moment hesitated to give the hon. gentleman the credit which he deserved for having offered his services, and the services of his battalion, to fight the battles of his own country. As we all know, at that time the North-West was in the hands of a man, or rather of a set of men, who were trying to subvert the Government of the country, who were trying to subvert the laws of the country—who were getting up a revolt in that part of Canada. Can it be said that there was a soldier in the volunteer force of Canada, which has always been so ready to answer the call of duty—is it possible to suppose that there was one soldier, or one commandant of a battalion, who would have refused to take service to maintain law and order and to defend the flag of his own country? Sir, I never accused the 9th Battalion, and the 9th Battalion has never been accused by anybody, to my knowledge, on the floor of this Parliament, of having failed to do everything that could have been expected of any one of the battalions of the militia of Canada, in the emergency which at that time arose. The hon. gentleman has cited the telegrams and letters which he has read to the House, and which indicate that whenever I had an opportunity of expressing my opinion, whenever I was given an occasion to speak of what our troops were doing at the front, and on the field of battle, I invariably expressed my admiration for the manner in which the 9th Battalion had fulfilled the duty which had been confided to them. It is perfectly true that I took every opportunity to say that the officers and men of the corps had done their duty, as Canada had a right to expect that every one of her volunteers would do on such an occasion. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says—and it is impossible for me to understand why there should be any difference of opinion between us on that point—in one breath he says that I have attacked the 9th Battalion, and in another breath he read my telegrams where I congratulated him upon the success which attended his efforts to leave Quebec as rapidly as possible, and to get to the front, and upon the manner generally in which his battalion had fulfilled the duty which had been entrusted to it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that at Winnipeg, in an interview with the reporter of the *Free Press*, he expressed his anxiety, and the anxiety of the 9th, about going to the front. Well, Sir, we all knew—no one in the Province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, suspected for one moment that the 9th would have desired



to remain in Winnipeg when fighting was going on at some distance from that city. Sir, I knew the hon. gentleman and I have never accused him, as he has insinuated to-night, of not being as brave as I know him to be; but the hon. gentleman immediately takes up the cudgels, because I congratulated him upon his success as a warrior, and immediately he turns around and says: "You have abused me, because you said I did not want to fight." Well, Sir, I have never, in any interview or in any utterance which I have ever made in Parliament or out of Parliament, that I can recollect—I never in any way spoke of the hon. gentleman, except in terms similar to those expressed in the telegrams and letters which have been read by him to-night. The hon. gentleman has kindly stated that he did not accuse the Minister of Militia of having been at all careless or negligent in providing for the comfort of the troops, but he has said that when they got to Winnipeg the officers and men were like animals who were put in a swamp, and they had to stop in a place covered over with water. I regret exceedingly, as we all regretted it at the time, the severe test to which our militiamen and the force of Canada were placed, but I must remind the hon. gentleman that he took the quarters which had just been vacated by Colonel O'Brien's battalion, and I never heard any great complaint from Colonel O'Brien or any of his men. It may have been, I am quite prepared to admit it, that at the time when the hon. gentleman succeeded to Colonel O'Brien in that particular camp it may not have been in quite so favorable a condition as it was when occupied by Colonel O'Brien and his men. But I must say that under those circumstances, and the hon. gentleman knows it better than anyone else, it was impossible to do more than was done to meet the requirements of the force which was being sent to the front. The manner in which the officers and men of every battalion bore the hardships of the campaign has been the theme of admiration not only among Canadians but by people abroad, who have spoken with admiration of the manner in which our men withstood the hardships of the campaign. In so far as the Department of Militia was concerned, it was impossible at that moment and with the very short notice that was given to have prevented the hardships that occurred. The hon. gentleman has read several telegrams, and has stated that I, as Minister of Militia, telegraphed him: "I place implicit confidence in you and your battalion." I did. I never heard the statement contradicted except by the hon. gentleman himself. Although the hon. gentleman who, as he says, was a friend of mine at the time, a gentleman whom I had met time and again not only in Parliament, but out of Parliament as a friend, suddenly turned round and urged this cruel war against me. I never attempted to attack the hon. gentleman. I never had any quarrel with the hon. gentleman. It was only when the hon. gentleman attacked me, when he called upon me as a Minister of the Crown to produce letters and telegrams which were laid on the Table of this House, that the difficulty arose between us. I never attempted to publish or to open my lips about anything which had been communicated to me by the hon. gentleman until he made a motion in 1886, as follows:—

"Motion for correspondence containing letters and telegrams exchanged between General Middleton and Lt.-Col. Amyot during the expedition of the 9th Battalion to the North-West; also between the Minister of Militia and the said Lt.-Col. Amyot during the same time."

It was my bounden duty, I could not possibly avoid it, to produce the papers, and telegrams, and letters which the hon. gentleman himself as a member of Parliament insisted upon having produced; and the hon. gentleman has cast a slur upon my conduct for having produced those telegrams which he says were of a confidential nature. I have here every telegram and every letter which the hon. gentleman ever signed and ever addressed to me, and I say that no

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

telegram or letter marked private has ever been produced or published by me. The hon. gentleman says this difficulty is between ourselves. Why? The hon. gentleman had a plan of campaign of his own, and it did not altogether agree with the plan of campaign of the Major-General who was commanding the force. I had confidence in the hon. gentleman; but the Major-General was in command of the whole force, and naturally I had to allow the operations of the campaign to be conducted by the general commanding. I can understand why the hon. gentleman in that telegram tells me this matter is between ourselves, because if that telegram had been communicated to the Major-General, no doubt the hon. gentleman would have been severely censured, if not punished very severely, for having communicated it to me. The point I wish to make is that no telegram sent by him, no letter sent by him to me and marked private has ever been published or brought down by me or spoken of in Parliament or out of Parliament. I have a number of his letters here and a number of telegrams which have never been published, and which I do not intend to publish, and I repeat that none of his communications marked private have been published. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, said that at certain places provisions had been wanting, and the troops had not all they expected to have or should have had. That may be, but it was a proud moment for any man who had at heart the interests of Canada that, after that campaign was over and the men who had gone to the front returned, not a word of complaint was ever uttered. It may have been—I am perfectly certain it must have been—the case, that, at particular places, and under certain circumstances, the provisions were not what they should have been. But our men withstood all the discomforts and fought under those hardships which were absolutely indispensable to such a campaign, and I never heard a word of complaint. Why—when the battle, has been fought and the men have returned to their homes and when they have done their duty—should this question be now brought forward? Why go back to those by-gone issues, to those events which properly now belong to past history, and which it can serve no good purpose to again bring forward and thrust before the notice of the public. It may have been that some provisions were wanting, and I am certain they must have been wanting. There must have been times when our men suffered for want of provisions, but I have never heard a word of complaint from any battalion, and I am confident it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had not again brought forward this matter. But I am attacked by the hon. gentleman in connection with the death of two of his comrades in arms in the North-West. I wish to put myself before the country and before Parliament in the position which I did take upon that occasion. The hon. gentleman says that Blais' pockets were rifled, and the few dollars found there were utilised by the officers of the department for the purpose of burying him. I have never boasted of what I done in this case, and I have never placed before Parliament the orders which were signed by myself and sent forward in reference to Blais. I telegraphed to Lieut. Colonel Lamontagne, Winnipeg, as follows:—

"Let me know out of what funds have been paid funeral expenses of Private Blais. Has it been done totally at the expense of the Government?"

"A. P. CARON."

I got an answer from Winnipeg:

"Partly of Blais' funds and balance by Government, under his uncle's, Mr. Beaudrie, of St. Boniface, direction. Letter explaining sent on 28th."

"E. LAMONTAGNE."

Mr. AMYOT. Did the hon. gentleman say his telegram was sent to me? I did not hear the beginning?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The beginning is a telegram from Winnipeg addressed to me at Ottawa, which I have read, and on the back of the telegram signed by myself I wrote :

"I wish all funeral expenses as already stated to be met by Government. In Blais' case there should be no discrimination made.

"A. P. CARON."

The hon. gentleman can see that it was not by my instructions that the pockets of Blais were rifled for the purpose of meeting the expenses of his funeral, for the first telegram which I sent was a telegram stating that I wished all the expenses connected with his funeral to be met by the Government. Of course I could not know what had been done up there, but my instructions to the officers of the department were such, as the telegrams and despatches show, and I could not be held accountable for what had taken place. I may moreover state that in letters received from Mr. Beaudrie, the uncle of that young man who died in Winnipeg, he insisted upon his contributing a share towards the funeral expenses. The next man to whom the hon. gentleman has drawn my attention, is the one who died at Calgary (Marois), and the hon. gentleman said that the expenses connected with his funeral have been deducted from the pay of Major Dowling. It may be true or it may not be true, and when I say it may be true I do not mean at all that the hon. gentleman said what he did not think to be true, but in so far as the records of the Militia Department are concerned, it is impossible to trace that anything has been deducted from Major Dowling's pay, or from any other officer's pay, to meet the funeral expenses of anybody. I did not know that the hon. gentleman was going over every incident of that campaign and I naturally was not prepared, as I might have been, to meet the charges which he has made on these different points. But so far as speaking from memory goes, I may say that so far as Marois is concerned no money was deducted from Major Dowling's pay to pay his funeral expenses. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot), when reading the letters which he was kind enough to read to the House, and in which he was kind enough to express his satisfaction at the manner in which I had been trying to do my duty as head of the department at that particular time, says that when he got to Ottawa everything had been all right. The hon. gentleman recollects well how happy we were all to greet him on his and his comrades return from the North-West. Your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, opened up the portals of the presidential hall to the volunteers who were returning from the North-West, and everyone, no matter what his nationality who happened to be in Ottawa, met together as one people glad to welcome them back, and to greet the volunteers who performed their duty so well. On that occasion, Sir, the hon. gentleman again expressed the satisfaction at what had been done. The hon. gentleman says it was all right up to the time he got to Ottawa. Well, everything was all right until the hon. gentleman chose to make it all wrong by attacking his old friends and by accusing them of having committed every possible atrocity, when they had only been doing their duty, as men who had been trusted by the country to do their duty as public men. The hon. gentleman has also stated that after the Riel matter the papers attacked him. Possibly they did, and I can say for one that they attacked more than the hon. gentleman. There were a good many persons who were severely criticised for the part they had taken in those sad events, but the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the newspapers, if they did attack him, attacked him because they said he had not been altogether consistent. They said that when he had been up in the North-West he praised everything that had been done, and that when he got back, thinking that those events might be fatal to the friends he had been supporting in politics for a number of years, he changed his views at that particular

moment, and he immediately turned around and attacked those whom he had been supporting for a great many years. If the papers did retaliate it was because the hon. gentleman had placed himself in that position in which he could be fairly attacked for not having been altogether consistent in the course which he followed. Now the hon. gentleman has also referred to the report of Major General Strange. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) has, I believe, expressed the view that this matter would not come before Parliament any more, and I really think it is time that it should not. I should like to place before you the report of Major General Strange in reference to the paper which the hon. gentleman says was sent to me by that officer and which was not produced or which was not published in its entirety :

"MEMORANDUM: Upon the application made by the hon. gentleman in Parliament (Mr. Amyot) on Monday next Address to His Excellency for copies of official correspondence between the Government and the commanding officer of the 9th Battalion, 'Voltigeurs de Quebec,' during the North-West Campaign of 1885 and respecting the same.

2. Copies of reports furnished to the Government and military authorities by Major General Strange, respecting the part that he took in the rebellion of 1885, as well as those respecting the dividing up of the forces under his command."

"3. Copies of the report furnished to General Strange by the Commandant of the 9th Battalion, V. Q., respecting the operations carried out by the said 9th Battalion during the said campaign."

I am now going to read to you the report made to me by Major General Fred. Middleton and signed by himself. This is the original document :

"There does not appear to be any correspondence on record in the Adjutant General's Office, between the Government and the officer commanding 9th Battalion Voltigeurs de Quebec, during the North-West campaign of 1885. Secondly, reports by Major General Strange, respecting the part he took in the North-West campaign of 1885, are to be found commencing respectively at pages 43 and 51 of the Annual Report on the Militia of 1885. There is nothing on record on the subject of dividing up the force under command of Major General Strange. Third, there is no report on record at Headquarters made by officer commanding 9th Battalion to Major General Strange, respecting operations carried out by said 9th Battalion during said campaign."

This is the official report from which I took the information which I conveyed to the House when the hon. gentlemen asked for the production of that report, which I said I could not produce. Now, I have very little to add to what I have stated. The hon. gentleman has been complaining a good deal of the papers which were produced, and of the papers which were not produced. It seems almost impossible to satisfy him; but I have so many of these valuable contributions to history that I am perfectly willing to allow the hon. gentleman to make his own selection of what he would like to be published, and what he would like to be left aside. But everything which has been produced and which can be produced will tend to show that there never was a misunderstanding between the hon. gentleman and the department up to the moment that he himself, returning from the campaign to Quebec, changed his front completely, and attacked the friends whom he had been supporting for so many years. One point I wish to call attention to. The hon. gentleman says that in publishing the telegrams which I did bring down to Parliament, I accused him, or made him appear, guilty of cowardice, I never accused the hon. gentleman of cowardice, and my telegrams to him which he has read indicate that, far from that, I stated time and again that I placed implicit confidence in him and his battalion; and why should he say that those telegrams which I published gave him the appearance of being guilty of cowardice? Why, they are the telegrams he himself wrote and sent to me; and surely I could not do better than give the opinion he himself entertained of his battalion and himself than by reading the papers he placed in my hands. I defy the hon. gentleman, however, to state that those telegrams or letters were private. It was on the motion which he himself made in Parliament, and which I was bound to obey, asking me to produce every letter and telegram which had been exchanged between the

Minister of Militia and the commandant of the 9th Battalion, that I produced those letters and telegrams; and if anybody is to blame for their production, it is not the Minister, who obeyed the Order of the House on the motion of the hon. gentleman, who immediately turned around and complained of the production of such papers. In any case, I sincerely hope that these discussions on events which are now past will not recur as often as they have done in the past. I think we ought all join together as much as possible to try and pacify, instead of keeping up, the agitation which has been caused by those events. So far as I am concerned, I have never attacked the hon. gentleman. I have defended my department whenever it was attacked, as I mean to defend it whenever it is attacked by the hon. gentleman or any other gentleman; but I never, directly or indirectly, insinuated or hinted or said anything that could lead the hon. gentleman to stand up and state, as he did to-night, that I had accused his battalion and himself of cowardice. I never did; and the whole record of that campaign shows, fortunately for Canada, that there were no cowards among those who went to the front to fight the battles of the country. Every battalion did its duty, French and English, as one people, as we should be, all joined together to protect law and order when they are threatened; and I for one never, directly or indirectly, accused of cowardice any portion of that corps which I admired so much for having fulfilled its duty to the very utmost. I may add that, in so far as the production of the papers is concerned, the hon. gentleman's object no doubt was to make his speech, and to place himself right before the country; but it would be impossible, from any precedent known, to bring down the reports sent by one general of a division to the major-general, and to lay them before Parliament. The other papers the hon. gentleman has; he has read every letter and every telegram, and, consequently, it would be useless to put the Government to the expense of a very voluminous return, containing papers which he has in his possession and which he has read to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no intention of entering into this discussion, which is largely personal between my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia; and even if I had the inclination, I frankly confess that I have not the knowledge of the facts which would enable me to do so. But one or two facts connected with this discussion have been elicited which call for a comment or two. The gist of the charge, which has been made more than once by my hon. friend from Bellechasse against my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, is that the Minister of Militia brought forward and gave publicity to certain telegrams of the hon. member for Bellechasse, which, presented in that manner, were liable to make him appear guilty of cowardice. To this charge the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia is that he never produced any telegrams or communications from the hon. member for Bellechasse except what he was forced to bring by the Order of the House upon a motion made by the hon. member for Bellechasse himself in the Session of 1885. Now, if my memory serves me rightly, this statement of the hon. Minister of Militia is not altogether accurate. So far as my memory serves me, my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia, brought down, at one time, some telegrams sent by my hon. friend, the member for Bellechasse, which, from the manner in which they were brought, appear to have been produced, not with the view of doing my hon. friend justice, but with a view of making a point against him. The occasion was the motion of the hon. member for Montmagny, at that time Mr. Landry—a motion of censure upon the Government for the execution of Louis Riel. To that motion the Government answered at once by the mouth of the Minister of Public Works, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works was followed by my hon. friend

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Now my hon. friend from Bellechasse, as a soldier, did his duty—and did it well, according to the testimony now given by the hon. the Minister of Militia—in quelling the rebellion; but as a member of Parliament, as a political man, he seceded from the Government party which he had formerly supported, because in his opinion, the rebellion he had aided, and properly aided to quell, had been excited by the Government themselves. Upon that occasion he chose his ground, and seceded from his friends. At a later stage of the debate the Minister of Militia followed, and then, for the first time, those telegrams—not all the correspondence and telegrams which had passed between my hon. friend from Bellechasse, while he was commanding his regiment in the North-West, and the Minister of Militia, but one or two of them—were produced; and these, taken by themselves, might convey the impression that my hon. friend had been guilty of cowardice; and, certainly, listening to the Minister of Militia on that occasion, as he brought down those telegrams—telegrams which were brought down, not upon a motion, and not when the hon. gentleman was speaking as Minister of Militia, but when he was speaking as a member of the Administration, endeavoring to shield it from the censure which was then impending—it was impossible to come to any other conclusion but that they were brought down to make a point against my hon. friend from Bellechasse, and not with a view of doing him the justice to which he was entitled.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They were brought down on a motion.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion had not been made then.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, it had.

Mr. LAURIER. My memory is not in accord with that of my hon. friend. At all events, on the 17th or 18th of March when the hon. gentleman spoke, the papers to which he now alludes had never been brought down to the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend will allow me just to give him one date. The motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse was made on the 11th of March, and I spoke on the 17th.

Mr. AMYOT. It was a notice of motion; the motion was never made.

Mr. LAURIER. The notice had been given on the 11th of March and the motion had not been made, the papers had not been brought down; and when the hon. gentleman spoke, he spoke, not as the Minister of Militia defending his own department, but as a member of the Administration, defending the case of the Administration; and he chose to select one or two telegrams of my hon. friend from Bellechasse and lay them before the House. I put it to the hon. gentleman to say whether his intention could have been other than to humiliate my hon. friend. Well, my hon. friend promptly resented the conduct of the Minister; and I leave it to the Minister of Militia to say if his conduct on that occasion was guided by the rules of military honor or of friendship, which, up to that moment, had existed between him and my hon. friend. This is the gist of the charge brought by my hon. friend, a charge which he has brought more than once since with a view of exculpating himself from the insinuations made by the Minister of Militia on that occasion. I am glad to see that at last my hon. friend has succeeded in his object and extracted from the Minister of Militia the admission that during the campaign of the North-West my hon. friend acted like a brave soldier.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I always said so.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, the hon. gentleman was not so understood. Passing to another point of the discussion, I

would like to call his attention to the question of the funeral of the man Marois. My hon. friend from Bellechasse, who was in command of the battalion, chose to give this man a military service, and I am sure his (my hon. friend's) object was praiseworthy, and I am sure also his object must have met with the approbation of the Minister of Militia. His object, no doubt, was to elevate the morals not only of the troops but of the whole population, and it was quite proper that an impressive service should be held over the body of one who had fought in the service of his country. But, to day, it appears, after three or four years have passed, that the expenses of that funeral service have not been paid. The statement has been made by my hon. friend, and is not denied by the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say that it is impossible to find any trace of anything of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. Will my hon. friend tell me, if he had been willing to exert himself a little, he would not have been able to find out whether that was the case or not. If the funeral expenses have not yet been paid, their non-payment is a disgrace to Canada, and I do not admit the excuse that the hon. gentleman is not able to find out. I have more confidence in my hon. friend than he has in himself. I am sure that if he will exert himself ever so little, he will be able to find out whether this is the case or not. If it is he will make it his duty at once to see that such an error—I will not qualify it by stronger language—should be remedied at once. I have a few words to say about General Strange. I have no censure to make of my hon. friend. I willingly give him the credit for having during the whole of that campaign discharged his duties in a manner most creditable to himself, but I believe also, if my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will exert himself, he will be able, not only to find what he has been unable to discover, so far with regard to the funeral expenses of Marois, but will also be able to have justice done to General Strange. Everyone who knows General Strange knows that he is a most deserving officer, brave soldier and honorable man, who did his country good service in her defence in 1885. Yet it appears that General Strange complains that a part of the report which he made on the operations during the campaign never found its way into the report of the Minister of Militia;—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not my report.

Mr. LAURIER.—and we have the statement made by the Commander of the Forces, that the whole of General Strange's report has been published. I will not lay the blame upon General Middleton or General Strange, but there is a strange discrepancy between the statements of these two officers. General Strange complains that the whole of his report has not been brought to light as it should have been, yet we have on the other hand the statement that everything which came from General Strange has been published. This is a most lamentable state of things, indeed, in the department of my hon. friend. My hon. friend ought to see at once that there is something wrong somewhere, when two honorable men, such as General Middleton and General Strange are making statements so opposed to each other. Perhaps, my hon. friend will say, on this question also, that it is impossible to find out who is in the wrong and who is in the right. Again I have to say to my hon. friend, that I have more confidence in him than he has in himself, and that if he will only exert himself a little he will find which is in the right.

Gen. LAURIE. I have occupied a seat for too short a time in this House to be able to follow the points raised by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), but I must express an opinion based on what the Minister of Militia has said, differing from him to some extent. He regrets that this matter has been brought forward this evening. From my

point of view, I am exceedingly glad it has been brought forward, because the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has most industriously and carefully collated a history of the transactions connected with the service of his battalion, and has produced documents showing the views of the Minister of Militia in regard to him throughout the whole campaign, and showing that the reports which were commonly current through the country, reports which were industriously spread abroad by candid friends, who are often too candid in their expressions of opinion, were devoid of foundation. Imputations have been levelled against my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse that he was not zealous in the campaign, and imputations have been levelled against the Minister of Militia that he had not acted fairly towards the hon. member for Bellechasse. We have had it shown to-night that the Minister of Militia was in candid, free and frank communication with the member for Bellechasse during the whole of that campaign, and it is exceedingly satisfactory to find what the relations were which existed between them at that time. It is true that, from a military point of view, those relations were not what they should have been. As a soldier, I cannot recognise as correct the communications which passed between these gentlemen behind the back of the Major General. It is evident that there was a misunderstanding between the two gentlemen who were corresponding. The Minister of Militia naturally considered no communications as private. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) would have gone outside of his duty if he had communicated with the Minister in any other manner than privately. I am to blame to some extent for this misunderstanding. The hon. member for Bellechasse was under my command, and a very good soldier he was, and I do not hesitate to say so. He and his battalion were under my command, and I never wish to have a better battalion than the 9th Battalion of Quebec. I had also some English soldiers, and, if I were to have a command in the field, I would wish to have a combined force of those two nationalities, French-Canadians and English, and in such a case I have no doubt that Canada would come well out of any difficulty. But, whilst I recognised that I was in a position of command, I could not help recognising, in regard to the hon. member for Bellechasse, as in regard to other hon. gentlemen, such as my hon. friend opposite who was then commanding the 35th Battalion, that we were friends, as well as occupying the position of commander and commanded, and I have no doubt that, in the dual capacity of members of this House, supporters of the Government and officers commanding a battalion, communications may have passed between member and Minister which would hardly comport with the position of a commander of a battalion and the Minister directing the civil branch of the Militia. As I said, I was myself to a certain extent to blame. I have no doubt that some of the views expressed by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) may have come from me. We chatted at different times. Of course, soldiers on duty and off duty are necessarily in a different position. We chatted as to where money might be saved, and no doubt the potentialities and the possibilities were discussed, and no doubt out of these possibilities were evolved the suggestions which my hon. friend from Bellechasse made, believing them to be private, to his friend the Minister of Militia, who, being Minister, apparently looked upon everything coming from him as official. We have evidence that everything in the militia of Canada is not always conducted with due regard to regularity. We have the evidence of a resolution passed by the non-commissioned officers and privates of the battalion of my hon. friend from Bellechasse, when he was coming up here, expressing confidence in him. These things are, of course, entirely contrary to the Queen's Regulations, but I do not know that, on the whole, the militia force is the worse for

it. It shows the good feeling which exists between officers and men. As to the services rendered by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and others, who were not fortunate enough to be in the front rank, in the fighting rank, it is thoroughly understood amongst soldiers and administrators, and those who are in the military service, that the duties discharged in forwarding supplies and guarding the lines of communication are of as great importance as facing the enemy in the field. The House of Commons in England mourns the loss of one of the most distinguished officers of the British service, Colonel Duncan, who was on the line of communication on the Nile in the campaign which had for its object the relief of Khartoum. He was decorated by the Queen and received high honors for the faithful discharge of his duties on that line of communication. The Great Napoleon, speaking of his troops, said it was not the actual collision of the troops with the enemy in which the highest skill of a general was shown, but he said that an army marches on its stomach, that it has to be fed, and that the men who are charged with the supply of an army, with the furnishing of its ammunition and of its daily food deserved greater credit and had greater responsibilities than those who met the enemy in the field. In the latest report of the English Commission on the Civil Establishments of the Army, we have the evidence of Lord Wolseley, who certainly may be recognised as an authority on military matters. In answer to a question, he says that the officer in command of the lines of communication: "Is to be a military officer of rank, who at the same time is to be the focus in which all the civil departments of the army are centered. All the different strands of the rope, or the different strands of the various civil departments will be united in him, and he, as a military officer, will be responsible for the feeding and the supplying of the army in front, while at the same time he commands the lines of communication and is responsible for their defence." For this very reason, a military officer of rank, of experience, and of judgment and of known courage is placed in that position. A member of the committee asked if it was intended to make a kind of Intendant General, to which Lord Wolseley replied: "that it was not so intended, but that it was intended that the head and most of the officers, and perhaps all the officers eventually, should be military." Another member of the committee asked the question: "Combatant officers in fact?" Lord Wolseley said: "Combatant officers—in fact, staff officers—because they would be the only ones fit to be placed in charge of such a commission." There is Lord Wolseley's opinion, and he recognises that the most important position in which he can employ his best officers is on the line of communications, which have to be defended in case of emergency. Here is another point to show the dangerous position which that is. He is asked if the public would know, in such a case, whom to hang in case of failure. Lord Wolseley replies that now it would be very difficult to find out whom you could hang. It may not be out of place to refer to the story of Sir Thomas Picton in the Peninsula War. He was a quick-tempered man and was afterwards killed at Waterloo. He was determined that his troops should be fit for fighting, and one day he summoned the commissary and said to him: "If my men do not get their rations to-morrow morning, I will hang you." The commissary went to the Duke of Wellington and complained. The Duke said: "Did he threaten to hang you?" The commissary repeated that he did. "Then," said the Duke: "If I were you, I would take precious good care to have the provisions ready, because Sir Thomas Picton is a man of his word." We have heard it stated across the House that no imputations have been levelled against the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) in this House or by the Government. It is true that mistakes have been made, but it is not likely to those who know the hon. member for Bellechasse, who have met him

Mr. LAURIE.

on the platform or in the House, who know that he is a man with the courage of his convictions—is there anyone who does not recognise that he is one of the most pugnacious, one of the best fighting men in this House? Knowing him to be of that character, it would be childish for us to charge him with anything approaching the term that has been thrown at him outside; it is wild talk. The hon. gentleman knowing that we do know him, may be assured that no such idea of him is entertained by any man in this House, or by any man in a responsible position outside of it. It is wild talk, and he can well afford to disregard it.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not persist in pressing my motion, as my object has been attained, and I beg to thank the hon. gentlemen for the kind words they have uttered in my favor. As to Marois' funeral, I want to say that my authority is Major Dowling's letter, which I read to the House.

Gen. LAURIE. If I might say one word in explanation, I took upon myself the responsibility, as acting on behalf of the Minister, of paying all the expenses of sending Marois' body on to his regiment, that he might receive a military funeral.

Motion withdrawn.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North-Western Junction Railway and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Jamieson)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 77) to further amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Interest Company.—(Mr. Cockburn)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Wires of Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Companies of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Small)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Super-phosphate Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I acknowledge with thanks the Address you have loyally adopted, in answer to the Speech with which I opened the Session.

I receive with satisfaction your assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful and full consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 21st February, 1889.

#### ENQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BOWMAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government whether they intend to bring down a return which I moved for last Session, in reference to the receipts and expenditures of fire insurance companies? At this stage of the Session, it would scarcely be worth while to repeat the motion, because it is not likely that it would be reached.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look into the matter.

#### PRIVILEGE—SECRET SERVICE FUND.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before the Orders are called, I would like, with the consent of the House, to make a statement with regard to certain articles which have been published in some newspapers, both in Canada and outside of the country, based, I have no doubt, upon a letter contained in the last report of the Auditor General. I dare say the letter is quite familiar to hon. gentlemen who have seen the report. The Auditor General does not give his own letter to me; but the letter which I sent to him in reply, I will read:

"INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT,  
OTTAWA, Jan. 17, 1889

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 15th inst., calling my attention to two payments to me out of the 'Preventive Service' expenditure for 1887-88, for which there are no vouchers except the paid checks, and asking me to furnish you with information as to the disposition of these sums.

"This information I must, of course, decline to furnish. The sums referred to were expended in accordance with the intention of Parliament.

"I am, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
"JOHN COSTIGAN."

This letter seems to have been made the basis of those articles published in the newspapers which I will not now take up the time of this House in referring to; but no matter how questionable a newspaper in this country may be, articles published in it are sometimes copied into papers outside of the country. I, therefore, attach some importance to them; and in order to set myself right, I ask the House to bear with me while I explain this matter. Following the publication of this letter by the Auditor General, these papers took up the question, and declared, in connection with some proceedings before the Parnell Commission now sitting in the O. d. Country, that the secret service fund of this country was placed at my disposal, that I controlled that fund, and that very likely out of that fund I had paid money to the gentleman whose name has appeared in the press lately as that of LeCaron. So far as the members of this House are concerned, I do not think it would be necessary for me to deny that; but for parties outside it may be necessary for me to state, in the first place, that I have nothing to do with the secret service fund at the disposal of the Government. Every member here knows that for my department, every year, besides the appropriations to pay salaries and contingencies, a certain sum is set apart, called the Preventive Service Fund, out of which the Minister is authorised to make, without giving any vouchers, such payments as he considers to be in the public interest. On very few occasions have I exercised that right during the eight years that I have been in the depart-

ment. I think not more than three or four occasions. I think the largest amount I have ever drawn from that fund was \$500 during the last year covered by this report. I must state to the House that the expenditure last year was about \$18,000 for the preventive service. Some payments are made at times without giving names or vouchers, for reasons well known and understood by Parliament when voting the money. I state that the whole \$18,000 has been expended and accounted for in the ordinary way, like other public moneys, except the \$500 referred to. I stated, of course, to Mr. McDougall, the auditor, that I did not think he had the right to ask for vouchers for the \$500 expended, and when he discussed the matter with me, he agreed that I was right, but he said I should take him into my confidence. This, I said, I was not obliged to do. I merely state, so far as Mr. Le Caron is concerned, that I never heard of him until I saw his name mentioned in the Press, that I had no occasion to use him, and that he has never been employed in my service. I am not looking after the secret service in any respect, but solely after the Inland Revenue Department, and every dollar of money paid out of my department including the \$500, has been paid to Canadians for services rendered within the Dominion of Canada in connection with my own department. Neither to men like Mr. Le Caron nor for services which he claims to have been rendered, and which, according to certain writers, entitle him to my sympathy, has any money been paid by me or through me or my department.

#### SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. I now rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the question of the Fisheries, and to the position in which the relations between Canada and the United States stand with reference to this question. I submit at once, and it is a proposition to which no dissent will, I am sure, be offered, that there is not at this moment a more important question to Canada; and I submit at once also, that it is urgent that upon this question the Government and Parliament should speak promptly and with no uncertain sound. The only reference made to this subject by the Government at all since the opening of the Session was the paragraph contained in His Excellency's Speech to the effect that since the Washington Treaty had not been ratified by the American Senate, nothing remained for Canada to do but to continue to exercise her rights as prescribed by the Convention of 1818, until some satisfactory adjustment was arrived at by treaty between the two nations. In the early days of the Session, the hon. gentleman who represents the counties of Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), gave notice of a motion which was intimately connected with that subject. One would have expected that the Government would have availed themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them, to expose fully and minutely to the House the course they intended to follow and the policy at which they had arrived. But when this motion was called, it was postponed once, twice, three times, four times and five times, and every time at the request of the Government. A few days later, when my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), put the question to the Government, whether they intended to continue or not the *modus vivendi*, the answer he received was the convenient, ever at hand, always serviceable answer: "under consideration." It must then have become evident to every man in this House that the Government, upon this question, had no policy to offer, that they hold, as they have held of yore upon that and many other questions, an irresolute, vacillating, halting and hesitating policy, and that they will continue such policy until the time for deliberation will be passed, until the time for action will well nigh

have passed away, until every action, even if taken in the right direction, will be taken too late and probably remain barren of result, powerless, perhaps, to repair the possibly irreparable injuries that may have been done in the meantime. Under such circumstances, when the Government refuse to rise equal to the duty of the hour, when they refuse to discharge the duties which are incumbent upon them, it becomes the duty of the Opposition to come to the front, to clear the way, and to show the Government what is the duty of the hour and what is the course which should be followed in the interest of the country at large. Were this a purely domestic question, the temptation would be great, perhaps, to fold our arms and to wait and profit by the ever-increasing embarrassment of the Government; but the issues are too great, the consequences are of too serious a character, and it is better, by far, to set aside all party tactics.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, better by far to lose all party advantage and to point out at once where the wrong is and where possibly may be obtained the remedy. What is the situation? At this moment there is an Act, which is the law of the neighboring Republic, whereby at any moment the President of the United States is authorised to close to our ships all entry to American ports, nay more, to prevent importations into the United States of any goods coming from Canada; and when we consider the fact that the exports last year of goods from Canada to the United States, exceeded the sum of forty million dollars, we have the evidence at once of the magnitude of the possible evils which may await Canada, should such a policy be put in force. This is the situation as it now exists. Here are the two principal offsprings of that great mother of nations, England, standing side by side, with every inducement of blood, of common origin and of a common history extending back into ages, to stand together on terms of the most intimate friendship, yet with their relations having reached such a degree of bitterness and hostility that at any moment we may have commercial war. A few days ago, in another debate, the opinion was quoted of an hon. gentleman who occupies a very high rank in the estimation of his party and country, Sir Charles Tupper, to the effect that the line is very thin which separates commercial war from actual war. His words may again be quoted as perfectly applicable to our present position. He said:

"We stood face to face with a Bill providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war. I need not tell you that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between the two countries, but that it involved much more. If that Bill had been brought into operation by a proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates commercial war between the two countries from actual war."

Still, even not going so far as Sir Charles Tupper went on that occasion, the fact remains that the situation, even if it means nothing else than commercial war, is a most deplorable one. Well, for that situation I say that the Government of Canada is largely responsible. I do not say solely, but I say largely responsible. Justice and fairness compel me to say, and I say it frankly, that in many things the Government of the United States, in their conduct towards Canada, were as blameable as the Government of Canada were towards the United States. If I were an American and stood on the floor of Congress, I would deem it my duty to say to the American people, how, where, and when their conduct has been wanting towards Canada in fairness and generosity. But I am a Canadian, and I stand here on the floor of Parliament, and I deem it my duty to show to the Government where they have erred, where they have committed wrong, and where in my estimation it is possible to undo the

Mr. LAURIER.

wrong which has been done. Sir, on this side of the House we are of the opinion that, from the moment the American colonies severed their connection with the mother land, the most satisfactory relations that ever existed between the mother land and the new Republic, and between that Republic and Canada, were the relations which were created by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. This is our belief; and upon that belief we act. We have made it an article of our programme to obtain, if possible, not merely a restoration, but an enlargement of that treaty. We have made it an article of our programme to convince, if possible, the two nations that it would be for their mutual benefit to restore and to enlarge the provisions of that treaty. There was a time not yet far distant, when to a large extent the Conservative party held the same views. They made those very views the basis of that system which since, by a strange misnomer, has been called the National Policy. The resolution introduced by the right hon. gentleman, at that time sitting on this side of the House, which has been the gospel of the new doctrine, which has been more than the law and the prophets to his party, has been often quoted to this House, and I might be dispensed from quoting it again, but the memory of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House is so short, so defective, so deceptive, and so treacherous, that it may be an act of charity again to quote that motion, and to show them the downward career they have followed ever since. The motion, after reciting all the benefits which were to follow from the adoption of the vague, indistinct policy which was called the National Policy in those days, went on in the following language:—

"And moving as it ought to do in the direction of a reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually reciprocity of trade."

That was the aim—a reciprocity of trade—and what is the result? Non-intercourse and a commercial war. Well, we believe that, as far as the hon. gentleman meant to have reciprocity of trade, he could not have adopted a worse policy than the policy which he adopted to achieve the end he had in view. Be this as it may, we on this side of the House still believe that the golden era of the commerce of Canada was the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty. It was not so only on account of the material prosperity which it assured to the people of Canada, but the treaty was also connected with other advantages, the importance of which no one can deny. First of all, it set at rest, for the time being, that ever vexing question of the fisheries. Then it tended to create and cement a growing amity between the two peoples. It is the individual experience, and it is the national experience as well, that amity will ever follow in the path of mutually advantageous trade relations; but, unfortunately, the growing amity, consequent upon that treaty, received a rude shock at the time of the civil war in the United States. It is a matter of history that, in that great struggle, when the existence of the Republic was trembling in the scales of destiny, the sympathies of the Government of Canada, and of a large number of the people of Canada, were not on the side which fought for right, and which eventually triumphed. In this, however, the Government of Canada were not more remiss than the rest of the civilised world, because, in that great struggle between freedom and slavery, the heart of the civilised world did not beat in favor of the side which was in favor of freedom. Even England, which had only a few years before abolished slavery in her own dominions, abetted the cause of slavery by covert acts, as far as possible, though not by overt acts. It was not that England sympathised with slavery, or did anything but hold it in abhorrence, but there was something which England, or at least the governing class of England, dreaded still more than slavery, and that was the democratic institutions of which the Republic was the embodiment, and

which were then on trial. Times move fast in our day. The England of 1889 is no longer the England of 1861. To-day, England is almost a democratic country. We have recently seen a scion of the English aristocracy attempting to organize a Tory Democracy. Who, in 1861, would have imagined it possible to see those two words combined? In that respect, the England of 1861 was very much the same as the England of 1775, and the state of feeling in that country in 1775, which led to the rebellion of the American colonies, is spoken of by Mr. Green as follows, in his "History of the English People." Speaking of the tyrannical and despotic measures of the English Government, which finally drove the colonies into rebellion, he says:

"And behind all these grievances lay an uneasy sense of dread at the democratic form which the Government and society of the colonies had taken. The Governors sent from England wrote back words of honest surprise and terror at the levelling principles of the men about them. To statesmen at home the temper of the Colonial Legislatures, their protests, their bickerings with the Governors and with the Board of Trade, their constant refusal of supplies when their remonstrances were set aside, seemed all but republican."

Those feelings which actuated the English Government and the English Parliament in 1775 were the feelings which actuated the governing classes of England in 1861. It was the same thing with the rest of the civilised world. A French writer said in the early part of this century, referring to the American Republic: "just let that child grow out of her swaddling clothes." He prophesied that, before she reached maturity she would be rent asunder by factions, and, when the rebellion broke out, the secret of the sympathy manifested throughout the civilised world for the South was that there was a secret hope that the Republic would be so rent as to go out of existence, and that the fragments would be held as a warning that purely democratic institutions could not be permanently embodied in a Government. I can understand that being the feeling in European society, but I am at a loss to understand how it was that Canada, which in that day, as now, was a purely democratic country, did not throw its whole sympathy into the cause for which the North was then fighting. Not that we could do anything to help it. The North could fight its own battles. But, if we had shown anything like sympathy with the supporters of the American Union in their struggles with rebellion, they would have given us their friendship in return, as they have always been ready to do to those who sympathised with them. But, finding a hostile people on their border, the first thing they did, when they had the opportunity, was to cut us off from the reciprocal trade relations which we had with them. This is the first fault which, I think, has been committed by the Government of Canada in our relations with our neighbors. With the abolition of the treaty all the old quarrels, all the old difficulties in regard to the fisheries, were renewed. An occasion, however, soon arose which put into the hands of the Government of Canada an opportunity, to some extent, of restoring the facilities of trade between the two nations, and good fellowship at the same time. The close of the war had left many difficulties to be settled between England and the United States, and at last, as we all know, commissioners were appointed to settle those difficulties, and amongst the commissioners was one selected from Canada, the right hon. gentleman himself. Well, the Fishery question was one of the first and most important that the commission had to deal with. The British plenipotentiary offered to settle that question by a restoration of the Reciprocity Treaty, but, as we can well imagine, the feeling of irritation in the United States was still such that that offer was rejected. Shortly afterwards, however, the American plenipotentiaries offered to settle the question by obtaining access to our fisheries in exchange of free trade in coal, salt, fish, and from the 1st of July, 1874, the article of lumber. I am sorry to say that this

offer, instead of being accepted, was asked by the British plenipotentiary to be supplemented with a money consideration, and this was refused. It is true, however, that the American plenipotentiaries had before that time offered to settle that question by a money payment. They seemed to have been willing to settle either by money payment, or by trade facilities; our plenipotentiary, on the contrary, offered to settle with them by trade facilities supplemented by a money payment. This was refused, and finally, as we know, the question was settled for a time by granting to the Americans, for the space of twelve years, access to our fisheries on the payment of a sum of money to be determined by arbitrators, and free trade in fish. Well, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that, in my estimation, of all the ways in which that question could have been settled, the most unfortunate was the way which was adopted, the most unfortunate was to settle it by a money consideration. It must have been then evident that what took place since must necessarily take place; that is to say, that as the terms stipulated and paid for had expired, the question would be re-opened with increased bitterness. However, this was done, and this was the second fault committed by our Government in the settlement of that question, and in the history of our relations with our neighbors. The right hon. gentleman at that time was in power, and shortly afterwards he lost power. When my hon. friend beside me was in power, the right hon. gentlemen, and his friends, being then in Opposition, turned savagely upon the Administration; they attacked it with all the means which a perverted ingenuity could devise, and they thought it honorable warfare, in order, if possible, to make a point against the Government, to open against the United States a campaign of brag and bluster. I have quoted the resolution introduced at that time by the right hon. gentleman. Well, if the matter had gone no further than that, I would not have much to say; but the resolution which was then introduced was intended to force the United States to give us the reciprocity which they would not give otherwise, and the feeling was intensified by the most violent speeches. Sir Charles Tupper, for instance, went to the Maritime Provinces, and stated there that by adopting a policy of retaliation, by Canada building up a tariff wall against the Americans, we would in a few years bring the Americans to their knees, and force them to give us reciprocity. In Prince Edward Island, he used the language again and again, and used it with some effect, because at that time the Islanders sent six representatives to this House, to help the Government to build that tariff wall which it was supposed was going to bring the Americans to their knees. I am glad to say, however, that since that time the people of Prince Edward Island have come to take a better view of the situation, and they now understand that in order to have reciprocity they must take some other way. Well, Sir, the least that can be said of our relations with our neighbors, is that such language and such conduct was not calculated to promote good feeling between the two nations. If the Americans were disposed at that time to enter into negotiations with us, with a view of establishing free trade between the two countries, the very moment that Canada pretended to be able to force them, that moment the Americans would stiffen their backs, and refuse to give to threats what they might have been disposed to give to negotiations. But that language had its effect in Canada. The Canadian people, believing the promises held out to them by the Conservative party, then in Opposition, returned that party to power, and gave them an opportunity to build their tariff wall and to establish a reciprocity of tariff. They did so, and what was the result? Why, the result was that in a few years, instead of opening the American markets to free trade, the first thing the Americans did was to take an opposite policy and to abolish the fishery articles of the



Washington Treaty, to cut off from us what little advantage we had under that treaty, and to bring back the state of affairs which had before existed. This was a serious matter. When the Americans gave notice to the Government of Canada that they would not continue the fishery stipulations of the Washington Treaty, the Government had before them a great duty to perform. And how did they perform that duty? They performed it by a policy of masterly inactivity; they never budged; they never stirred; they observed upon that question a conspiracy of silence, remaining serenely indifferent as to what might be the consequences of the attitude of the United States. When we on this side reminded them that they had a duty to perform, when they were asked from this side to act, to do something, anything, to meet the new situation that had arisen, what was their invariable answer? Their answer always was: "Hush! hush! hush! don't ask for information; don't ask for anything whatever; leave the matter to us; you do not know what harm you may do to an international question of this sort, by asking for information; do not force our hands; leave it to us; everything will all come out right in time." They never stirred a finger in order to meet the new situation which was about to face them. Seeing this inaction on the part of the Government, we on this side of the House attempted to do in 1884, what we are doing at this moment; in face of the inactivity of the Government we attempted to clear the way, and to show them the duty which lay before them. My hon. friend behind me, from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr Davies), moved a resolution, in 1884, to which I call the special attention of the House, because it shows how the Government were guilty in that respect. The resolution was couched in the following language:—

"In view of the notice of the termination of the Fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing, and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with the addition of reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by someone nominated by its Government."

Here was a policy clearly indicated by the Opposition, by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, that the Government should at once enter into negotiations in order not only to meet the difficulty, but to meet it by an extension of trade facilities. What was the answer? The answer was just what I said a moment ago: Keep silent, do nothing, leave everything to us. I cannot do better than quote the language used by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion. He summed up his argument in the following words:—

"But the hon. gentleman says that the United States have shown a desire to extend their trade by having a reciprocity treaty with Mexico and the Sandwich Islands. Who commenced negotiations in these cases? Was it the Sandwich Islands and Mexico? No; it was the Government of the United States in both instances, who was desirous of getting control of the trade of those two nations, inferior in population, inferior in wealth, and very much subject to American influences. They desire to increase that influence and to obtain control of the trade of those two nations; but it was not King Kalakua, it was not the President of Mexico, who wanted the treaty; it was the Government of the United States that pressed upon those almost auxiliary nations and forced upon them, almost forced upon them, these treaties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we must to a certain extent pursue the same course."

"I think we must to a certain extent pursue the same course and in the same manner as the Government of the United States," was the reply. That Government went to Mexico and to the Sandwich Islands in order to obtain treaties of commerce with them; we must follow the same course and wait until the Government of the United States approach us, or, indeed, force the Government of the United States to come to us and ask us also to negotiate with them new commercial treaties. I cannot say I was surprised at

Mr. LAURIER.

that language. This was exactly in accordance with the policy always pursued by the hon. gentleman and his Government; it was the same policy which had been inaugurated in 1877, to force the Americans to come to us and not allow Canada to go to the Americans. The Government had a policy by which they were going to force the Americans to come to us; they have put it into effect piece by piece. First, they erected a tariff wall around this country; but that not being sufficient they made an addition. And what was that? The unwarrantable manner in which they commenced to execute the Convention of 1818. I take issue with the right hon. gentleman upon this, and I say that, in my estimation, no greater fault was ever committed by his Government than in the way they carried out the Convention of 1818 in 1885. They refused to ship the fish of Americans in bond. They seized their schooners for alleged or trivial offences of the customs law, and they placed upon the Convention of 1818 the narrowest construction it was possible to put upon it, a construction so narrow, and in some cases so inhuman, that there are instances where the schooners were forced back to sea without being allowed the privilege of buying a single article of food in a Canadian port. They expected to bring down the Americans by that policy. What was the result? The result was the Retaliation Bill—the Bill which was passed in 1887, when the American Congress authorised the President at any moment to sever commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada. The Government had not anticipated that action. Still they did not move. But it is well for Canada that there is in the United States a Canadian with a true Canadian heart, a man who has the honor of being daily abused by the Conservative press of this country, a man whose name, when it was mentioned the other day in connection with this very subject, was received with jeers, to their shame be it said, by the majority of this House. Erastus Wiman stepped to the front, and he did then what should have been done long before by the Government of Canada—he constituted himself ambassador for Canada to the United States, and had an interview with Mr. Bayard.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there any dissent expressed to that? Have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten their own history? Have they forgotten the language which was used not later than twelve months ago by Sir Charles Tupper in this House? Have they forgotten the praise given on that occasion to Mr. Wiman by Sir Charles Tupper? If they have, let me recall the language used on that occasion by Sir Charles. He said:

"I know this, that a mutual friend—I have no objection to mentioning that it was Mr. Wiman—at an early day after this speech was delivered, intimated to me that he had had a long conversation with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bayard, and that that gentleman had said that he would be very glad to have an opportunity of discussing the mutual relations of Canada and the United States with either my right hon. friend the Premier of Canada or myself."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chestnuts.

Mr. LAURIER. Chestnuts, says an hon. gentleman. Sir, I am really surprised that on a subject of such vital importance as this, so much levity should be displayed. But this is quite in keeping with the policy of the Government which hon. gentlemen opposite follow. If Mr. Wiman on that occasion had not stepped to the front, what would have been the consequences? I do not know, but the Government, at all events, thought it fit and proper at last to move, and they commenced to act upon the suggestion and the action of Mr. Wiman, and promptly Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington. He did what should have been done years ago, and he had an interview with Secretary of State Bayard. It is proper to refer to the correspondence which was the consequence of that interview between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard. It originated in a letter written

by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, and in which is to be found a very significant paragraph :

" I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and state-manlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any indentment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

To this paragraph Sir Charles Tupper responded in a similar spirit :

" MY DEAR MR. BAYARD,—I had great pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31, evincing as it does the importance which you attach to an amicable adjustment of the Fisheries question and the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up. I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and state-manlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

It is a matter of history that in consequence of that correspondence, commissioners were appointed to meet at Washington to settle that question. And when they met, Sir Charles Tupper, remembering the paragraph which I have just quoted, remembering the spirit which had dictated that correspondence between himself and Mr. Bayard, was prompt in asking from the American plenipotentiaries a settlement of the question upon the very basis which had been laid down by Mr. Bayard—that is to say, a commercial basis. He made the following proposition :—

" That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Such was the proposition made by Sir Charles Tupper, and this proposition was in conformity with the proposition contained in the letter of Mr. Bayard to him. For what reason and for what cause was this proposition rejected by Mr. Bayard and the American plenipotentiaries? Simply on account of the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite had followed in regard to the Fishery Treaty, simply on account of the irritation which had been caused in the United States by the harsh and inhuman manner in which that treaty had been carried out. Perhaps, Sir, that will be disputed also, but if disputed, I can bring an important witness to support my statement, and my witness on this occasion will be Sir Charles Tupper himself. Speaking of this very fact and explaining the reason why the offer he had made had not been accepted, Sir Charles Tupper used the following words :—

" Mr. Bayard and those other gentlemen said that ' there is only one way to reach this (for Congress alone can take the duty off any article), and on account of the exasperation that has been excited in this country by those fishery difficulties, you have seen the result, you have an unanimous bill passed by the House of Representatives and passed by the Senate and assented to by the President, you have to meet what they hold was the inhospitable conduct (they used good deal stronger terms in some of their State papers I am very sorry to say) of Canada in reference to the treatment of their fishermen, our representatives have said that they would never purchase from Canada any immunity for their fishermen by reciprocal trade arrangements' imbued, as their minds were, with the idea that we had adopted that policy to force reciprocity upon them."

Now, Sir, you have the opinion of the man best qualified to give evidence upon that subject, that the reason why the free trade relations which were touched upon by Mr. Bayard in his correspondence with Mr. Tupper were not carried out, was just on account of the policy which had been followed by hon. gentlemen opposite upon that very question. The right hon. gentleman and his Government have always prided themselves upon their superior wisdom, and statesmanship, but upon this occasion I ask, where was the wisdom and where was

the statesmanship? If the motion that my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Davies) made in 1884, when he suggested that the Government should send a commissioner to Washington in order to settle this question, had been adopted, then, Sir, does it not follow from what I have stated that there was a chance to be heard and a chance of obtaining what we had in view. At that time the Government would not yield to the pressure put upon them. They would not send a commissioner to Washington, but three years later they were forced to send one, and upon that occasion, as on many occasions when they acted, it was too late. If the Government had then acted in time they would have obtained some result; but they refused to act in time, and they lost everything. To day we see the same policy still pursued, the same policy of procrastination, and we are forced upon this occasion to suggest what, in our judgment, is the true policy that should be followed in the interest of Canada. What followed the result of the last negotiations at Washington? The treaty was rejected, it is true, and rejected by the American Senate, which has the power to deal with this question. Then came the celebrated Message from President Cleveland—and there is this to be said in favor of the President's Message, that he simply suggested (since he might be called upon at any time by the action of this Government to put the Retaliation Act in force) that a milder course should be adopted than the course demanded then. President Cleveland simply said to the American nation: " I may be called upon at any moment to put that Act into force, but I cannot put that Act into force without, to a large extent, injuring American trade. There is a better way of reaching the Canadian people, since they refuse to carry our fish in bond. Instead of shutting out all their imports it would be better for us to prevent them carrying their goods in bond upon our railways." Such, however, was the bitter sentiment of the American people against us at that time, that Congress refused to act upon the suggestion of President Cleveland. Nothing came of his suggestion; the Act remains in force; and at this moment we are just in this position: that, to-morrow, or the day after to-morrow, the new Administration may at any time, if they choose, cut off altogether the existing commercial relations between Canada and the United States. Again I ask: What is to be done? What is the policy that ought to be followed by Canada? I say to the Government: Reverse your policy, give up the policy of harshness which you have been following hitherto, and adopt the policy of conciliation; admit that you have been in the wrong, and endeavor, not by threats or by acts of violence, to obtain reciprocity of trade with this country, but endeavor to obtain it by negotiation and peaceable means. I am aware, from my past experience, that in daring as I do now, upon an international question, to say to the Government that they were in the wrong, and to say that the other nation was in the right, I will bring once more upon my head all the thundering indignation of the Conservative press and party. Be that as it may, I hold that there is all the more reason to speak upon the question, because it is an international question. Because the consequences may be graver, there is all the more reason to act, and to act promptly, and to speak in no uncertain tones. I know very well, from my past experience of the manner in which the Conservative party of this country have always understood party allegiance, that it is an act of disloyalty, that it is an act of treason, to attack Ministers who shield themselves behind the sacred name of country; but, Sir, I say without offence, that I do not care for the Ministers, but I do care for my country, which may suffer from their conduct. The tactics of the Conservative party are not new, they have always been the same, and it has always been held disloyalty and treason to attack the Conservative Ministers, even though it be to save the country. There was a time in the history of

England when the American people, then colonists of England, were forced into rebellion by the harsh conduct of the British Government and by the tyrannical measures of the Imperial Parliament. There was, also, at that time the greatest Englishman of his day—a man who has done more than any man of his time to launch England on that career of military and commercial aggrandisement which has since signalled her course. Lord Chatham never ceased to call upon the Government, and on the English Parliament, to retrace their steps, and to abandon their policy of harshness and adopt the policy of conciliation. These gentlemen on the other side of the House have such slavish opinions—and I can use no other word but slavish—of loyalty, that it may not be amiss if I put before them the language used by Lord Chatham, the greatest Englishman of his time. He had to speak upon the policy which had driven the American colonists into rebellion; and he was speaking at a time when those colonists were in arms, fighting against His Majesty King George III. On one occasion he made use of this language:

“Every motive, therefore, of justice and of policy, of dignity and of prudence, urges you to allay the ferment in America—by a removal of your troops from Boston—by a repeal of your Acts of Parliament—and by demonstration of amicable dispositions towards your colonies. On the other hand, every danger and every hazard impend to deter you from perseverance in your present ruinous measures.”

On the same occasion he made use of the following language:—

“We shall be forced ultimately to retract; let us retract while we can, not when we must. I say we must necessarily undo these violent oppressive acts; they must be repealed; you will repeal them; I pledge myself for it, that you will in the end repeal them.”

They were repealed two years later, but they were repealed too late. Repealed in time, they would have had some effect; repealed too late they only encouraged the American colonies to persevere in their action. On another occasion he made use of this no less significant language:

“If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never—never—never.”

Sir, this language was held to be treason at that time; such language would be held to be treason to-day. At that time it was held to be treason by the whole Conservative party, and still more by that well meaning, short-sighted, thick-headed Tory, King George III. He called Lord Chatham a trumpet of sedition; yet, if the voice of that trumpet of sedition had been heeded at that time, King George III would have saved to the British Crown the loss of those royal domains which England has ever since deplored. Well, Sir, the loyalty of that great man which does not pander to prejudices, which does not court the favor of king or mob, but which speaks the truth whenever the truth is called for, this is the loyalty of this side of the House. It is in the name of that loyalty I now speak; and, doubly encouraged by the language of that great man, I say to the Canadian Ministry of this day that they are repeating the same fault which was committed by the English Ministry of 1775, and in the same terms I appeal to them to retrace their steps and take a new course. If you ask me, Mr. Speaker, to come down to practical measures and to say what I would recommend, I answer: The Government themselves admit that a new treaty has to be negotiated. They say so in the Speech from the Throne, where I find this language:

“It now only remains for Canada to continue to maintain her rights as prescribed by the Convention of 1818, until some satisfactory readjustment is arranged by treaty between the two nations.”

That Speech was made on the 31st of January. They then contemplated acting under the Convention of 1818. I am glad to see that though to some extent they have not been able since then to come to any different decision, yet they have wavered a little in their opinion. When they were asked

Mr. LAURIER.

by my hon. friend behind me, a little while ago, whether they intended to put into force the *modus vivendi*, they said it was under consideration. They did not know whether they would or would not. Well, let us help them along a little, and let us say that, in our judgment at least, since they are to negotiate a new treaty, they should not go back and act upon the harsh clauses of the Convention of 1818, but rather upon the more generous clauses and dispositions of the *modus vivendi*. If you are to negotiate a new treaty, it stands to reason, if you commence to harass American fishermen by the enforcement of the clauses of the Convention of 1818, that that would be a very sorry prelude to all our negotiations. But if you go to Washington with the generous treatment provided under the *modus vivendi*, there is some reason to believe that an agreeable and satisfactory solution of the difficulty may be arrived at, in the only manner which would be satisfactory to both nations, that is to say, upon a basis of freer commercial relations between the two countries. Sir, there is every inducement for that policy. I give it as my deliberate opinion that ever since the abrogation of the Treaty of 1854, the relations of the two countries have never been satisfactory; they have never been openly hostile, but they have never been avowedly and generously friendly, always characterised by petty annoyances and vulgar bickerings; and, unfortunately, that state of things has also extended to the relations between the mother land and the republic. Nothing, I am sure, could be more painful to every friend of England than the hostility displayed during the last presidential contest towards England. It is my deliberate opinion that this hostility, displayed at this date towards England by the American people, is a blot on the fair fame of the United States, just as much as the hostility displayed during the civil war by England towards the United States, was a blot on the fair fame of England. It behooves us, situated as we are in this country, having the relations we have to the mother land, and connected geographically as we are with the United States, to help to create a better public sentiment in the two countries towards each other; and this view is largely shared, I am glad to say, by the whole Anglo-Saxon race in the two hemispheres. Though there are at this moment these unpleasant characteristics in the relations between England and the United States, there are no two nations in the world to-day which are so closely allied. Their trade is daily increasing, and to-day it already exceeds the trade of any other two nations. More than this, their intellectual life is every day getting more and more intimately interwoven. Books—all those important books which the literary world awaits on the tiptoe of expectation—are published simultaneously in London and New York. Actors exchange boards; preachers exchange pulpits; there is no artistic or literary fame originated in one country which is safe and secure until it has been sanctioned in the other. While all these facts are healthy, I, for my part, would want Canada to step into the movement, to turn a new leaf in her history, to forget the past, and to do her share to reach that which must be, I suppose, and I hope, the ultimate object, namely, closer and ever closer union between all countries of British origin and British institutions. With those views, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word “That” be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—“in view of the rejection by the Senate of the United States of the Washington Treaty of 1888, and the unfortunate and regrettable differences existing between Canada and the United States on the fishery and Trade questions, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, for the satisfactory adjustment of such differences, and the securing of unrestricted freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that, in any negotiations entered upon for such purposes, Canada should be directly represented by someone nominated by its Government.”

That, in the meantime, and to permit of such negotiations being favorably entered on, and to afford evidence of the anxious desire of Canada to promote good feeling, and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, this House is of opinion that the *modus vivendi* proposed on

behalf of the British Government to the Government of the United States with respect to the Fisheries should be continued in operation during the ensuing fishing season."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In all fairness, my hon. friend should have communicated the terms of his resolution to us in time to allow us to take it up and discuss it sentence by sentence, and paragraph by paragraph. The hon. gentleman has not confined his resolution to any one subject. He has brought into it a question which I thought was disposed of, namely, that Canada should be represented at Washington, and in all foreign countries, by her own ambassadors; he has brought in the *modus vivendi*, and ends, I suppose, with unrestricted reciprocity. These are the three subjects treated by his resolution. One of them has been disposed of, but the other two might well have been presented in separate resolutions, and have been the subject of separate discussions. However, my hon. friend has taken his own course, and we must for the nonce reply to his elaborate essay, if I may so call it, upon the situation of Canada with respect to the United States as regards her commercial relations. I cannot congratulate my hon. friend on the success with which he has shown that Canada has been altogether blameable, that the United States has been altogether, or nearly altogether, innocent of wrong, that these sixty millions of people have been trampled upon and oppressed by the five millions of Canada, and that we should change our position and conciliate these poor sixty millions of people in order to restore friendly relations between us. The hon. gentleman says: I advise hon. gentlemen opposite to change their course; I advise them to have the magnanimity to admit that they are wrong; I advise them to conciliate the United States. Well, we cannot accept the advice of the hon. gentleman; we cannot admit that we are wrong, because we have not been in the wrong; and what is still more remarkable, all he has to do, while advising us to admit that we are wrong, is to look at the treaty made last year with the United States, and he will find in it that the President of the United States, and the commissioners appointed by that president, and the gentlemen who signed that treaty, admit that every one of the pretensions of Canada, every one of the arguments used by Canada, every one of the positions taken by Canada, were just and right. Without one single exception, that treaty admits that all our pretensions, and the course we have taken under the Convention of 1818, were justified by their acceptance of the *modus vivendi*. The Americans admitted they would have to pay for the privileges which, before that, they contended were theirs by right, and the American fishermen willingly paid for those privileges; and the hon. gentleman comes forward and asks us to continue for another year that *modus vivendi* in which the two nations, in fact, declare that the United States ought to buy, and will buy, as a favor, what they formerly demanded as a right—and the hon. gentleman now asks us to admit that we are wrong. We are not wrong. We have been right from the beginning. We have been right in principle, and we have been right in practice. But the hon. gentleman, a friend, like other cosmopolitans, to every country but his own, at this moment, just at the commencement of a new régime in the United States, just two days before a new Government is about to enter on the administration of affairs in the United States—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Six days.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—a few days before there is going to be a new Government in the United States, with the new Government's policy undeclared, with no means of knowing what course is going to be taken by the United States, and at a time when we ought to know, the United States admitting that we are right, saying, here is a *modus vivendi* by which you agree to pay us for these privileges that formerly you improperly and illegally contended

to be yours—the hon. gentleman comes down and says: Go on your knees, you have oppressed the United States, you have wronged the fishermen of the United States; go to Mr. Harrison, go to Mr. Blaine, and say to them: Oh, we were wrong from the beginning. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) says so; therefore it must be so. We must go down upon our knees, and after having given up everything in this world, after having admitted that we were wrong, after having admitted that we had acted inhumanly towards the American fishermen, after having admitted that we had wronged them and oppressed them, we should say to the Americans, now make a treaty. But the United States will say, what is the use of making a treaty? You have conceded everything that we asked for; you have given up everything that you had contended for; you have given up even what we admitted, through the President of the United States and the commissioners appointed by him, was wrong on our parts; although we had to confess that you were right and that we must ask as a privilege what we had asserted as a right; you have given all that up, and then you ask us to make a treaty. That is not the way, Sir, that equal treaties are made. That is not the way this Government proposes to make treaties; that is not the way by which you can get a settlement with the United States. You must stand upon your dignity; you must stand upon your rights. Now, the hon. gentleman said that we were vacillating in our conduct and in our course; that, when we were asked the question, which was as inexpediently asked as the hon. gentleman's motion now is inexpedient, and is put in at the wrong time and in the wrong way, whether we were to continue the *modus vivendi*, we said that was under consideration. That is now under consideration, and it will continue to be under consideration.

An hon. MEMBER. No doubt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg that the hon. gentleman will not interrupt me. No one on this side interrupted my hon. friend in his remarks, but there is a persistent rudeness on the part of the Opposition, which is unparliamentary and must be objected to. I say that the question about the *modus vivendi* was inopportunistly put, because it was put before there was an opportunity, or a probability, or a chance—and I hope there is a good chance—of renewing commercial negotiations with the United States. That question was put just at the wrong time. Now, the hon. gentleman is shaking at us, as if we would be frightened at it, the Non-Intercourse Bill. Well, Canada discounted that non-intercourse threat a year ago. They are not afraid of it; they would regret to see it carried out, but if that Non-Intercourse Act is put into force by the United States, it will be a wrong-doing to a friendly people, because it is without cause. But, supposing that on the 4th of March, or whenever the inaugural address is presented, the President should announce—it is very improbable, I hope it is improbable, almost impossible—that he was going to carry out the Non-Intercourse Bill; suppose, on the 4th March, we were told that the Non-Intercourse Bill was going to be put into force, and that, before that, we said we would issue licenses for the whole year up to February, 1890, to all the American fishermen, what would be the consequence? While we should be prevented from all trade and intercourse by that Bill, we should have opened our fisheries and our markets to the Americans, and committed ourselves to the whole extent of the *modus vivendi*. We should have given them everything; they would have entered every port in Canada and transhipped their fish over our railways, and we could not help it, because there was the *modus vivendi*; and yet, at the same time, we could not send a herring into the United States because they had passed their Non-Intercourse Bill. Therefore, the Government stated that they had that under

consideration. There was no inconvenience to anyone, because the fishing season has not commenced, and will not commence until shortly after the inaugural speech is delivered. It has not yet commenced, and there was no inconvenience to either Canadian or United States fishermen by withholding that until we saw what the policy of the United States was to be. I hope and believe, from information I have from unofficial sources—they are unofficial, but I think they are entitled to some credit—that the United States will not assume anything like a commercially hostile position towards Canada. If that be so, we shall have all the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, which were surrendered for the sake of peace and on payment of a license fee, to deal with, and we shall go to the United States and say: We offered you this before. And why did we offer it? It was in good fellowship, it was with the desire that the Canadian Government had, knowing the feeling of the Canadian people, to cultivate friendly relations and to enlarge commercial relations. The *modus vivendi* says this, that, in order to give an opportunity for the consideration of the treaty, and while the question of whether it shall be adopted or rejected is not decided, in order to give an opportunity for full consideration of it, Canada offers, of its own accord, the right, for a reasonable license fee, to buy bait, the right of transshipment, the right of repairs to the utmost extent, in order to give you an opportunity to consider the terms of the treaty, and pending the consideration and discussion of that treaty. The meaning of that was, of course, that, if the treaty was rejected, the reason for offering the *modus vivendi* had ended, but, with a happy prevision, the power was given to keep it afloat until February, 1890. Having that weapon in our hands, having that evidence of friendship and amity in our hands, having that proof of the desire of Canada to extend relations with the United States, of her desire to remove any cause of temporary irritation while negotiations were going on, it was extended lest perhaps the treaty might not be rejected, but kept under consideration for two years. We have that now in our power, and I need not tell the hon. gentleman opposite that, on the first intimation of a desire on the part of the United States to enter into enlarged trade relations with us, we shall be only too happy to enter upon them as well as on the more burning question of the fisheries. The hon. gentleman must know that we do not stand alone in this question of the *modus vivendi*, but that there is the important colony of Newfoundland, who have their rights and who have, as a matter of fact, issued many more licenses under the *modus vivendi* than Canada has done, and I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman, I am at liberty to tell him, that that important colony approves of our course in regard to the *modus vivendi*, and says it is desirous to act with us in every respect. With this important subject on our hands, in this crisis of our commercial connection with the United States, is it wonderful that we, acting not only as patriots but as men of common sense, are reserving ourselves, are keeping everything we have a right to keep, are holding our position and asserting our rights, and that we do not take the whole world into our confidence, even my hon. friend. As between man and man, there is no one in this House whom I would entrust with greater confidence than my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), but I would not even take him into our confidence in dealing with a foreign nation, because the hon. gentleman would be obliged in party duty to divulge my statements to those who surround him, and thus to divulge it as well to the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman said that the United States had not been altogether right, that they were blameable to a certain extent, but that we were blameable, and greatly blameable. I have already stated that, in my opinion, and with my full knowledge of all the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

facts, Canada has never asserted a claim that is not well founded. Canada has never set up a pretension under the Convention of 1818, that the Americans have not now finally admitted; Canada has never exceeded her rights and her claims under that convention, and I defy hon. gentlemen to point out one instance in which Canada can be obnoxious to that charge. And yet the hon. gentleman has evoked the shadow of Chatham, and he has read the passages in which Chatham said: "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, I would never lay down my arms"—until those wrongs and impressions were removed of which he was speaking. Why, does the hon. gentleman suppose that there is any analogy between the two cases? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has forgotten that the last, the dying speech that great man made, when he almost fell to the floor while making it, was a solemn protest against granting the United States their independence. Does the hon. gentleman remember that? The hon. gentleman called him a traitor, but he was no traitor. He fought the battles for the Americans as Burke and other great statesmen did; he fought the battle of the colonies, as English statesmen would do if we were oppressed; if Canada were oppressed at this moment, I have no doubt many men would rise in the English Parliament and defend our rights. So did Chatham, and so did Burke, defend the rights of the British subjects who inhabited the thirteen colonies now the United States. But he never thought of giving up everything, he never thought of conciliation purchased by abandoning the rights of Englishmen; while the hon. gentleman has got up and has wilfully, and of a malice aforethought, announced as wrongs what the United States have admitted to be rights. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement against which I must protest, and that is that the sympathies of the people of Canada, during the great war between the North and the South, were with the South. The sympathies, not only of the classes but of the masses, in England, were in favor of the South, I must admit, including the author of the famous phrase, "classes and masses," Mr. Gladstone. But it was not so with the people of Canada, and I defy the hon. gentleman to point to any one act committed by the Government, by the people, or by the magistracy of Canada, which showed any sympathy with the South as against the North in that awful and fratricidal war. Individuals might have their own opinions, but the Government of Canada—and I was a member of the Government of Canada in those days—were so anxious, and showed their anxiety so continually, that if the hon. gentleman will look over the records of that time he will find again and again thanks from the United States Government for preventing this country from being made a base of hostile operations against the United States; and Mr. Seward, in his terse language, said "I wish to God that England would behave half so well towards us as Canada does." Sir, I defy any one to show any improper or unfriendly act, on the part of Canada towards the Northern States during the whole of that war. Mr. Speaker, we had our shores lined with our own militiamen; at one moment we had nearly 10,000 men lining our shores, not to keep a foreign foe out, but to prevent those men from the South, who were abusing the hospitality which Canada, like England, offers to all the world, from making this country a base of operations against the United States. We know that when, notwithstanding all our precautions, a raid was made from Montreal upon St. Albans, and a bank was robbed, the Government came at once to Parliament and asked for a vote to restore the money that had been raided by those Southerners, who had wrongfully taken advantage of their position in Canada and the shelter we gave them. That money was restored by a vote of Parliament, it was voted cheerfully, without one single word of opposition. Look again on Lake Erie, when a seizure was made of a

vessel which was turned into a piratical ship, the Government took immediate steps to surrender the wrongdoers. As regards the sympathy of the people of Canada, it was pronounced in favor of the North as the actions of the Government were in favor of a benevolent neutrality. I believe it has been said that 40,000 volunteers went from Canada and enlisted in the Northern army. That, I believe, is an exaggeration, but I do not know; the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shakes his head as if it was not an exaggeration; but, at all events, the people of Canada showed, by going and shedding their best blood, and fighting for the cause of liberty and against slavery, that they were in sympathy with the United States. The statement which the hon. gentleman now makes, that the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was denounced and terminated in consequence of the sympathy of Canada for the South, is erroneous—it was a mere pretext. It was partly induced, no doubt, by a feeling of irritation against England, and Congress thought that Canada, being a part of England, ought to pay a portion of the penalty. If the hon. gentleman would look into the matter with a commercial, rather than a political, eye, he would find that pressure was brought by the American farmer upon the American Congress, which was told that Canada had all the advantages, that we had the control of their market, and that it left nothing for them. That was the real cause why the treaty was ended, no doubt fostered as well by those who desired its abrogation for commercial reasons, as by those who raised a cry that Canada had been in sympathy with the South. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that I should speak of these things, although, apparently, they do not seem to have much relevancy to the questions now before us. Then, the hon. gentleman spoke of the Washington Treaty of 1871—he says that I was there. Certainly I was there, I was one of the commissioners who settled that treaty, and the hon. gentleman may remember the objections that were taken in Parliament by his own friends against that treaty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. member for Bothwell, who was in Parliament at that time, took strong ground against the treaty; and yet one of the principal charges that have since been brought against the present Government was that we had not managed to get the treaty of 1871 continued for an indefinite period. What is the cry? It is: Why are you so negligent, why could you not have induced the United States to agree to a renewal of the treaty? One hon. gentleman opposite had compared me to Judas Iscariot, another gentleman compared me to Benedict Arnold, because I was so base a traitor to my country as to sign that abominable Treaty of 1871. Now the hon. gentleman comes and says: This has been a sleepy Government; they have always been too late. Why did they not press and insist upon having the Treaty of 1871 continued? Why, the answer is, because the Americans were resolved not to continue it. They thought the Treaty of 1871 oppressed them, tyrannised over them, and they, poor people, thought they must be free from that tyranny and oppression, and must become free men once again by the abrogation of that treaty. It was no fault of ours. But the hon. gentleman says: Oh, but you make a great mistake; the United States offered coal, salt and fish and lumber in exchange for our fisheries. We did not happen to think that the removal of the duty from coal, salt, fish and lumber was a sufficient compensation for the surrender of our right to our inshore fisheries to the United States, and all the consequential surrender. We did not think so. I may say, for now the history is past, that some of my colleagues on the commission thought we had better yield. An appeal was

made to the home Government, and Mr. Gladstone said I was right, that it was not a sufficient compensation. But when this subject was being discussed the Canadian Parliament was sitting here, I being at that time in Washington, and Parliament *suadente diabolo*, and Mr. Holton passed a Bill taking the duty off coal and salt, and I was confronted by that vote of the Canadian Parliament. We were completely sold by our own people, and Mr. Hamilton Fish, chairman of the American Commission, with a quiet chuckle, said: "We withdraw our offer." The hon. gentleman spoke of the negotiations which took place before the treaty of last year, and he said it was owing to Mr. Wiman, whom we have been so much abusing, that negotiations were entered upon. Well, it is quite impossible to enter into, or discuss, or lay before the House, as hon. gentlemen who have been members of the Government must know, all the unofficial diplomatic communications that pass between power and power and Government and Government; but, Mr. Wiman, who is a Canadian, a clever and an able man, gave an opportunity to us, to Sir Charles Tupper, who was here on the nonce, for the time, to run down to Washington and see how the land lay. The outlook was very unpromising before. Hon. gentlemen had found out how unpromising it was when Mr. Brown went there on the same mission. We found out how unpromising it was when Mr., now Sir William, Howland and Sir Alexander Galt went to Washington. We found out that the more we tried the more we convinced the United States that reciprocity was a necessity, and that we must yield to their terms. The more we went down on our knees, the more we humbled ourselves, the more haughtily the Americans held back, as is the fashion of that people. But when we adopted, *ex necessitate*, after the termination of the Treaty of 1871, the course of defending our own waters, of keeping our own property to ourselves, of keeping poachers and smugglers out of our preserves, the moment they found there was going to be trouble between the two nations, and they have no desire to have any trouble (for I have no doubt the President and Mr. Bayard had no desire that difficulties should increase, or rather if there were difficulties that they should be removed) the position became somewhat changed. Then we commenced the negotiations respecting the fisheries. If the hon. gentleman will read candidly and carefully and apply his mind to the English of those despatches, he will see how reluctantly Mr. Bayard went further, and that we could not induce him, nor could the British Government induce him, to consent specifically and explicitly to a statement that the Commissioners should have full power to enter into the subject of a commercial treaty. But it is mentioned incidentally, and we were glad to get as much as we did. We were anxious, if it could be done with any promise of success, that the commissioners should not confine the discussion to the fisheries, but take up the subject of our trade relations. The commission was formed and the members proceeded to Washington. But the American commissioners withdrew even from the expressions that had been used in the previous correspondence; they refused to take up the question of trade and confined themselves to the fisheries. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Bayard spoke of the irritation that had existed as being the cause of this. The irritation was merely a phrase used. The truth of the matter was this: The President of the United States was in a minority in the Senate; he ascertained that there was no chance for the adoption of any trade treaty, whether on the basis of the old reciprocity of 1854, or on a different basis, whether a contraction or an expansion of that treaty. I believe Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Bayard were sincerely anxious to settle the fisheries question, and as they knew that if any trade provisions were added to the articles respecting the fisheries, the treaty

would be doomed from the beginning; they, for the purpose of getting a fishery treaty, for the purpose of giving the treaty a chance, the President, in effect, said: We must set aside all negotiations respecting trade relations; that subject must stand over to another and a happier day. That was the reason why the treaty was limited, as it was, to a settlement of the fisheries question. How justly was his appreciation of the situation we can now see, because even limited as it was, reasonable as that treaty was, so reasonable that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), denounced it as an unworthy concession made by Sir Charles Tupper, on behalf of Canada—

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read the hon. gentleman's own speech and you will see. He denounced the unworthy concessions that were made then. Notwithstanding that we had gone to the very verge of concession, notwithstanding that we had tried our utmost to bring the United States to adopt our treaty, it was rejected. Now the hon. gentleman says that we ought eat humble pie, that we ought go down on our knees to the Americans whether they will give us a treaty or not, whether they will pass a non-intercourse act or not, whether they will allow us to enter their country or not, and whether or not they pass a law keeping out Canadians from the United States as they have kept out Chinamen. Notwithstanding all this we must, forsooth, say to the people of the United States: "You may come into our waters, you may do just as you please, you can have the right to fish in our waters"—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the *modus vivendi* provide that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it does not. It provides for all the incidental claims that are made by the United States Government and that the United States fishermen to buy bait, to make repairs, to tranship, and so on. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are to give up all our rights at the same time that we may be excluded from the United States. I do not intend to discuss the trade portion of this resolution which means, I suppose, unrestricted reciprocity. I do not know whether it is unrestricted reciprocity in disguise or avowed. Is it undisguised or open? Will the hon. gentlemen let us know? I pause for a reply. Is it unrestricted reciprocity or is it something more shadowy, but yet looking like the original? This resolution will, I believe, meet with the condemnation of this House, as it will meet with the condemnation of this country. I believe and I know that the people of Canada will resent anything like humiliation or insult to their status or national honor. Servility may be the badge of a certain tribe in Canada, but servility is not the badge of the people of Canada. They will put up, if they are obliged to do it, with wrong, they will put up, if they are obliged to do it, with an interference with or obstruction to their trade, but they can say, and they do say, and I say it for them, and I know I am speaking the opinion of the majority of the people of Canada when I say, that we are anxious, yes, we are more than anxious, to enter into the most free relations with the United States, but—in the language of my resolution of 1876, which the hon. gentleman did me the honor to quote—only so far as the interests of Canada will allow. The interests of Canada are a sacred trust; they have been entrusted to us since 1878; I will not go back further than that. Those interests have not been sacrificed in our hands; those interests have been guarded by the support of Parliament and by the support of the people of Canada under our Government. The hon. gentleman knows that this motion is bound to be defeated in this House, and I will tell him

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that it is just as certain that it will meet with the opposition, and the indignant opposition, of the whole people of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House has listened to the speech of the right hon. gentleman with a very great deal of interest, and certainly with not a little disappointment. The right hon. gentleman began his speech by complaining that my hon. friend who made this motion did not communicate its terms to him. I remember that the right hon. gentleman for some time led the Opposition in this House, and I have no recollection of a single instance in which the right hon. gentleman communicated to the Government of that day, a motion which he intended to move in amendment to going into Supply, or in fact that he ever communicated his intention to move an amendment to any act or resolution of the Government. The hon. gentleman has given a summary of the history of this country during a former Administration of his, and he told us that while the people of the United States may justly complain of the hostility of England towards that country during the civil war, that no such complaint could fairly be made against the Government of this country. He told us further, that he himself was a member of the Government at the time, and he knew right well that the Government and the people of this country sympathised with the North as against the South. I am not going to enter into any controversy with the right hon. gentleman upon that subject, but my recollection of the events of that day is somewhat different from that of the right hon. gentleman. I think that I remember on one occasion when the Northern Army under General Hooker met with defeat at Chancellorsville that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues stood up on the floor of Parliament—then sitting in Quebec—and cheered when they received the report of the success of the Southern Army. It was the conduct of the right hon. gentleman and those who were associated with him in the Government of that day which, much more than anything that was done by the Government of England, led to that feeling of hostility in the United States which extended over the entire North and which led to the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1865. The right hon. gentleman has denied that he says that the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty was brought about by commercial considerations altogether, and that political considerations in no degree entered into the action of the Government of the United States. The right hon. gentleman's former colleague, the Commissioner to the United States last year (Sir Charles Tupper) entertained very different views from those expressed by the right hon. gentleman here to-day and I have no doubt whatever that the opinions expressed last year by Sir Charles Tupper, much more accurately represent the feeling which actuated the Congress and the people of the United States in the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty than those which the right hon. gentleman has expressed here to-day. Last year, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"It was not in consequence of any commercial reasons that the abrogation took place, but it was, as is well known in consequence of an unhappy sentiment which grew up in the United States, that during the time of the civil war which rent that country asunder the sympathy of the British North American Provinces were very strongly with the South."

Those were the opinions expressed by Sir Charles Tupper in this House last year, and I have no doubt whatever that they accurately represented the situation. The right hon. gentleman has referred to an incident connected with the Treaty of 1871. Let me say—and I generally recollect with a good deal of accuracy what has been said in years past in the debates of this House—that I do not remember any hon. gentleman on this side of the House calling the hon. gentleman Judas Iscariot or any other insult-

ing name. I have no recollection of his having been designated Benedict Arnold. I think, if the hon. gentleman would consult the debates of that day, he would find a very great deal of difficulty in discovering those epithets, and my impression is that they are due to an imperfect recollection and a vivid imagination rather than the retentiveness of the hon. gentleman's memory. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that he received as a member of the commission an offer from the United States to permit the free importation of fish, coal, salt and lumber for all time to come into the United States for the privilege of fishing without restriction in Canadian waters. I have no doubt that offer was made; but, Sir, my information on that subject does not exactly agree with the information which the hon. gentleman has to-day communicated to the House. My information was that when this offer was made the hon. gentleman did not know exactly what our trade with the United States was in those articles, that he took time to consult his colleagues in Canada, and that before he received information back as a member of the commission at Washington, the American commissioners withdrew the proposition; and the hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the date of the protocol, and the date of the proceedings of this House, that the repeal of the duties which had been imposed on those articles by the Parliament of Canada, took place before that offer had been made by the American Commissioners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD The resolution was carried.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman cannot assign as a cause that which only happened after the event was concluded. The hon. gentleman will further remember that his Government was then in power. Sir George Cartier, a distinguished and influential member of the Administration, was then leading the House, and the hon. gentleman was supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of this House; and so far as I know, he never complained, never tendered his resignation to His Excellency, in consequence of that disastrous act on the part of the Canadian Government, so seriously affecting the interests of the Canadian people. All the hon. gentleman had to do at that time, if the event happened chronologically as he represents it, was to communicate to the House, and let his colleagues here know how seriously the repeal of those duties was likely to affect the negotiations carried on at Washington. If he had done that, there is no doubt the hon. gentleman could, by an overwhelming majority, have had the decision of the House reversed. Therefore I think the hon. gentleman can hardly shift to the shoulders of Parliament, a Parliament which was led by his colleagues in his absence, the responsibility of any wrong that was done on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say it was wrong, but I say it caused an effect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says everybody now praises the Treaty of 1871, which was found fault with and severely criticised from the Opposition benches in 1872. Well, Sir, I have never yet heard anybody on this side of the House approve of any of the provisions which on that occasion were condemned. The hon. gentleman conceded to the people of the United States for all time to come the free navigation of the St. Lawrence without securing anything in return except the navigation of Lake Michigan for a period of ten years. I do not know that anybody on this side of the House has approved of that provision. The hon. gentleman failed to secure the navigation of the Columbia River to any other than the Hudson Bay Company or parties trading with that company so long as the Hudson Bay Company should continue on that river. This came to an end, and the rights of anybody

trading with that company came to an end at the same time. I have never heard anybody, who condemned the hon. gentleman's oversight on that occasion, say that it was a wise and proper conclusion. Then, we had the right to navigate, not only for commercial but for all purposes, the various rivers flowing through Canadian territory to the Pacific Ocean. The hon. gentleman ignoring what had occurred between Great Britain and the Russian Government, limited the right we had to all those rivers to their navigation for commercial purposes alone. Well, Sir, we condemned that act. We pointed out how neglectful the hon. gentleman was of the rights and interests of the people of Canada. Has the hon. gentleman ever found any one on this side of the House who criticised that provision of the Treaty of Washington, receding from the position he then took, and approving what the hon. gentleman did? Then, Sir, there was the provision with regard to the boundary and the position of the Island of San Juan. Has the hon. gentleman found any one on this side of the House to approve of what he did on that question? The hon. gentleman referred the question to the Emperor of Germany, to choose one or other of the main channels. It is well known that he was advised that the middle channel should have been selected, which would have given us the islands then in dispute; but the Emperor claimed that he had only to choose one or other of the main channels, and was debarred from acting in accordance with the true interpretation of the Treaty of 1846. We, on this side of the House, condemned that oversight on the part of the hon. gentleman, and so far as I know there is no one on this side of the House who ever said that he was right and we were wrong in our criticisms. So far as the Treaty of 1871 is concerned, every provision we took exception to at that time we take exception to still, and say that the hon. gentleman failed in his duty to the people of this country in permitting those provisions to be inserted in that treaty. The hon. gentleman says that everything that they did as a matter of public policy, whether growing out of our commercial relations or out of a strict interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, was admitted—every one of our contentions was admitted—by the Government of the United States in the negotiations of the treaty of last year. So far from that being the case, we were told by Sir Charles Tupper, in this House, that the illiberal construction, the narrow and straitened construction, that was put on the Treaty of 1818 by the Minister of Customs and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, now the Minister of Finance, imposed serious obstacles in the way of the negotiations, and that when he went to the United States in the first instance he found few members of Congress disposed to sympathise with the American fishermen in their extreme pretensions; but when he went again for the purpose of carrying on those negotiations, he was met not only by a hostile representative body, but by a hostile press and an exasperated people of 60,000,000. That was the condition of things the Commissioner represented as a consequence of the policy pursued by the Government who were his colleagues. Now, did the United States admit the construction of the hon. gentleman? So far as that from being the case, so far was even the Canadian commissioner from admitting the soundness of the extreme position taken by the Government of Canada, that he stated it would be a most inhumane proceeding and one that would fail to receive the sympathy of any portion of the civilised world, if the Government were to persist in the course which they had adopted. He went on to say that vessels which entered Canadian ports in stress of weather, were not allowed to obtain the supplies necessary for their homeward trip were wrongfully dealt with. The hon. gentleman said:

"I say that under the Treaty of 1818, it is true we had the power to refuse. Under the strict interpretation of that treaty an American fisherman has no right to unload his cargo and to tranship or to sell it,



but what I say is that in making this concession, which is an undoubted concession, we were only acting from the dictates of humanity and with a due regard to the credit and reputation of our own country all over the world."

That is the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper. When we look at the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, we find that all the restrictions imposed upon the fishing vessels of the United States were imposed for the purpose of preventing those vessels improperly fishing in Canadian waters. Those restrictions were incidental to the protection of our sovereignty over our own waters; and if it could be shown that these restrictions were unnecessary to that protection, then it was an improper construction of the Treaty of 1818 to so interpret it as to prevent American fishing vessels receiving the food and supplies which every civilised country accords to the vessels of another country in distress. There is, no doubt, a wide distinction between sovereign rights and police regulations. It is absurd to dignify or to undertake to raise to the position of sovereign rights, regulations which are mere regulations of police. Those restrictions upon American fishing vessels, those provisions against their entering Canadian waters except for certain specific purposes are not a declaration of sovereign rights. It would be absurd to dignify them by such a name, but they are declarations of our right to make extreme police regulations for the purpose of giving to the fisheries of Canada the adequate protection they may require. In the interpretation of every document you have to recognise the changes that society undergoes, the progress that a community makes. When the Treaty of 1818 was made there were no railways, no telegraph lines. There is not a word in the treaty to authorise an American fisherman to land for the purpose of sending a telegram, and you have the right, under a strict construction of the treaty, to say that no American shipmaster shall land to send a telegram or make any report. You have as much right to do that as to prevent them transshipping their fish. Yet, does any hon. gentleman maintain it would be a fair construction of the Treaty of 1818 to say that it does not give to American fishermen the right to send a telegram, and therefore they have no right to exercise any such privilege upon Canadian territory? The hon. gentleman, I understood, had somewhat withdrawn from the position he took two or three years ago. He withdrew last year from that position, but we have to-day the same position reasserted. We have it reasserted in His Excellency's speech; we have it here put forward; and, being so put forward, it was the bounden duty of my hon. friend, or some other hon. gentleman on this side, to declare what, at all events, is the policy of a large section of the Canadian people, and what, in spite of the declaration of the right hon. gentleman the First Minister, is, in my opinion, the policy of the great majority of the Canadian people.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) There are many rules to be considered in the interpretation of a treaty. I do not say that hon. gentlemen opposite have put an improper legal construction on it so far as the mere bare interpretation of the words of the Treaty of 1818 are concerned, but we must read a treaty, not wholly by the light of the events of 1818 but by the surrounding circumstances as they at this moment exist. The world has changed, society has progressed, there have been many inventions and many discoveries which have necessitated a change in the relations among independent states, and the Treaty of 1818 cannot be construed in every respect now as it was construed at the time it was entered into. Many of the provisions that the hon. gentleman has acted upon are justified solely as

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

police regulations. They are not provisions of the treaty, but they are provisions which the construction of the treaty might authorise, if it can be shown they are necessary for the protection of those rights that were secured by the treaty. Under the Convention of 1818, the United States abandoned their pretensions to fish in certain British North American waters, but they retained the right to enter these ports for certain purposes specified, and agreed that they would not enter them for any other purpose whatever. The reasons for that provision, when we look at the protocols and at the correspondence that took place at the time, are easily seen. It was asserted on the part of the British negotiators that this interdiction was necessary for the protection of the fisheries, because if the Americans were permitted to enter for any other purpose except to obtain wood and water, or to escape stress of weather, they might fish on their way. It was therefore deemed necessary to have the power of excluding them for every other purpose. It is true that we have the power, but the question is whether we are justified in using it or not. That depends on whether it is necessary for the purpose for which it was given. If you can show it is no longer necessary this power should be exercised for the purpose of protecting the fisheries, then your right to exercise the power, so far as the vexed question is concerned is gone. I think the hon. gentleman will find at this time of the day it is pretty difficult to contend for a strict construction of the law. The hon. gentleman knows that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine, who are largely responsible for the state of irritation that existed in consequence of what was done during the past three or four years, made these regulations, not for the purpose of preventing the Americans fishing in our waters, but as a matter of commercial policy, thinking that by imposing such restriction upon the American fishermen, the American Government, to secure the relaxation of those restrictions, would be disposed to enter into more favorable trade relations with us in respect of our fisheries than at that time existed. So hon. gentlemen will see that the object of the Government in making these regulations was altogether outside of the Treaty of 1818. The Treaty of 1818 had nothing whatever to do with our trade with the United States, it had nothing whatever to do with securing us more extended trade relations with the United States, it had nothing whatever to do with securing the free admission of our fish into the ports of the United States; it had to do simply with the exclusion of the American fishermen from fishing within the waters which are recognised as being within British North American sovereignty. It was for that purpose, and for that purpose alone, that these conditions were inserted in that treaty, and it is in pursuance or in maintenance of this right that the exercise of these powers of exclusion can alone be justified. If I were to ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House whether it is possible to defend those restrictions as a matter of right for the purpose of protecting the fisheries, I apprehend that no hon. gentleman on that side would seriously argue that we could so defend them. They were imposed for another and a different purpose. If I were to ask, can the right of exclusion which it is attempted to apply to protect these fisheries be applied in any case where the fisheries are within our sovereign control and where the treaty does not extend, we would have a fair test to show whether there was a use or abuse of the treaty in the making of these regulations. No one, I apprehend, will argue that, in those waters of Canada where fish may be found, if American fishermen who were fishing in their own waters and were to come within our waters for any purposes, we would have the right to exclude them; and, if we would not have a right to exclude them in such a case, we would not have the right to do so under the Treaty of 1818, because that treaty was not intended to do

anything more than to assert our sovereignty over certain waters, and that we had such rights as were necessary, in accordance with the usages of nations, for the protection of our fisheries in those waters. I do not intend to go a step further in the discussion of this subject to-night than we went when the ratification of the Treaty of 1888 was under consideration. There were many of those proceedings to which we took exception then and to which we take exception now. It was one of the charges I made here last year when discussing that treaty, that hon. gentlemen were obliged to make concessions to the United States of certain sovereign rights belonging to this country in consequence of the mischievous assertion of their acts of commercial policy. Now, it is well known that the United States are claiming control over land-locked bays and waters upon their coast which are larger than those waters which we claim and which are conceded to be common waters by the convention or treaty made last year. I expressed my regret that these concessions were made, and I say that, if the Government had not pursued a mischievous and irritating policy with the view of forcing the United States into commercial relations which any one who had carefully considered the subject would see could not be accomplished in that way, then it would have not been necessary to make those concessions; but those concessions of sovereign rights were made in order to conciliate the United States, and allay the irritation which the hon. gentlemen by their policy evoked. We were told last year by Sir Charles Tupper that he found himself face to face with sixty millions of people hostile to this country. How came they to be hostile to this country? They were made hostile by the policy which the Government had pursued. The Government refused to permit Canadians to engage on board American vessels. How did they accomplish that? Could they say to any citizen of this country, you are not at liberty to enter into a contract with the captain of an American vessel? No; they could not in that way interfere with the liberty of Canadians, but what they did was to forbid an American vessel from coming into any port in Canada, and the men had to go to the United States ports in order to enter into any of these contracts. The hon. gentleman knows that at least 40 per cent. of the persons who are employed on American fishing vessels are citizens of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, and these people had been in the habit of bringing their vessels into Canadian ports on Saturday night and remaining there till Sunday evening. Those who were employed on the vessels had the opportunity of going to church or of remaining with their families. The Americans did the same. Then the hon. gentleman made a regulation that, unless the vessel paid Customs charges and entered at the port, it was liable to be fined; and fines were imposed, and vessels were seized under circumstances which were very vexatious, and under regulations which hon. gentlemen were obliged to abandon when these treaty negotiations were entered upon. There is no doubt that the Message of the President threatening retaliation after the treaty was rejected by Congress was largely due to the conduct of the Government here. In fact, it was a warning to the Government, it told them that, if they returned to the policy which existed before the negotiations were entered upon, the result would be retaliation. It was a warning to them that the policy which had been adopted to coerce the Americans to make agreements in reference to trade which would be favorable to the Canadian fishermen, so far from having a good result, had only served to provoke the most extreme hostility. Another thing of which we complained here last year, was that these treaty provisions were brought under the consideration of this House too soon. We called the attention of the Government to the fact, that it was highly inexpedient to call upon the House to ratify the provisions of the treaty when the United States Senate, one of the parties to the

treaty, had not yet acted, when we did not know what its decision would be, and when, if the ratification by this House took place, it would be very difficult to withdraw from the position, and refuse to agree in any subsequent treaty to what we had already conceded in this. We called attention to the fact, that the new treaty which had been negotiated, and which was afterwards rejected by the United States, would be taken as the last point of departure in any new negotiations, and that the Americans would be in a position to withdraw from every provision in the treaty, while it would be impossible for this Government to withdraw from what they had conceded, and had asked Parliament to ratify. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has spoken of the relations between the two countries. He said a crisis existed between the countries. Ever since the hon. gentleman has been in office that has been the condition of things. There has never been a period, so far as I know, since the expiration of the fishery provisions of the Treaty of 1871, when a crisis did not exist. If the hon. gentleman were allowed to have his way, a crisis would always exist. The hon. gentleman spoke of the condition of things that existed during the civil war. Sir, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he and his friends rejoiced at the success of the South, that they rose to their feet and cheered in the House and sang a Southern song, when the report arrived of the defeat of the North at Chancellorville. I had some doubt as to whether any other hon. gentleman recollected the fact but on making enquiry at 6 o'clock, I find that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who had a seat on the floor of Parliament at that time, remembers well the circumstances to which I refer, and I refer to it now as showing how far the right hon. gentleman, in his course of public life, has tended to evoke a feeling of hostility in this country, and to create a feeling of prejudice against the people on the other side of the line, and how far he has succeeded in promoting a feeling of hostility in the United States, which has stood in the way of beneficial commercial relations between the two countries. The hon. gentleman referred to the Non-intercourse Bill, and he said that my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) had shaken that Non-intercourse Bill in the face of the Government. Sir, my hon. friend did nothing of the sort. The hon. member who sits here for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) had upon the Orders of the House a notice to inquire into the best mode of carrying on the trade and commerce of this country when this Non-intercourse Bill came into effect. Why, Sir, the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have adopted a course calculated to evoke hostility, calculated to provoke the people of the United States into putting this retaliatory measure into force. They have told us that we could get on well without the United States; that the railways of this country, especially of the Maritime Provinces, would not suffer if this Non-intercourse Bill were carried into effect. Sir, in my opinion it is time to consider how the trade relations between the two countries can be put upon a more satisfactory basis than that upon which they rest at this moment. It is important to consider how far a policy of conciliation, a policy of justice, in our intercourse with our neighbors, would tend to secure more satisfactory relations than exist at the present time between the two countries. My hon. friend has said that we and the people of the United States are both children of the same mother. That is a fact. The two countries have similar institutions, the people entertain the same religious opinions, they speak the same language, they have similar political institutions and a common literature. Why, Sir, even our fellow-countrymen in the Province of Quebec have their friends and fellow-countrymen, if I may so express myself, in the people of Louisiana; and so there is every reason that we, who

are of the same race, of kindred institutions, of like literature and religion, should make an honest and earnest endeavor to secure more satisfactory trade relations with our neighbors than exist at the present time. Sir, it is possible for Canada to do a good deal in this matter, it is possible for her to secure, not only a better position for her own people, but it is possible for her to do very much to bring the mother country and the great Republic to the south of us, together; I say it is possible for us to do in this respect a great deal in the interest of the whole Empire as well as in the interests of our own people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted a policy of irritation, their interest seems to point in the direction of keeping Canada and the United States commercially apart. One would suppose that they consider that trade relations between the two countries would be inimical to Canada, that the more we extended trade relations the worse it would be for ourselves. Sir, we cannot change our geographical position; we are beside the United States whether we wish it or not. In that respect our position is beyond our control, and the question we have to consider is whether we will endeavor to be agreeable or disagreeable to our neighbors, whether we will seek to promote a better understanding, or whether we shall seek to deal with the American people as the Jews dealt with the Samaritans. Sir, every new railway that is built from one country to the other, every new trade that springs up to enlarge the commerce between the two countries, is a guarantee of a more extended friendship and a more certain peace. In my opinion it is possible for the people of this country to secure more intimate trade relations with them than has existed in any previous period of our history. I know very well that a few years ago, if we had not lost the confidence of the country in the elections of 1878, before a year had gone round, in all probability we would have secured a commercial treaty establishing more extended trade relations with the United States than existed in any former period of our history. Sir, I found that the American Government were most anxious to meet our wishes, and to do whatever they could to oblige us. I remember being in that year in Manitoba. At that time the only means of sending produce out of the country—it was the first year that the wheat crop was exported—was to send it out in bags upon the boats that went up the Red River. Every bag at the boundary had attached to it a bonding seal, 8 cents were paid upon each bag of grain; it had to go to some point in Ontario before the bag could be emptied and it could only be used for one or two trips in the season. I remember writing from there to the Secretary of State at Washington, with whom I had personal acquaintance, calling his attention to this regulation, and recommending that the bags should be counted, that they should be emptied into the cars at Fisher's Landing, that the cars should be bonded, and that the bags should be returned on that boat. Well, Sir, instead of waiting to communicate with the American Custom house officer at the boundary by post, they telegraphed to him to give instructions in accordance with the sentiments of my letter, and after that the people of Manitoba were enabled to receive five or six cents a bushel more for their wheat than they received before. The American Government, so far from putting impediments in our way, did everything they could to meet our wishes. I remember when I came to St. Paul having my attention called to the bonding system for the transport of salt, and for the transport of hardware from the various parts of Ontario to the North-West Territories. At that time every piece of hardware had a bond attached to it, and instead of this being continued, the articles were counted and put in a car, and what was paid before on a single article, was afterwards only paid upon a car load. And so, whatever we asked to have done to

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

remove impediments in the way of trade, and to facilitate intercourse between one portion of Canada and the other because at that time we had no means of communication, except through American territory—I say that everything that could be done was done by the Government at Washington to meet our wishes; and, Sir, it is clear that if the hon. gentlemen had taken as much pains to secure a better understanding as they have taken to irritate the people of the United States, a very different condition of things would exist at this moment from that in which we find ourselves. One would suppose from the course that was pursued by the Government, that their object was to create a feeling of hostility and of irritation, so as to keep the two countries as far apart as possible, as the surest means at their disposal for maintaining the so-called National Policy. If those hon. gentlemen desired to adopt a course calculated to irritate and to prevent success being achieved in any commercial negotiations, they could not have devised one more effectual than that which they pursued during the two years prior to the negotiations of the late treaty of Washington. The First Minister in speaking of the resolution now before the House, said its principal provision had already been discussed. That is a mistake. We declare ourselves in this resolution in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and a larger measure of trade with the United States; in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which was voted on a few days ago, we declared ourselves in favor of Canada negotiating her own commercial treaties. We adhere to that, we adhere to this also. We believe that persons earnestly anxious to secure more favorable trade relations with the United States are capable of attaining that object, and that the best persons to enter on such negotiations are those who represent the Canadian people and who are responsible to the Canadian Parliament. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not succeed it will be a great misfortune to this country, and in my opinion it will be their own fault. They should remember that we are 5,000,000 of people lying alongside a nation of 60,000,000, and that it is not in the interest of this country to adopt a policy that is calculated to make those who are our immediate neighbors hostile to us. At this moment the United States are engaged in negotiations with countries of South America and with Mexico with respect to the trade relations of the western continent. How is it that Canada is not represented; how is it that our relations are not there discussed? The trade between Canada and the United States is twice what it is between the United States and any other country on this continent. The reason is obvious, namely, that hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to such negotiations. They are opposed to arriving at a satisfactory commercial understanding, and those hon. gentlemen although they are opposed to it they have not the courage of their convictions. We know what hon. gentlemen said last year. While they profess still to stand by the resolution submitted to Parliament in 1876 by the present First Minister, many of them declare they believe that this country would gain nothing by reciprocity with the United States, not even in the natural products of the two countries. That opinion is still their opinion; and, although not publicly expressed, it is the view they entertain. They know right well that this policy of excessive protection is one that cannot stand unless they continue to have the support of the agricultural class. They know right well that if there was an opportunity of securing better trade relations with the United States, that support, even to the limited extent now given, would be withdrawn. They know right well that if they were without the agriculturists' support, their whole fabric, by which the people have been taxed and by which a few have been benefited for a limited period, would come to an end. What we propose in this re-

solution is to secure more extensive and intimate trade relations with those in our immediate vicinity. We have what they require, they have in their possession what can be produced more cheaply there than on this side of the border. We desire to trade with them. In spite of the barriers which hon. gentlemen opposite have erected, that trade amounts to 50 per cent. of our export trade, and yet in the face of that fact hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this country has no special interest in more extended trade with our neighbors to the south. Without sacrificing any territorial rights, without abandoning any interest which pertains to the sovereignty of the British North American possessions, it is possible to secure a settlement of the fisheries question on a permanent basis and satisfactory to the people of the United States, without sacrificing any interests of this country, it is possible to secure satisfactory commercial relations by which the trade of the two countries would be developed in spite of those barriers which hon. gentlemen have during the past ten years endeavored to maintain. If hon. gentlemen opposite fail to secure those advantages to the people of this country, it will be their fault, and not because the people on the other side of the border are not prepared to enter into such negotiations and assented to such a settlement as I have indicated.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened, Mr. Speaker, with a good deal of attention, if not with a good deal of profit, to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and although I am not given to undue criticism I fail to find at what conclusion the hon. gentleman arrived in all the devious wanderings into which his mind led him. He started out and continued with a good many assertions, but it seems to me that his assertions lack the consequent proof which is necessary to make them strong, and at least to make them convincing. One of the first statements he made was that the regulations which were carried out, or as he said which were made, by the Minister of Customs and Minister of Marine, that is by the Government, after 1885, were not meant to protect the fisheries of the Dominion, but were meant for a totally different purpose, namely, to coerce the United States into granting commercial privileges to Canada. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that question, and I defy him to point out the first scintilla of proof in the correspondence which has taken place, and it has been voluminous, between this country, Great Britain and the United States, and I defy him to produce any single item to prove that assertion from the utterances of any Minister of the Crown or any one responsible for the carrying out of those regulations. It is purely an invention of the hon. gentleman's brain and an invention which does him little credit and does very little good to his cause. I know, from having had to do with the regulations and with the carrying out of those regulations, that the purpose of them and the intent of them was no other than simply to protect the fisheries of this country as they were guaranteed to us by the Treaty of 1818, to protect our rights as we considered to be ours under the terms of that convention; and if the hon. gentleman chooses to run away with the idea that those regulations had a totally different aim and that that aim was to coerce the United States into granting commercial relations with us, the hon. gentleman is welcome to take it and run away with it and keep it for a constant companion. He said that the mischievous course which was begun by the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine, that is by the Government, with respect to the carrying out of the Treaty of 1818 was responsible for all the trouble that had arisen, and was the reason why no arrangement had been entered into or could be entered into with the United States of America. That is also an assertion which, I think, lacks proof. In looking around for a reason for the failure of the ratification of the draft treaty of 1888 the hon. gentleman simply makes this as an assertion,

which he uses against the Government and he has not been able yet, nor has he yet attempted to cite any proof of the correctness of that allegation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We cited it last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not quoted any proof of his allegation either from any source in Canada, or from any source outside of Canada. I think that the hon. gentleman might look upon this failure of proof as fairly indicative of the falsity of that assertion, and I think at least that the country will take it as indicative of its falsity. Great Britain was the power that made the Treaty of 1818 with the United States of America, Great Britain was the major party to that treaty, Great Britain revised all the correspondence which was carried on during the controversy from 1885 up to the present time and up to the time of the sitting of the Commission in the City of Washington, and the hon. gentleman fails to find in all our intercourse with the Home Government one single line in which that Government admonishes the Government of Canada for having gone one single step beyond the just rights which were guaranteed to this country by the Treaty of 1818. The continuance of peace between Great Britain and the United States is of so great moment that hon. gentlemen on the opposite of the House have averred again and again that England held so sacredly the good relations between the two countries that she would not even press for our rights. I say that when that state of things is known to exist it comes with very poor force as an argument from the hon. gentleman if he cannot find a single line in the correspondence with Great Britain which has such great interests at stake, admonishing us that we were taking a wrong course. He has to resort to making a single assertion propped up by no proof whatever, that it was the way in which Canada carried out those resolutions which caused all the trouble and which was responsible for the failure of the treaty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sir Charles Tupper said so.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not say anything of the kind. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for saying so abruptly that Sir Charles Tupper did not say so. While the point is fresh and as a good deal has been said about it, I may read what the then Minister of Finance stated in his speech to the House on the Fishery Treaty:

"I say when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries fell back upon the same policy his predecessor had adopted under like circumstances and took such measures as were absolutely necessary and indispensable for the protection of the rights and interests of the fishermen of Canada, the United States complained bitterly. Difficulties again took place. Fishermen, perhaps, are the most intractable and uncontrollable people in the world, and when a fisherman gets on board his little smack he thinks he is monarch of all he surveys, and he can go where he pleases, and do what he pleases. The result was that, as before, collisions occurred. Those parties brought themselves under the operation of the law, and it was absolutely necessary, as I have said, in the defence of the rights of Canadian fishermen, to make examples of those parties who showed that disregard for law. The result was, an entirely erroneous impression grew up throughout the United States. It was shared by the Government—by the Senate, by the House of Representatives. It was accepted by the great body of the people; and the press and the people of the United States, almost without exception, came to the conclusion, without a particle of ground to justify it, that Canada was enforcing a most harsh, ungenerous and unwarrantable construction of the terms of the Treaty of 1818, for the purpose of forcing reciprocal trade relations upon the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that this became a universal sentiment in that country. One can understand the mass of people in the United States sharing such an impression."

That is what Sir Charles Tupper said, and Sir Charles Tupper explicitly states in what I have read that this impression which was widely spread in the United States of America, was an erroneous impression although widely spread, and one which had not a particle of truth to rest upon. I leave my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) with the statement of Sir Charles Tupper in that respect to reconcile it with his own. In fact there were no new regulations made from

the time that the Treaty of 1818 came to be enforced until the sitting of the commission in Washington. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs made not a single new regulation and he merely carried out what was the law of the land in order to protect the interests of this country in a commercial sense as well as to protect the fisheries. No new regulation was made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries outside the similar regulations which had been made in 1870-71. Those same regulations slightly differing and differing in non important particulars were the regulations of 1886-88, and the latter regulations were rather softened than otherwise. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Mills) presents a strong contrast in his speech to the hon. gentleman who preceded on that side of the House (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman who preceded him commenced by saying that this should not be looked upon as a party question and that as far as he was concerned he would strive to divest himself of party feeling while discussing it; my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not troubled with such scruples and he came to his task with the evident determination to make every point he could against the Government, no matter what injury he did to the country and no matter how long he should put off that day, which he proposed to himself as a happy day for this country. He could not resist, before concluding his speech, from bringing up an incident—I do not know whether the circumstances have occurred or not—regarding what he says was a scene in this House when the representatives of Canada sang songs in sympathy with the Southern cause and against the Northern cause at the time of the Union war. Be that true or be that not true, what good under the sun could the bringing up of that matter be to-day? What good is it to put it on the records of the House and send it broadcast to the country with which we hope and with which we wish to have improved relations both trade and otherwise. What good under the sun can be effected by resuscitating and giving new life and vigor to an incident like that, even though it did occur. It seemed as if my hon. friend looked about him to pick up every possible thing which could be irritant for the purpose of sending it to do its work of irritation in the minds and hearts of persons on the other side of the line. He commenced towards the latter part of his speech to give the House and country some information as to how it would be possible to bring about a better state of relations on the fishery question, and I listened with the utmost intentness until he should have evolved those different things that he said it was possible for us to do, but I got nothing definite from the hon. gentleman. He said geographical position was a great deal and I suppose that the geographical position remains the same whether my hon. friend is on the Treasury benches or not. He says that railway building will do a great deal to bring the two countries more closely together. I recollect, as we all recollect on both sides of the House, that if there is an hon. gentleman on that side of the House who has opposed railway development in this country more than any other member it is the member for Bothwell himself. So that one of the very things the development of which would bring about, as he said, a better state of trade relations between Canada and the United States, is a line of development which the hon. gentleman himself has opposed to the utmost. Then, his third point was that if hon. gentlemen opposite had remained in power one year longer after 1878, they would have had established a satisfactory state of trade relations between the two countries. That is another of the very well founded and well supported proofs that my hon. friend has given, supported by unimpeachable evidence drawn from the records, that a better state of trade relations could be brought about. He then asked why Canada was not included with Mexico and the various countries to the south in the invitation which has been issued by the United States for a general conference, and he

Mr. FOSTER.

states that it is because Canada through her present Government is opposed to better trade relations with the United States. Well, I always supposed that Canada was not included because she was not invited, because when the resolution was drawn the gentleman who made it and those who voted for it never named Canada at all. It was their own pleasure as to whom they should invite, and they did not invite Canada, while they did invite the others. However, on that point of treaty negotiations, it seems that, after all, however many treaty negotiations may have been started by the United States, with Mexico or other states near by or far away, very few have been brought to successful conclusions. My hon. friend says that the National Policy is what keeps us apart—that the idea of protection, which this Government and the party supporting it are allied with, keeps us from having better trade relations with the country to the south of us; and yet my hon. friend asserted a moment or two afterwards that he and his party had nailed their colors of unrestricted reciprocity to the mast, which means what? Putting themselves and this country under the yoke of a protective policy which gives almost double the protection we have in this country. The inconsistency of gentlemen who base themselves one day on the rock of free trade, and declare that its principles are the only correct financial and trade principles, and the very next day raise a hue and cry to get under a protective policy which runs twenty or thirty per cent. higher than the protective policy of this country, is an inconsistency which I think the hon. gentleman himself must feel the people of this country will not fail to see or be slow to appreciate. Now, Sir, I have done with my comments on the speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. I have, however, a word or two to say with reference to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He commenced by throwing the blame for what he considers the bad state of relations between us and the United States upon the Government of Canada and upon Canada generally. Then, he says, coming to the present day, as this state of relations is thus and so, and as when we ask questions of the Government, the leader of the Government gives us no decided answer and will not state his policy to us, but simply says that these matters are under consideration, it is time for us to move to show what ought to be done and to bring about a more satisfactory state of relations in this way. Now, it seems to me that if any country is going to make a trade treaty or any other kind of a treaty with a foreign power, it is not the best course for it to show its whole hand to the country and the world, to state just exactly what it wishes to give and what it hopes to gain in every way, and then, after having pledged itself to those conditions, to go to that foreign country and treat with it. On the contrary, it seems to me, that it is always the case that a Government, in treating with another, holds its position as firmly as it can, holds its better positions under cover as far as it can, and uses its advantages without pledging itself beforehand in order to draw as far as it can advantages from the country with which it negotiates. But my hon. friends opposite wish the Government to pledge itself before and as to what it will do, as they ask this Parliament to say to-day that whatever comes, before we enter into any fresh negotiations, we must pledge this country to maintain the *modus vivendi* with all the advantages it gives. Sir, I think it is not apparent that that is the best way in which to make favorable treaties with, or to gain advantages from, great countries with whom we wish to undertake negotiations. My hon. friend said that the Treaty of 1854 gave us the best relations that we ever had with the United States, and that it was the golden era of Canada, during which the amity which existed between the two countries was greater than that which has existed since; and, true to his idea that it was the Canadian Government which was to blame for the failure of all treaties and the abrogation of existing treaties,

he stated that the reason that treaty was abrogated was that there was undue sympathy in Canada with the South, and that that reacted upon the Northern mind. Well, Sir, suppose for the sake of argument, what I am inclined to deny as a fact, that the feeling of the Canadian people was one of sympathy with the Southern power, that was no fault of the Canadian Government, and if it was a fault at all it was a fault which was held in common with a great many people in other parts of the world. But my own reading of history is that the historical basis is unsound which states that the Treaty of 1854 was abrogated because of ill-feeling on the part of the United States, for the sympathy which they supposed the people of Canada had with the South during the war of the rebellion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say the people of Canada. I said the Government of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated a moment or two ago that I was not addressing myself to the hon. member for Bothwell, but to some of the arguments offered to this House by the hon. leader of the Opposition. My own belief with regard to that is this, and I think it is historically correct, that that treaty would have been under existing circumstances brought to an end if there had been no war between the South and the North, and consequently no question of sympathy one way or the other. If you read the history of that time, from 1855 to 1866, you will find this state of facts. Commencing shortly after 1856 and continuing on in an increasing ratio until 1866, there was a feeling of dissatisfaction all along the border between these two countries with the state of things which grew out of the Treaty of 1854. That treaty made free between the two countries certain natural products, and from the very beginning of its operation the people of the States along the border, and the people affected by those States, began to come to the conclusion that that treaty was more in favor of Canada than of the United States. That while Canada had a larger proportion of the raw material which the United States required, that raw material was admitted free into the United States, while the manufactured goods coming from the United States, which they wished to supply to Canada, had to pay tariff duties. I hold in my hands elaborate reports containing the opinions of the Chambers of Commerce of the United States, from the extreme eastern limit of the line dividing us from the United States to the extreme limit of the great lakes, and there is scarcely a Chamber of Commerce from one end of that line to the other which was not outspoken against the unfairness of the Treaty of 1854 as regards the United States interests. That dissatisfaction culminated at last in a concurrent resolution, passed by the Legislature of New York, and which was taken up by the Congress of the United States; and any gentleman who will take the trouble to pursue it will find I am correct in stating that it was the dissatisfaction to which I refer that brought about the abrogation of the Treaty of 1854, and not any question of sympathy or sentiment. After the Treaty of 1854 had been abrogated in 1866, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) came to the Treaty of 1871. He reviewed the circumstances which surrounded the negotiations of that treaty, and while upon that subject I think it would be well to show that there was no lack of effort on the part of Canada towards securing then a larger measure of trade relations between the two countries than existed or than we were able to obtain. We find that at one of the conferences at which the Commissioners were present at Washington, in 1871, the American Commissioner said that:

"With the view of avoiding the discussion of the matters which subsequent negotiations might render it unnecessary to enter into, they thought it would be preferable to adopt the latter course and enquire what, in that case, would be the basis which the British Commissioners desired to propose."

What was the first proposition of the British Commissioners?

"The British Commissioners replied that they considered the Reciprocity Treaty of the 5th June, 1854, should be restored in principle. The American Commissioners declined to assent to the renewal of the former Reciprocity Treaty."

That does not bear out the assertion of my hon. friend that the Canadian Government has been opposed to larger trade relations between the two countries or to trade relations on the former basis. It shows, on the contrary, that in 1871 the British Commissioners, of whom Sir John A. Macdonald was one, stated at the very outset of the Conference that they were willing to go back to the Treaty of 1854, if not in entirety, in principle, and to base their negotiations upon that. That was, however, refused by the American Commissioners:

"The British Commissioners then suggested that, if any considerable modification were made in the tariff arrangements of the treaty the coasting trade of the United States and of Her Britannic Majesty's possessions in North America should be reciprocally thrown open and that the navigation of the River St. Lawrence and of the Canadian canals should be also thrown open to the citizens of the United States on terms of equality with British subjects."

What was the proposition? It went further even than the preceding Treaty of 1854. It was that there should be reciprocity in coasting trade between the United States and the Provinces of British North America. The American Commissioners declined this proposal, and objected to any negotiation on the basis of the Reciprocity Treaty. What did they give as the reason for the abrogation of the old Reciprocity Treaty? Not that the North was angered against Canada because of the sympathy Canada had with the South with their struggle. No, they did not act on theories; they were business men, they were sent there to represent the business feeling and sentiment of the United States. The reason they gave was that the treaty had proved unsatisfactory to the people of the United States, and consequently had been terminated by notice from the Government of the United States, in pursuance of its provisions, and that its renewal was not in their interest and would not be in accord with the sentiment of the people. They further said that they were not at liberty to treat of the opening of the coasting trade of the United States to the subjects of Her Majesty residing in her possessions in North America. Those negotiations show that Canada, represented on the commission, was in favor of opening up better trade relations, if possible, with the United States, and was willing to go back at once to the basis of the Treaty of 1854. They show that the United States Commissioners refused, because such a treaty would not be to their interest; they show further that Canada was favorable to a reciprocity in coasting trade, but that this was also refused; and ultimately the proposition was made by the Americans to buy out the fishery rights of Canada for a sum of money, which was, of course, refused. At last the Treaty of 1871 was agreed upon and made operative between the two countries. Now, the Treaty of 1871 was certainly not abrogated because of feeling aroused by any conduct of Canada inimical to the conditions of that treaty. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not asserted that. The Treaty of 1871 was abrogated because the United States believed, first, that the money which they had paid as equivalent for the rights they gained under that treaty was excessive, and, secondly, that the treaty itself, that the rights given them by the treaty to fish in our limits and to enjoy certain commercial privileges in our limits were not worth anything to them. It is well to have that point thoroughly settled, and that cannot better be done than by going back to February, 1883, when notice was given that the Treaty of 1871 would be abrogated at the earliest possible moment. After it had been decided to abrogate the treaty and instructions had been given by the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

and after the chairman of that committee had brought the matter brought before the House, Mr. Rice, of Massachusetts, said :

"I think if the gentleman from Minnesota will hear the explanation which I will briefly give, it may, perhaps, satisfy him on all points, with reference to the propriety of the adoption of this measure. By the treaty of Washington certain sections were devoted to rights given in British waters to the American fishermen. The amount that the United States was to pay for the privilege was to be settled by the Halifax Commission. The sum that was to be awarded by the Commission paid for that right for the term of twelve years, and no longer. The sum awarded by the Halifax Commission was \$5,500,000. We must now give notice, by the 1st of next July, of the abrogation of the clauses of that treaty and provisions is contained in the treaty for the abrogation of those clauses, and nothing else. So that the matter stands by itself, or else we enter upon another term, for which England may demand ample payment from the United States, according to the enormous and unjust awards of the Halifax Commission for privileges which nobody in the United States, who has investigated the subject, considers worth keeping."

That is the key of the whole affair. The opinion that obtained at that time in the United States—whether it obtains there now is another question—was that the privilege which the United States fishermen gave up of access to our inshore fisheries and the privileges they had commercially consequent upon that treaty, were not considered worth keeping. Mr. Rice continued :

"The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously reported this resolution. It was adopted by the Senate without an objection : and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, having fully examined the matter, unanimously instructed me to move the adoption of the resolution by the House, which I now do, under that instruction. With this explanation, I trust that no objection will be made to the consideration of the resolution, which, I am very sure, I can satisfy everybody, ought to be adopted, to avoid liability to further payment of an extortionate sum to Great Britain, for that which is not considered worth anything to us by parties who are interested in the matter and who have examined into it."

And that is the underlying note of the indisposition of the United States of America to make any extension of that treaty or to negotiate further for a treaty on the same lines; and that especially in conjunction with another point, that the Treaty of 1818, as they contend, is a treaty which is obsolete, which has lost its force through lapse of time and from the great changes which have taken place since. These two things, the plea that the treaty was no longer binding or could not be made binding on the United States and the belief that the privileges to be gained in Canadian waters were no longer worth anything, and were so declared by those who had examined into them, were the two fundamental reasons why the United States Senate and the United States Congress have been disposed in the first place to get rid of the Treaty of 1818 as soon as they could and have been indisposed since that time to enter into any negotiations for a treaty providing for like privileges between the two countries. The hon. gentleman said that Canada was to blame for the abrogation of that treaty. In the light of these facts, can any one fairly hold that Canada was to blame for the denunciation of that treaty? When that treaty came near to the point of denunciation, what were all the indications? Those which I have read are some of them, but they are few. In the United States prints from one end of the country to the other, the same opinion was prevalent, that these privileges were worthless, and that they did not want them any further. That was the opinion expressed in the United States Congress, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. An attempt was made to have that treaty extended for a time. That attempt was made through diplomatic correspondence, and, finding that could not be done, it was attempted to have the terms of the treaty go along for a little while so as to allow time for negotiation. All these attempts failed. Hon. gentlemen say that nothing was done, that "hush" was the word, that it was a period of masterly inactivity. I ask any hon. gentleman who may be uninfluenced by party motives, who may take a fair and a candid view of the subject, how it is possible for one of

Mr. FOSTER.

the two parties to conclude a bargain in which it is indispensable that both shall have the wish, and that both shall agree before the bargain is made. There was one party to the bargain, the United States, denouncing the treaty at the earliest possible moment with a unanimity which was not broken by a single dissenting voice in public, and refusing to negotiate for another. When the President's Message came down in 1883, that part of it which related to this matter was not even noticed. When the President's Message came down in 1884, suggesting that a commission should be appointed, the dominant party in the legislative body, reported that they did not care for, and would not vote for a Commission to sit upon this matter. If you look into the report of the Senate Committee, you will find, after thorough investigation and after taking all the official documents, which were many and voluminous at the time, the same idea runs through them, that this treaty is obsolete and that they do not want the privileges in the Canadian waters under the old treaty. They say: "Let us denounce the treaty and we will not make another." We are stated to have been in fault not only because of dilatory action, which does not lie, but also because of arbitrary action. In what did that consist? That treaty came to an end on the 1st July, 1885. You might have said it was arbitrary if, when the American fishermen were with full fleets on the shores of Canada, men who did not have a very just idea of treaty rights, when they were in the midst of fishing season, Canada had done what she had a perfect right to do, if she had put her cruisers there and protected her fisheries and brought those who acted against the Treaty of 1818 to book and imposed the penalties that might have been imposed. But Canada did nothing of the kind. Going against a strong sentiment in this country even, going against the views of some hon. gentlemen opposite even, Canada said: "We will give a fair chance—for the sake of the United States? no; for the sake of the fishermen? no; but for the sake of negotiations which may take place, we will give a grace of six months, to give time for opening up negotiations, and, if possible, making a treaty. That period of six months was given, and it was not till April, 1886, that Canada, after full warning and full diplomatic correspondence, by means of which the position was plainly known, not only by the United States authorities, but by the United States fishermen themselves, seeing that nothing else could be done, felt she must for her just rights cling to the privileges guaranteed to her by the Treaty of 1818. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, says we did wrong, that our conduct was arbitrary, and his policy is to reverse that conduct and do differently. In what way did we do wrong? Were we wrong in our contentions as to the rights the Treaty of 1818 conferred upon us? Not in a single case. The law officers of the Crown of Great Britain, the officers of the Government of Great Britain, from the highest down, who had to do with our negotiations, have stated, and their opinion is on record, that in every single instance of Canada's action she was in her just right and did not pass beyond it. The hon. gentleman says that vexatious regulations were carried out, and, without a scintilla of proof and without an attempt to invoke the records in favor of what was said, my hon. friend stated this afternoon that we went so far as to drive away from our shores fishermen of the United States who were in want of bread to eat, that we turned them away from our harbors and refused them the rights of hospitality.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says "hear, hear," and stands at the back of that assertion. I say that cannot be proved. I say that no document can be brought forward to prove it, and the United States diplomatic correspondence failed itself to prove it, and I think it is a little too much for men who still hold themselves to be patriots and

lovers of their country, and who profess that their only object is to do their country ample justice, to make speeches of an hour or an hour and a half, in which there is no word of even mild condemnation of the course of the United States Government towards us, while every other sentence is laden with invective against the Government of Canada. There is no word of sympathy for the poor toiling fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, men who merit on the part of both sides of this House and from the country the strongest sympathy and the very best efforts for the betterment of their lot and the maintenance of their rights. There is not a word of sympathy for their rights or for themselves, but all the sympathy is directed to the United States, and all the invective is given to those who stood fairly, and honestly, and courteously, and with forbearance for the rights of our fishermen, and for the rights of Canadians. Now, Sir, of all the cases of all the vessels which, in those two years, were in the waters of Canada, the United States Government, through its diplomatic agents, brought only 30 cases of alleged grievances before the attention of the British Government and the Canadian Government. In the two years of 1886 and 1887 we know the number of fishermen that were down there, a large number, we know the constant going and coming, we know the surveillance we had over them, we know the number of those that were boarded, and when they were supervised by our officers and by our cruisers, yet out of all these, there were but 30 cases to which our attention was drawn as a matter of grievance, and there was but one out of the 30 cases in which, when we had given a complete answer, there was even a reply to the answer that we made, and that was in the case of that famous man Madoe Rose, who swore one way and then swore another way, and then swore back again on the old tack, and then came back again on the first tack. When he was in the United States he would swear for the United States, and when he was in Canada he would swear for Canada. That is the only case upon which they attempted to meet the reply that we gave them to the grievance that was alleged. Now, Sir, the case of the *Mollie Adams* is the only case upon which hon. gentlemen can base a declaration that a vessel was ever turned away in distress from the shores of Canada. The captain of the *Mollie Adams* was Solomon Jacobs, and if they will take the records of this case, which have been placed upon the Table of the House, and which are there for all to read, it will be seen beyond possibility of doubt that the captain of the *Mollie Adams* himself, when he went into port, asked the collector if he could buy a barrel of flour, and the collector, doing his duty, as he ought to do it under his instructions, asked him: "Have you enough provisions to do you, or are you in want?" and the captain of the *Mollie Adams* said he had enough provisions to take him back home, that he was not in want, and he sailed away and went home. Now, Sir, that is the only case, and this opinion which my hon. friend talks about as being so strong in the United States, is exactly what Sir Charles Tupper said it was, without a particle of foundation. It gained credence and currency in the United States, largely—from what circumstance? Because hon. gentlemen in this House, and hon. gentlemen who control papers in this country, put out as being true the contention of the skipper in the first instance, and sedulously avoided the proof that was given of the falsity of these statements, and the untenable position which they took, with a studied desire, as it would seem, to avoid examining into the case, and to rush to take up the case as first given by the person who had the grievance. That very feeling was added to, because the American papers copied more largely from our own papers and the speeches of our own public men than they did from the statements of those who had a grievance to give to them at first hand. Now, Sir, so much for that. My hon. friend said that it was the policy

of himself and his party to go back to the Treaty of 1854, and to get that treaty and, if possible, to enlarge it. Now, I suppose my hon. friend, if he were in power to-morrow, and were to remain in power for ten years, has no idea that he could get the Treaty of 1854 again between this country and the United States. If he does think so I will refer him to a statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is not at present in his seat, who, in 1883, in this House, as will be found on reference to the *Hansard* of that year, page 271, made this statement:

"It is perfectly hopeless to dream of obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States in the future, which is confined in its operations to the natural products of the soil of the two countries. Such a treaty will, as the Treaty of 1854, work almost exclusively to the advantage of the Canadians."

I refer my hon. friend to his *confrère* and party follower, to debate that subject between themselves and come to a conclusion. But, Sir, he said that if he does go back to the Treaty of 1854 he wishes to enlarge it. Then I put the onus of proof upon him to show to this House, and to his followers, and to the country that he hopes to have follow him, to show one single leaning in the strong dominant opinion of the United States which is in favor of increased trade relations on the lines that he lays down, and that his party lays down, and that they take as their fixed policy. Sir, do you find it in the Bills which have been introduced, either the Mill's Bill or the Senate Tariff Bill? Do you find it in the election which took place in the United States last year when both parties wrestled with each other for the supremacy, and brought out every point of practical policy that they supposed would influence the electors? Where, Sir, on all the platforms, and in all the speeches, will you find a single public platform advocating unrestricted reciprocity with Canada? Not in one single instance. But you find men high in political position in the United States, men who are either now dominant or who will be dominant in the administration, who simply say: "Yes, Canada can have all the advantages that the United States people have when she is of a mind to come under the United States flag, and not before." That, Sir, is the statement of the Hon. James G. Blain, who all people believe has a dominant influence in the Republican party, and who most people believe will have a dominant position in the Cabinet which is soon to be. Sir, you may find those men occupying the position of Mr. Sherman, one of the strongest men in the Republican party of the United States, who says: "Unrestricted reciprocity—yes, I would be favorable to it if it led to a certain conclusion"—and that conclusion was the absorption of Canada into the United States of America—"but I favor it only if it can be shown to me that it would lead to that conclusion." Sir, I do not speak here of the Butterworth's and the Hitt's, and the other men strong in position in the United States. I do not speak of the papers of New York, of Boston, and of Chicago, which show the dominant public sentiment of the country; in not one of these can you find a defender of unrestricted reciprocity; in every one you may find a reference to "manifest destiny," and to the time soon coming when as a ripe apple falls off the tree, Canada shall fall into the hands of the United States of America, and there shall be but one flag and one people from the North Pole down to the Gulf of Mexico. Sir, that is not the sentiment of young Canada to-day, that is not the sentiment of the best people in Canada to-day; and rather than join and link her fortunes with a destiny which is so strongly held out to her as being the only condition on which she can get these, to a large extent, mythical advantages, which are so much talked about, Canada comes to the sensible conclusion that, with a people of five or six millions, with a territory as large and as rich as her own, and a climate and a soil which are unequalled, with a stock, so far as her people goes, which



combines the best excellences of the best peoples of the world, has a future before herself, and that while she will cultivate amity and the best feeling with her neighbors to the south, and with all other neighbors, she will pursue her own undeviating course, with the star of future promise full in view, and make a people by herself, maintaining her own institutions, her own commerce, her independent development through and through, keeping intact her institutions, her government, and those ties, stronger than some people think them to be at this day, which bind us to the mother country and to every portion of the British Empire the wide world over.

Mr. EDGAR. I hope the followers of the Government listened with great attention to the speeches delivered from the Treasury benches on this question, because they were most distinctly educational speeches. Why, we have heard from both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance that there is something good in reciprocity after all. They say they are in favor of reciprocity with the United States and of cultivating the most friendly relations with our neighbors. But did we not hear last Session, night after night, when the debate on reciprocity was going on, speeches from the followers of those hon. gentlemen to show that we did not require reciprocity with the United States? Did they not enter into elaborate calculations to show that Canada was perfectly independent commercially, agriculturally and in every other way of the United States? The leaders of the Government have evidently learned something already if their followers have not done so, and they are trying to educate their followers in that direction. The Ministers have been educated by the country. Since last Session we on this side of the House have gained three seats from them in Conservative counties on the square and direct issue of unrestricted reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. EDGAR. That counts six votes on a division in this House, and perhaps the Ministers think it is about time to begin to educate their party to accept unrestricted reciprocity. The Minister of Finance opened his remarks by informing the House that we were altogether wrong in declaring that their treatment of American vessels in 1886 was for any other purpose than the protection of our fisheries. The Minister said it was not to interfere with American commercial intercourse with Canada, but it was simply to protect the rights of our fishermen and the treaty rights to the fisheries that action was taken. I desire to contradict the Minister most positively, but in a parliamentary way. What we complain of is not any interference by the Canadian Government with American fishing vessels trying to poach on our fisheries within the three-mile limit, for we are entirely with the Government, always were with the Government as all Canadians are with the Government on that question, but it was when the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine also in their respective departments interfered with American vessels, wantonly and unnecessarily in 1883 and irritated and annoyed them. Was it for the protection of the fisheries that the case of the schooner *Pearl Nelson* occurred, where the captain of that vessel was fined \$200? For what? For encroaching within the three-mile limit, for throwing his nets in our waters? Not at all, but he was fined \$200 for simply putting ashore two native Canadians at their own homes to see their wives and children when in port. The fine was imposed for doing that and nothing else, and the Minister cannot deny it. More than that. A Canadian in that crew had died on board, and the captain of the vessel wanted to put the dead man's clothes on shore, to give them to his family; but he was prevented from doing so, because this fine of \$200 had not been paid. And yet, the hon. gentleman rises in his seat, and lectures hon. members on this side of the House, for not having sympathy for the poor

Mr. FOSTER.

fi-hermen down by the sea. But those were Canadians, and those were fishermen whom he would not allow to come ashore, and the dead man whose clothes could not be landed was a Canadian fi-herman also. The Minister contradicted my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) flatly when he made the assertion that American vessels had been deprived of obtaining a reasonable quantity of provisions at a Canadian port. Does not the hon. gentleman remember the case of the *Laura Sayward*, at Shelburne, where the captain was refused permission to buy seven pounds of sugar, three pounds of coffee, one bushel of potatoes and two pounds of butter for the use of his little crew on the return voyage to Massachusetts. The hon. gentleman cannot deny it. Let him look at the *Hansard* of last Session, when I mentioned this very case, and when his colleague, the Minister of Customs, said it was perfectly right.

An hon. MEMBER. It does not make it right.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think it does, but it was justified in this House last Session, and it is a fact. The hon. gentleman will perhaps still insist that the action of the Government has been simply to protect the fishing rights of Canada under the treaty, and not in regard to our municipal or domestic legislation. No doubt the Minister is quite familiar with the celebrated dispatch of 1st February, 1887, sent from Canada to England, which contained a copy of a report of a Committee of the Privy Council, signed by the Minister himself, who was then Minister of Marine. Whether he wrote the document or not I do not know. I rather suspect the Minister of Justice prepared it, but the Minister of Finance was responsible for it. In one clause of that document he describes the position the Canadian Government was taking and which at that time they were determined to maintain. The hon. gentleman said in that report of the Privy Council:

"It is not to be expected that after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights and upon the respect due by foreign vessels while in Canadian waters to the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are governed, in the absence, moreover, of any decision of a legal tribunal to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments withdraw from the position taken up deliberately, and by doing so, in effect, plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity and bad faith which, in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States."

The Minister of Finance himself justified their action towards American vessels as regards the municipal legislation of this country, and it is of that we complain. We contend that in regard to all matters of petty detail the Government have been unreasonably hard. I do not pretend to say that all the cases reported in the United States were justifiably complained of—I do not think so at all. But very few cases were sufficient to irritate the people of the United States and the whole body of fishermen, and it was certainly extremely unwise, and under the circumstances criminal, for this Government to have allowed any of the cases to have occurred. The hon. gentleman has stated, however, that the English Government entirely supported them. I do not think that the English Government when it was negotiating with the Secretary of State at Washington was very likely in its public despatches to announce that the Canadians had been guilty of all the crimes that were attributed to them. I would not expect to find that told in the English despatches, but the Ministers know a great deal better than I do what were the private and confidential opinions of the English Government upon their course of action. But this I do know from the public despatches, that the English Government put their hand down upon the Canadian Government and prevented them in 1887 from repeating the course of treatment they were guilty of

in 1886. If I am not out of order in referring to another debate, I may say that I remember distinctly on an occasion not long ago, in this House, that the Minister of Finance said that in 1887, they had no cause to interfere with the American fishermen because the season of 1886 had taught them to behave themselves. I think I can show that it was the English Government that taught the Canadian Government how to behave themselves in 1887. In this wonderful despatch which I quoted just now and which is a sort of no surrender despatch, the Canadian Government said that they had done perfectly right and that they would not surrender. That is just what the Finance Minister and the First Minister have said to-day. I quote from the despatch :

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve their abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the people of this country."

What followed this despatch? It must have been received towards the end of February, 1887, in Downing Street, and it could not have been received very long before the Secretary of State sent a cable message out to the Governor General here, dated 24th February, in which he said :

"Her Majesty's Government are disposed to think after much consideration of the entire subject—"

I have no doubt that consideration included the case of the *Pearl Nelson* and the *Laura Sayward*—

"—that the best and simplest settlement of the difficulties might be arrived at, if both parties would agree, so as to permit discussion of the more extended relations, to ratify for a term at least, if not permanently, the condition of things that existed under the Treaty of Washington. Fish and fish production being again reciprocally admitted free of duty and the fisheries being once more reciprocally thrown open. They are further of opinion that it would be the clear interest of the Dominion that no suggestion of a pecuniary indemnification should be made in making this arrangement."

The plain English of that is that in 1887 and 1888 the Canadian Government was to allow the Americans the right to use their fisheries without stopping them. It was quite reasonable that this should be done or otherwise there is no doubt whatever that we would have been plunged into a war with the United States. What did our brave captains of the Canadian navy say to that? What did the Minister of Marine say to that? Why, Sir, he at once owned his mistake, and said he would cheerfully do what was suggested to him by the English Government. And Lord Lansdowne cabled back on the 26th February, almost the next day, to the English Secretary of State in the most dutiful and proper spirit :

"Referring to your telegram of the 24th February, Canadian Government is prepared to accept your suggestion of reverting temporarily to the condition of things existing under the Treaty of Washington without at present raising question of indemnity."

You see that is the way in which the Government taught the American fishermen how to behave themselves in 1887. The hon. gentleman says that Sir Charles Tupper approved of their action, but does he not remember, because I do very distinctly, and I think every one else in this House does too, that Sir Charles Tupper in speaking of this very construction of the Treaty of 1818 which the hon. Minister is defending to-night, said :

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction and it is another thing to enforce it."

That is all we say on this side of the House, and that is all we ever said. We do not deny that the technical construction of that treaty is right as construed by the Canadian Government. I remember the Minister of Finance the other night asking across the House whether we held that their interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 was right or wrong. I shall answer in the words of Sir Charles Tupper : "It is one thing to hold a technical construction and it is another thing to enforce it." If there is any one else besides Sir Charles Tupper who was acquainted with those fishery negotiations at Washington and who would likely be accepted as an

authority by the other side of the House, I think that man would be Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. I think I can tell the hon. gentleman what Mr. Joseph Chamberlain thought of their course of conduct in 1886. At a banquet given him in New York while speaking of these same troubles with the fishing boats he used these words :

"This interference, whether justified by law or not, provoked great irritation and ill-feeling in this country."

That is Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's view of the situation. That is exactly the view we take on this side, and the view we always have taken. When we find those two gentlemen agreeing with us and disagreeing with the Ministry we may fairly regard ourselves as justified in the course we have taken in this matter. I may also say that the language of these gentlemen fully justifies the language which the leader of the Opposition used last summer, in the speech which he delivered at St. Thomas. Both the First Minister and the Minister of Finance to-day professed friendliness to the United States, and a desire for reciprocity, yet, when we profess friendliness to the United States they call it disloyalty, and when we say that we are in favor of reciprocity we are told by the other side that it is the same thing as annexation. A few minutes ago we had a vigorous denunciation by the Minister of Finance given to the annexation tendencies of certain persons, not mentioned, and he told us that a great many people in Washington were in favor of the annexation of Canada. He mentioned them by name, although he did not mention any on this side of the House by name. I can tell the Minister of Finance that if this Government opposes, as they opposed last Session, and if they continue to oppose, the efforts which we are making, and the suggestions which we offer to them towards obtaining larger commercial relations with the United States, they will be very apt to make a great many annexationists on the other side of the line, and on this side, too, because it is perfectly clear to those who observe the feeling of the people in Ontario at least, that they desire to have free trade relations with the United States.

Mr. RYKERT. No.

Mr. EDGAR. I will draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the hon. member for Lincoln. The hon. member is one of his reconstructed followers, and his able speech to-night has not convinced the hon. member yet. The hon. Minister had better take him in hand and give him another lecture. Well, apart from the hon. member for Lincoln, nearly everybody in the Province of Ontario is anxious to have larger trade relations with the people of the United States, and if the Government continue to announce that that desire on the part of the people will lead to annexation, they will make annexationists by the score in this country. But we say in order to get ample trade relations with the United States, annexation is not necessary, and therefore we persuade people not to be annexationists. Our policy prevents them from being annexationists. If they can get the commercial advantages without the political union, they will not be annexationists ; but I am satisfied that an increasing number of people will say that if they are to be debarred by the Government from obtaining commercial advantages unless they accept the political union, they will be very much tempted to accept the political union ; and therefore I warn hon. gentlemen opposite that they are making annexationists in this country every day that they resist our policy. Now, Sir, an important part of this motion involves the direct negotiation by Canadians, through their own accredited representatives, with the United States Government for the purpose of negotiating this treaty. I think that the experience which Canadians have had of English negotiators on behalf of Canada with the United States has not been very encouraging. On the contrary, it has been a disastrous history of failures all along ; and I do not think that even

the assistance which Sir Charles Tupper received during the negotiation of the Treaty of 1858 from Lord Sackville or from Mr. Chamberlain, could have been worth very much. I think he would have done quite as well, and very likely a good deal better, if he had been sent there as the direct representative of Canada. Now, Sir, I think there is a great practical advantage in sending our own representative to Washington. The hon. Minister of Finance referred to an Act of Congress providing for a conference of the States of Southern and Central America with the United States at Washington for the purpose of negotiating treaties of commerce, and said that Canada was not to be represented there because we had not been asked. Now, Sir, the Act providing for this conference, which was passed in Congress during last year, is similar to a Bill which was introduced during several sessions by Senator Sherman. In that Bill Senator Sherman made proposals for the encouragement of closer commercial relationship and in the interest and for the perpetuation of peace between the United States and the republics of Mexico and Central and South America, and the Empire of Brazil. He proposed that conference in a spirit of the broadest statesmanship: and if there is a man living to-day in the United States, who is a broadminded statesman, that man is Senator John Sherman. When he had one of those Bills of his before the Senate a short time ago, a gentleman who was in Canada, and who was intimate with Senator Sherman, wrote a letter asking him why he did not include Canada in his Bill; and I have permission to use an extract from the letter which Senator Sherman wrote to that gentleman in reply. He said:

"DEAR SIR.—The reason why the Dominion of Canada has not been included among the nations to be represented, is that under the form of Government existing there, we can only negotiate with and invite Great Britain, the paramount authority in Canada, to participate in the Congress. Both official etiquette and the subordination of Canada to the British Government prevent any negotiations with the Canadian authorities in such a Congress. I know very well that Canada is a much more important country for trade and commercial intercourse, and is in many respects more akin to us than any of the South American States. The fact that we speak the same language, are governed by kindred institutions, and are descended from the same source, would make it natural and easy to form closer commercial and business relations; but we cannot invite the Canadian Government into this Congress, composed as it is of independent States."

There is the reason from Senator Sherman himself why Canada is not invited into that Congress, and cannot send a representative there. Now, what is suggested in this proposal before the House to-night is that Canada should send her own direct representative to the United States, and if she were in a position to do so, we should be so far independent of the control of Downing Street in that matter that we would be accepted and admitted into that Congress to negotiate in that enormously important matter with the United States and the other countries represented there. Now, there is a most distinct practical illustration of the important commercial advantages that we should have by acquiring the right to send an independent negotiator. Well, Sir, at one time the hon. First Minister himself rather squinted in that direction. I dare say the hon. gentleman's colleagues will remember that Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir Charles Tupper were in London in 1879, and in order that Sir Alexander Galt might be appointed as a distinct negotiator for Canada at other countries, these distinguished gentleman, including the First Minister, signed a memo. which they sent into the Colonial Office, and which they concluded in these words:

"It is further submitted that the very large and augmenting commerce of Canada and the increasing extent of her trade with foreign nations are proving the absolute need—"

Of what? Why—

— "of direct negotiations with them for the proper protection of her interests."

The First Minister, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Leonard Tilley actually ten years ago proposed to the English Government  
Mr. EDGAR.

that Canada should have the right to enter into direct negotiations with foreign countries; and they went on to say:

"The necessity has thus arisen for providing separate and distinct trade conventions with foreign powers with whom Canada has distinct trade."

If we have not distinct trade with the United States sufficient to justify us appointing a Minister to that country, I do not know of any country with which we have sufficient trade. You see, therefore, we are not so much in advance of what the right hon. the First Minister himself was in 1879. Now, I think the proposition is a perfectly feasible one. I do not think we would meet with any objection from England if this resolution were carried and if we were distinctly to ask for the right to make our own commercial treaties. That would be only asking the right to use the name of the Queen ourselves. We do not propose revolution, we do not propose that the name of Queen Victoria should not be used in those negotiations, and we think that, as subjects of Queen Victoria, we would be getting a good deal nearer to the Queen herself by being allowed to use her name in making our own commercial treaties. We use her name every day in our writs; we use it in all our domestic matters. I do not think we have very much disgraced her name by any use we made of it as Canadians, and I really do think it would tend to strengthen the silken ties that bind Canadians to the Empire if we were at liberty simply to use her name in making commercial treaties with foreign countries. What earthly objection could England have to our sending our representative to the United States to make a commercial treaty? The only possible objection that could be suggested is that in making these treaties we would be discriminating against England or against countries with which she has entered into commercial treaties containing the most favored nation clause. That is an objection which might have some force if negotiations of a similar kind had not already taken place, and if legislation connected with the duties on foreign goods had not already taken place here, which render it impossible for the English Government to make any objections of that kind. On many occasions and for a good many years England did object to Canada making discriminating arrangements of that kind. In June, 1868, the English Board of Trade protested against our statutory offer to the United States of reciprocity in natural products. That is the offer which hon. gentlemen opposite boast so much about as being sufficient to satisfy all reasonable requirements of the United States. The protest which the English Government made against that offer was combatted very cleverly by Sir John Rose, and the English Government yielded. If we go back to the Elgin Treaty of 1854, we find that under the terms of that treaty there was an express claim to discriminate against England and against all other countries. In 1854, there were a great many treaties between England and foreign nations in which Canada and the other colonies were included, and which contained the most favored nation clause. These treaties would therefore prevent Canada from making a treaty with the United States, offering special trade arrangements with that country, but in the face of that treaty, we made those arrangements. It might be said that although on the face of the Elgin Treaty, we had discriminated against other countries, still when we came to legislate on the subject of the articles which would be admitted into Canada free of duty, we put those articles on the free list as regards the rest of the world. Well, it happened that we did not do so. We did not put all those articles on the free list; several of them were not on it, and, therefore, in respect of those, we did discriminate against England and against the world. There was the article of dried fruits. In that the principle was asserted by Canada of her right to discriminate in favor of the United States. The United

States was the only country from which we could import dried fruits free of duty; therefore we discriminated against all other countries in the world. Among others, there was Greece with which England had a treaty containing the most favored nation clause at that time, and including the colonies. That was a most material violation of that principle, and there was no protest at the time from England or Greece. I have heard a good deal of stress laid upon the speech which the Hon. George Brown made in the Senate on his return from negotiating the draft of a treaty at Washington in 1874. In that speech he suggested that the manufactured articles, which were to be admitted free of duty from the United States, should be placed on the free list, and at any rate, as far as Great Britain was concerned, that there should be no discrimination against her. Now, I think it is impossible that Mr. Brown could have intended to go any further in restricting the right of Canada to discriminate than the English Government itself proposed to go, and I find that when the draft of treaty, which the Hon. George Brown drew up, was sent over to England, the Government there submitted it to the Board of Trade for their consideration. Now, remember that that treaty not only included all the natural products of the Treaty of 1854, but also embraced a large number of manufactured articles, which it proposed to admit reciprocally free between Canada and the United States. The Board of Trade in England commented on that provision of the treaty, and these are the words they used:

"To this no objection can be taken, whatever criticisms may have been made on the original Reciprocity Treaty on the ground that Canada was setting up differential duties against this country and countries with which we have most favored nations treaties. No such objections can be taken now."

So that the English Government, through its own Department of Trade, distinctly and positively repudiated all desire to prevent Canada from setting up differential duties against England or any other country in the world, if it should be in the interest of Canada. This obsolete doctrine, that Canada could not set up differential or discriminating duties, was found in the original Governor General's instructions. Article 9 of those instructions was as follows:—

"You are not to assent in Our name to any Bill of the classes herein after specified, that is to say:—"

And amongst them is this:

"Any Bill imposing differential duties."

There was a most distinct objection on the part of the English Government, which framed these instructions first, to our right to make those discriminating duties, but in 1876, Mr. Blake visited the Colonial Office, and the result of that visit was the disappearance of that clause in the Governor General's instructions. Not only did that clause disappear, but we have the reasons very frankly given by Colonial Secretary, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, in a despatch to Lord Lorne, dated the 3rd May, 1879, in which he says:

"The clause was at the instance of the late Government of the Dominion, omitted from the revised instructions because Her Majesty's Government thought it undesirable that those instructions should contain anything which could be interpreted as limiting or defining the legislative powers conferred in 1867 on the Dominion Parliament."

Now, that was entirely in the line of the report of the English Board of Trade in 1874. Yet, as an illustration of the profound ignorance of Canadian and colonial affairs shown by prominent English public men at the time, and of the necessity of our having Canadians to manage the negotiation of our own treaties, we find that Lord Kimberley actually, in 1882, attempted to fetter us again in this matter. After all that had passed, after the decision of the English Board of Trade, after more than once changing the royal instructions, and after all the incidents to which I have referred, Lord Kimberley, referring to the proposed commercial arrangement with Jamaica, undertook to take the old, old ground, and he said:

"I need scarcely say that Sir A. Musgrave is entirely right in his assumption that Her Majesty's Government could not sanction any arrangements which would involve the creation of differential duties in favor of Canada."

Even the present Government, or that of 1882, could not quite stand that from Lord Kimberley, and they of course knew better than he did how the position stood, and he was very soon made to withdraw the objection he had made to our negotiating an independent treaty with Jamaica. The memorandum of Council, which I entirely approve of, says:

"That, in accordance with this precedent, the Canadian Government claim that it is competent for any of the colonies possessing representative and responsible government to enter into mutual agreements for either partial or absolute free trade with the mother country, or with each other, or with both."

That memorandum is to be found in the Sessional Papers of 1883, No. 89, pages 38 and 39. The Minister of Finance no doubt has observed that, in this motion which is before the Chair to-day, nothing is proposed about the right of Canada to negotiate treaties with British American Provinces. I recollect a few days ago the Finance Minister making a great discovery in the debate on the motion respecting commercial treaties when he said that, in the resolution respecting commercial treaties which Mr. Blake had proposed in 1882, he had included the right to make treaties with British North American Provinces, and he wondered why it was not in that motion, and he pointed to its omission in the resolution of the other day as an evidence of disloyalty. Now he will see the reason, which is that shortly after 1882 the Government of the day obtained from the English Government the distinct acknowledgment that they could create differential duties and negotiate independent treaties with any other colony; and therefore my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have displayed ignorance equal to that of the Finance Minister if he had included any such unnecessary proposal as that in his resolution. I think the hon. gentleman was not in the Government at that time, but he probably read the Government organs, and, if he had read the *Montreal Gazette*, he would have found the announcement in that paper which I have just mentioned to the House. I am not aware that it was ever vouchsafed by the Government to the House, but the *Montreal Gazette* announced it to the public in this way:

"We understand that the principle therein laid down by the Canadian Government has been conceded by the Imperial Government, and that hereafter the colonies are left free to enter upon reciprocal trade relations with each other, whether the arrangement involves discrimination against Great Britain or against other colonies than those immediately concerned."

And, in order to show that the *Montreal Gazette*, a few years ago, was not afraid to see Canada extending her independent trade relations, I will go on to read from the same article which says:

"There is in that concession no weakening of the tie that binds the various portions of the British possessions to the Empire; on the contrary, the freedom of action in the arrangement of whatever policy may be deemed by the colonies most conducive to their material progress and prosperity, can have no other effect than to strengthen the attachment of the colonies to the Crown."

I think that utterance was almost prophetic. It would refer to the resolution which was before the House last Session, to the one which has already been before the House this Session, and to the resolution in your hands to-day, Mr. Speaker, and I would distinctly draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to that article. Now, in order, if possible, to make it more certain that there can be no objection raised by anybody to Canada, making a discrimination in favor of this country and against any other country in her commercial treaty arrangements, I would just refer the hon. gentleman to the *Revised Statutes of Canada*, to section 11 of the Customs Act, in which there is a proposal standing to-day, and it has been standing on our statutes since 1879, and has been very often boasted of by the Government of

the day, and that is the proposal to allow wines, when imported from France or Spain, to be taken off the customs lists, as regards those two countries only. Now, Sir, in that clause of the Customs Act, we distinctly offer to France or Spain, either one of them, a differential discriminating privilege against England and against all the world, in spite of the most favored nation clause in any English treaty. So that it is absolutely clear that the doctrine of differential duties, and of not discriminating against England, or against those favored nations, is absolutely a dead letter, and has been abandoned by English statesmen of every Government, both Liberal and Conservative; and it is, therefore, absolutely open to Canada to make whatever arrangement she likes with the United States about her own commercial matters. England has not, as I am aware of, discriminated in favor of Canada, and she is quite able in trade relations to take care of herself, and she has not asked that Canada should discriminate in her favor. Therefore, Sir, I think, it is the manly course for Canadians to say that, that only possible difficulty being out of the way, they should demand the right to negotiate treaties with all foreign nations, but more particularly with the United States at our doors, and for that reason, especially, I cordially support the motion of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PRAYERS.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

### PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House, I desire to move the addition of two members to the Printing Committee. The Senate appointed nineteen members on this committee instead of seventeen, and it is thought better that we should add two names rather than ask them to reduce the number. I beg to suggest the names of Messrs. Hickey and Ellis.

Motion agreed to.

### REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, for the year 1888.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

### EXTRADITION ACT.

Mr. WELDON (Albert) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) to extend the provisions of the Extradition Act. Mr. EDGAR.

Act. He said: A Bill of this nature is of very grave importance now. The position of Canada with reference to the matter of extradition in a very singular one, partly by reason of her geographical position, and more largely by reason of what may be called historical accidents. To make more clear the purpose that I have in view in this short Bill, let me say a word with reference to the ruling policy underlying the whole matter of extradition law, whether embodied in treaties or statutes. The object of extradition is two-fold. It aims, first of all, more vigorously to enforce the criminal law, and, secondly, a matter of still greater importance, to enable particular communities to rid themselves of a very dangerous class of immigrants. Whatever view we take of the criminal law, we must agree that the objects of the law are to confine and in some cases to destroy very grave offenders, and furthermore, to restrain and to deter those who may be contemplating the commission of crime. The experience of hundreds of years has abundantly shown that the arm of justice is paralyzed when the criminal who has violated the laws of his country escapes punishment by crossing the boundary line. Here, in Canada, we are powerless to reach our hand beyond our boundary line and draw a criminal from a foreign country; but the second purpose, namely, to rid our country of a dangerous class of residents, fugitives seeking an asylum here on account of crimes they committed abroad, is a matter within our own powers, and with which the Parliament of Canada is competent to legislate. Our geographical position is peculiar. On the North American continent there are three political communities, Canada, the Republic of the United States, and Mexico. With the one we have no treaty; with the other we have a very narrow treaty, and the result is that the criminal classes of those two important nations to the south of us are found settling down in Canada. This is, so to speak, the very bottom of the basin; and with an international boundary 3,000 miles long, with increased facilities for travel, the mischiefs resulting from this immigration have been in later years greatly augmented. With reference to the historical accidents of the case, it is a singular fact that while the country of which we form part has now extradition treaties with all important states, all those treaties but one are of comparatively modern dates, and are modelled upon the statute which the English Parliament passed eighteen or nineteen years ago. The statute contains a full list of crimes and an excellent procedure, and was meant to be a guide and model for future treaties; and all the treaties which England has are modelled upon it with the exception of one. That one treaty, that imperfect, that old treaty, is the Ashburton Treaty, which was made forty-seven years ago, and that treaty is of more moment to us than all the others put together. The tenth article of the Ashburton Treaty of 1842 relates to extradition and is singularly defective. It will surprise hon. members who have not given attention to the matter, that it contains a list of but seven crimes, and of really but five. Of these five, four are violent crimes against the person and property, and there is but one commercial crime. The crimes named are murder, assault with intent to commit murder, piracy, robbery, and arson, and the only commercial crime is forgery, including the utterance of forged bills. Within the past forty or fifty years, there has been, for obvious reasons, a great increase of crime in commercial matters. There is an additional complexity in commercial transactions, there is a great extension of credit, a great multiplication of the forms of credit, a great enlargement of our paper money, a great development in the way of replacing these by cheques, and credit forms, and drafts, almost the equivalent of money. These developments have given occasion to a great increase of crime of a commercial character, yet there is in the treaty which determines our extradition re-

lations with the United States, but the single commercial crime of forgery. During the years since 1842, efforts have been made by the diplomats of Great Britain and the United States, to replace the Ashburton Treaty by a better one. The Rosebery Treaty failed to pass in the American Senate. It is not my purpose to trace the reason, I can only deplore the result; and to day, despite the hopes we had a few years ago of a fuller treaty with a larger list of crimes and a better procedure, we are still governed by the old Treaty of 1842. We cannot have all we would like in this matter. Every member of this House would have earnestly wished to see a reasonable, wise treaty adopted by the two nations, and to see the Ashburton Treaty replaced by a wiser and fuller one. But if we cannot have the whole loaf, let us have the half. It is within the power of the Parliament of Canada to give to the people of Canada the very best half of an extradition treaty. It is within our power to drive from our own borders the more flagrant and atrocious criminals who seek Canada as an asylum. The Bill is very brief. It provides in substance that as between Canada and any country which has no extradition treaty with Great Britain affecting Canada, it shall be within the power of the Canadian Government to surrender criminals who are enjoying asylums from certain flagrant crimes committed in foreign countries; and in respect of a state with which we have a treaty, but an incomplete treaty, one containing too narrow a list of crimes, it is provided that the Canadian Executive may surrender criminals having committed one of the long list of crimes contained in the schedule of the Bill, on the demand of a foreign state. There is an *ex post facto* clause in the Bill, and a provision that the expenditure incurred in this matter of extradition, under the Bill, shall be borne by the state which demands the fugitive. The provision is made necessary, apparently, by some difficulties of three or four years' standing between the Canadian Government and some foreign powers, notably Belgium. The offences in this Bill are grave offences, and I desire to emphasise very strongly the fact that the Bill does not in any way impair or invade the right of asylum for political offenders, which in Canada, and in other parts of the Empire, they have enjoyed under all Canadian and British statutes. Long ago, England held out her arms to the people of oppressed nationalities who wished to find a home in that country, and that rule and policy has been carefully conserved in this. I call attention to the fact that, though this legislation is of an exceptional nature, the case is exceptional, and we rest upon strong authority. I will read a short paragraph from the report of a commission which was appointed ten years ago in the mother country to deal with the question of extradition. It was a very strong commission. I do not think that any stronger commission has been appointed during the reign of Queen Victoria. Among the members were the late Chief Justice of England, Lord Cockburn, Lord Blackburn, Russell Gurney, the Recorder of London, Mr. Baggallay, the present Master of the Rolls, who was then Sir Baliol Brett, Sir Fitzjames Stephen, who is now in Queen's Bench, Sir William Harcourt, and some others whose names I do not now recall. They reported in favor of adopting the course that we are proposing in this Bill, of not waiting for a treaty, but of going on by statute to cure the greater half of the evil. I will read this short extract from the first article of the report, which was made in 1878 by the commission, which was appointed the year before:

"We would, therefore, suggest that extradition treaties with other states, which appear to be practically of use only for the purpose of ensuring reciprocity, should no longer be held to be indispensable, and that, while the power in the Crown of entering into extradition treaties with other nations, as now existing by statute, should be still retained, statutory power should be given to the proper authorities to deliver up fugitive criminals whose surrender is asked for, irrespectively of the

existence of any treaty between this country and the state against whose law the offence has been committed. It is as much to our advantage that such criminals should be punished, and that we should get rid of them, as it is to that of the foreign state that they should be brought within the reach of its law."

There are the reasons clearly given in support of the policy of this Bill. I will not now dwell on the multitude of the evils which exist under the present conditions. These may be dwelt upon better at a later stage. I think there is no more insidious danger than that great criminals from other states, carrying off their booty, and making their homes here, should defy the law, should spend their money here, and should corrupt and taint the morals of our young men. I think it is the duty of the people of Canada to protect themselves against this contagion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to negotiate, at as early a date as possible, with the Indians of the Rosseau River, in the Province of Manitoba, for a change of their present reserve to a more suitable location for them, and to open to settlement the land now held by those Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The land in the above reserve is of most excellent quality. It is also well wooded, and altogether a most suitable location for the Indians. It would not be in their interests to remove them.

#### LARUE, CASGRAIN, ANGERS & HAMEL.

Mr. TURCOT asked, What is the total amount paid for fees, costs, emoluments and disbursements since 1st January, 1885, to the following law firms:—1. Messrs. Larue, Angers & Casgrain; 2. Messrs. Larue, Angers, Casgrain & Hamel; 3. Messrs. Larue, Casgrain, Angers & Hamel; 4. Messrs. Casgrain & Angers; 5. Messrs. Casgrain, Angers & Lavery, and to Thos. Chas. Casgrain, Esq.?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The total amount paid to all these firms for costs, fees, emoluments and disbursements for the last four years has been \$12,000. If the hon. gentleman desires the details, I think he will have to move for a return.

#### BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH asked, Has any survey been held on the Belle Creek Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, during the past season? If so, by what engineer, and what is the amount estimated by him of the cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, a survey was made. I am unable to state the name of the person who made the survey, as the orders were sent to the resident engineer at St. John, who, no doubt, detailed one of his assistants to do the work. The amount stated in the report as the estimated cost is \$7,500.

#### OUTSTANDING NORTH-WEST SCRIP.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What is the total amount of North-West land scrip (colonization, volunteer, half-breed, police, and other kinds, if any) now outstanding?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would ask the hon. member to allow that to stand for a week or so, and I will endeavor to get the information for him.

Mr. MULOCK. This day, week?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

## BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, Whether any action has been taken by the Ministry in reference to a petition of the 25th of August, 1887, from the Bresaylor half-breeds for compensation for losses sustained during the North-West rebellion? Whether any compensation has been made to Charles Bremner, for the alleged destruction of cattle, and appropriation of his furs? Whether any steps have been taken to recover the value of his furs from the parties charged with the trespass?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No action has been taken in reference to the petition of the Bresaylor half breeds, except in the case of Charles Bremner. Shortly after I came into office the Minister of Justice called my attention to the promise which he gave the House last Session that further inquiry would be made respecting Bremner's claim for furs. I have given the matter consideration, and so soon as inquiries, which are now being pursued, are complete, definite action will be taken. No steps have as yet been taken to recover the value of the furs from anyone charged with the trespass.

## CASCOMPEQUE HARBOR FOREMAN.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PERRY) asked, Has the Government dismissed Mr. Achille Jobin, foreman for blasting rock in the harbor of Cascumpeque, Prince Edward Island? If so, what are the reasons for his dismissal? Has another foreman been appointed? If so, who is he? Has John P. Brennan, of Alberton, been appointed assistant foreman?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The services of Mr. Achille Jobin were dispensed with, as recommended by Mr. James B. Egan, the assistant engineer of the department in charge of the operations at Cascumpeque, who said it was not desirable that he should be continued on the work. Captain Gillis, late of the dredge *Cape Breton*, who had been serving the department since 1874, was appointed in his place. Mr. J. P. Brennan is not employed as assistant foreman.

## NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, Who is the present lessee of the New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry? What is the annual rental? Are there any arrears of rent due by him? If so, how much? Are there any arrears of rent still due by the former lessee, C. H. Chabot, who was lessee from the year 1881 to 1885? If so, how much?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Thomas Mansfield is the present lessee. The annual rental is \$350; balance due by him, \$875. Arrearages due by C. H. Chabot, \$920. Steps will be taken to collect arrearages.

## ALBERT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Has the balance of the money granted to the Albert Railway Company been paid; how much money has been paid on account thereof since the 1st July, 1887, and to whom was the same paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. No. 2. To Albert Railway Company, \$2,341.19; to interest account, \$770.94; to L. R. Harrison, for professional services, \$111.12; total, \$3,223.25.

## AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What masters of Government cruisers were authorised to enter and clear American fishing or other vessels during the year 1887? How many vessels were entered and cleared under such authority, and by whom?

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. BOWELL. The following are the names of the masters and cruisers:—James McLean, of the steamer *General Middleton*; Charles Dakin, of the steamer *Lansdowne*; Thomas Quigley, of the *L. Houlett*; William McLaren, of the schooner *Critic*; Matthew Sweetzer, who did serve; Andrew Gordon, of the steamer *Acadia*; Charles T. Knowlton, of the schooner *Advance*; J. N. Pratt, of the schooner *Capt. Howard*; L. Pouliot, of the steamer *Annie C. Moore*. The department has no means of knowing how many vessels were entered and cleared by them. No return of the kind was ever made to the department except when called for. Their instructions were to send such reports and clearances to the nearest collector for registration in his books. I may add that if the hon. gentleman would like to know the number, he can send to each of the ports in the Maritime Provinces.

## PICTOU BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The total length of the Pictou Branch Railway, from its junction with the Intercolonial to the terminus of said Pictou Branch at Pictou?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Fifteen miles.

## INTEREST ON CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BONDS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What sum has fallen due for interest upon the \$15,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway bonds, as authorised in 1888? Has all interest been met by the railway company, or has the Government been called upon to pay any sum upon their guarantee of 3½ per cent; and if so, what sum, and when was it due, and when paid?

Mr. BOWELL. The first payment of six months' interest (\$262,500) on \$15,000,000, Canadian Pacific Railway bonds authorised last Session, fell due on the first of January, and has been made by the company.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

Copies of all memorials addressed to the Government by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories which sat recently at Regina.

He said: In making this motion I desire to occupy the time of the House for a few moments, and that the House listen, not to my words, but to the voice of what, without a figure of speech, may be properly called a New World. It has been opened up by you, and it is under your charge. It is some six years since that greater Canada was opened up by a railway, a railway which not merely opens up that great territory, but constitutes a highway for the world. It is a railway which will always be connected with the name of the right hon. gentleman, and had he nothing else upon which his fame might rest, that railway would secure his memory. It is a railway that realises the dreams of great and enthusiastic men. Lachine, near Montreal, marks the object of one, and the English Franklin aimed at doing, and gave his life in trying to do, what this great work has accomplished for the world. Now, Sir, six years ago I witnessed the opening of the first North-West Council, not the first North-West Council held in the Territory, but the first held at Regina. That council was crude, but in the succeeding years it did good work and laid the foundation of our educational and municipal systems, and our criminal and civil jurisprudence. At that time Brandon, which is now a flourishing city, whence we get one of our ablest members of this House, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly)—at that time Brandon was crude, and I remember that my hon. friend welcomed us to a tent club.

Earlier than that time, a little over six years ago, Calgary had no existence—it was merely Fort Calgary; Medicine Hat had no existence, Moose Jaw had no existence, and none of the flourishing little towns that stretch across the prairie now, had any existence. The prairie itself was practically virgin of the plough. Now it produces millions of bushels of grain, and we exported such quantities of grain the year before last, as to almost embarrass the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not only so, but coal mines have come into existence, sawmills, flour mills, cheese factories, dairies. Ranching and horse raising are carried on to a very large extent, and the day is at hand when we shall have smelting and reducing works there, and there is no reason why, at this moment, we should not have tanneries flourishing in Regina, Moose Jaw and Calgary. Every year at Calgary you have 10,000 hides, and 3,000 sheep-skins, so tanning could be carried forward successfully. The council has, within a short time, owing to the action of Parliament last year, grown into a Legislative Assembly. That Assembly sat last year, and I am only echoing the language of persons who visited it from the east, when it was in session, in stating that that Assembly need not fear comparison with any Provincial Assembly in the Dominion in the *personnel* of its members, in their intelligence, and in the zeal with which they give themselves to legislation. During that time the Minister of Interior presided over the destinies of that country, and took a deep interest in its welfare, and it is due to him to say, that the educational progress we have made has been largely due to the great interest he took in education in the Territories. I ask without fear the attention of members of this House for that portion of the Dominion, because I think this House is now sensible that in that vast and fertile region we have the solution of the difficulty in the way of Canada becoming one day, however distant, a self-contained nation. As regards the settlers who are in that prairie region, I will say this for them, that there are not in the whole Empire men more calculated by reason of their intelligence, morality and business qualities to lay the foundations of a great and prosperous community. They are all energetic, most of them are reading men, some are cultured men, and there is no doubt whatever, that the free and independent bearing which characterises the men in the North-West is due in part, possibly wholly, to their free surroundings. It may be that even the associations of the North-West have some influence on them. The associations connected with the North-West are of the most inspiring kind, for though a new land, it is a land which has historical associations of which people can never read or think of without enthusiasm. Some 150 years ago Pierre Gauthier de Varennes traversed those very regions, and Forts Du Pas, Fort du Grande Rapide, at the Rapids of the Saskatchewan, Fort La Corne, and other places familiar to North-West travellers, are among their footmarks that are living yet. That prairie region alone contains 123,000 square miles, reaching up from the arid plateau of the Missouri to the forests of the Saskatchewan and stretching away from Manitoba to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. That whole region maybe described as one vast wheat mine. There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who knows that country that it is destined to be the great wheat-producing region of the future. My hon. friends from Hamilton visited the country last year. Both of them went north and south and saw what sort of a country was there. The correspondent of the *Empire*, Professor Dawson, visited the country, and probably some hon. members have read his letters about the country; but my hon. friends from Hamilton, with visitors from Ontario, at an earlier period, saw with wonder the extraordinary crops produced. It is not merely, as I have already stated, a wheat-producing country. We have farmers in every part of the North-West who are also engaged in stock raising. If you go north of Regina or

Moose Jaw, you will find farmers who came in there without \$100, as they will tell you, owning herds with nearly their whole homestead cultivated. In the Qu'Appelle valley you will find several herds increasing at an almost mathematical ratio every year, and horse ranching south of Regina is most successful. I have here a pamphlet just issued by the Regina board of trade. I will not trouble the House with the details contained in this pamphlet.

Mr. MITCHELL. Read it.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not read it, even though that desire be expressed by the Third Party without a single dissenting voice, but I will give the House some idea of the character of the pamphlet. On page 13, there is the testimony of Robert Green, who came to the country without very much money, and who is now a prosperous man. He says:

"This year (1888) I had eighty acres cropped as follows: Wheat—29 acres, yielding 30 bushels per acre, which will grade No. 1. Oats—48 acres, yielding 60 bushels per acre, first-class quality and weighing 42 lbs. per bushel. Potatoes (Early Rose)—3 acres, yielding 350 bushels per acre. The binding of the grain averaged 3 lbs. of binding twine per acre. I have also a garden consisting of one acre of land on which I raised cabbage, cauliflower, turnips, beets, mangolds, &c., which for size and quality may be equalled but not excelled in any agricultural district in the world."

Then there is the testimony of Charles Martin to the same effect. Then there is the testimony of Walter Simpson, who spoke in a like manner. Adam Traynor, who spoke in a similar strain, said:

"I broke 100 acres here in 1886 with a gang plow drawn by four to seven oxen, the driest season we have had since the place was settled, and backset 70 acres of the same, besides doing what other work I had to do. Good days I broke 3½ acres per day, but my average during the month of June was about 3 acres per day; in backsetting about seven to eight inches deep, with six to seven oxen, I averaged about 2½ acres per day, on half mile furrows. I have my homestead all broke but about three-quarters of an acre where my house and granary stand, and nearly finished backsetting."

He goes on to give like testimony to the fruitfulness of the soil. J. W. Reynolds, eighteen miles north of Regina, advises young men to go to the country. He says:

"Yes; I like the country, climate good, health ditto; going to have school house right on my farm; Regina and Long Lake Railway runs across corner of my land. Have oxen, ten head of cattle, farm implements, good frame house. Just threshed, wheat gone over thirty bushels to the acre, No. 1 hard at that, and no frost. I think this is the country for good practical farmers, would like to see every half section taken up, and have no hesitation in advising energetic young men to come here."

Neil Martin gives similar testimony. Then we have the testimony of a Crofter, Donald McFayden, a hardy Scotchman of 57 years, who makes the following statement:

"I came to the Regina district on July 15th, 1887. I am located on Section 34, Township 20, Range 19. I have a wife and five children; built a good log house 19x15 last year; put in ten acres this spring on breaking; it is a beautiful crop. We have a good school house and a Scotch minister in our midst. When I landed in the country from Scotland I had no money. I like the country well, have good health, and I can in good conscience advise all in my native country who are not doing well to come to this country. All the Crofters in this section are doing well and like the country very much."

James Bole tells us:

"This year, 1888, I had 105 acres under crop (eighty acres wheat, twenty oats and five barley, potatoes and rye). The wheat on new land yielded thirty-five bushels to the acre, and took four lbs. of binding twine per acre. The oats were the finest I ever saw, standing nearly five feet high all over the field, and yielded eighty bushels to the acre,—this was fourteen acres on old land, part of which was cropped three years and part five years in succession. I had six acres of oats harrowed in on stubble *without ploughing*. This is a style of farming I do not approve of, but the spring was very late and I thought I would try it and grow green fodder if nothing else, but to my surprise it came on as thick and looked as well as any of the crop in the district; the field is not yet threshed, but I feel confident the six acres will yield 500 bushels. Mr. Ira Morgan, president of the Ontario Agricultural and Arts Association, who saw this field while standing, and Mr. McDonald, editor *Mark Lane Express*, who saw it in the sheaf, can testify to the correctness of this statement. My wheat this year grades No. 1 hard, and I have already sold 600 bushels to Regina dealers from \$1.08 to \$1.11 per bushel.

"At the present time I have seven horses and a small start in thoroughbred cattle; seven hogs ready for pork by Christmas, a binder,



sulky plough, two hand ploughs, two waggons, sleighs, harness, a small house, comfortable stable, good well of water, and everything else necessary, all of which are paid for or at least provided for, and will have at least a thousand dollars additional to further improve the farm, enlarge the house and stables, and provide comforts which pioneer days did not afford.

"Considering that I am now past 60 years of age, and that I started without capital (having lost my farm in Ontario by endorsing and subsequent business failure), I think I can with clear conscience advise every man of sober habits and a determination to succeed to come to this country. Farming is pleasant, and to every man who knows his business and attends to it, is profitable. No forests to cut down, no draining, no taxes, as nature has given us good roads, everything a man could desire is here for the man who desires to use them."

John McIntyre, a brother of Mr. Duncan McIntyre, who has a very large farm, gives similar testimony. Thomas Barton, an Englishman whose farm I have visited myself, corroborates this. Mr. Barton's farm is certainly one of the most interesting places that one could visit, because it is a piece of England transferred to the wilds of the west. He has a cottage buried in flowers, and it is hard, when sitting in his parlor and looking at the wealth of flowers around you, to realise that you are in a cottage which was raised there five or six years ago when all was a wilderness around. Mr. Barton says:

"This year I invested in a threshing machine, and for the past month have been threshing in the district, and I can testify to the great productiveness of the soil. Have just got through at Mr. Henry Fisher's farm, where we threshed over 8,000 bushels of grain. Wheat is yielding all the way from 22 to 42 bushels to the acre, and oats from 50 to 90, and in a few cases, on my own farm, for example, over 100. I find Regina a good market for all kinds of farm produce, grain, butter, eggs, pork, and fat cattle always find ready sale. As to how I like the country, I say first-class. If a man works hard, and is a good manager, he will get rich quicker farming than in any other country in the world that I know anything about. All branches of farming can be carried on, dairying, cattle raising, wheat growing. Large areas of land can be put under cultivation in a short time, and there is plenty of pasture to start as big a herd of cattle as a man likes. Don't think I have any more to say, unless I might add that this appears to me to be the right country for good, hard working men, who are living in the old country from hand to mouth. To all such I say, sell all you have and come out here and start over again. If you are not a practical farmer, you will soon learn, if you are willing to learn and willing to work. Hoping, gentlemen, you will succeed in getting us more neighbors."

So, Sir, I could mention case after case. There is a gentleman here at present, Mr. Cars, who was a Carleton farmer well-known in this district, and he is now one of the most successful men in the whole North-West. He has a large herd, farms extensively, and has probably made some \$20,000 in the North-West. He is here at the present moment, speaking to his friends in Carleton and giving them some idea of the Land of Promise where he himself has succeeded so well. A moment ago I spoke about the schools in the North-West, and I shall now refer to them again. This House will be glad to know that in that new region opened up six years ago we have 167 schools at the present time; the teachers are carefully examined, they have to have certificates just as your teachers have here; and as I have visited many of the schools I can bear testimony to their great efficiency. I would like to impress on the Government, and especially on the Minister of the Interior, that I really think a step might be taken further in the matter of education and something done in the way of having a high school at some central place. The children that went to our ordinary schools six years ago have now grown beyond the teachers, and we ought to have a high school for them. I spoke to you a moment ago about that Assembly which has charge of so important a part of our interests. It has very wide powers now and it is gliding into responsible government. That Assembly passed a number of memorials which it desired should be brought before this House. I do not intend to occupy your time at any great length, and I will rapidly describe what those memorials are. The first relates to a subject which need not be impressed upon any hon. member: it is the necessity of opening up as rapidly as possible the Saskatchewan district by railway communication. I believe the Government have done

Mr. DAVIN.

their part in this matter and that we shall soon have a railway opening up the Saskatchewan territory. It is a district of the North-West which is, if anything, more attractive than even our prairies along the line, because it is varied with hill and forest and stream, and the House will easily understand what an attractive place for immigration it will be when a railway gives facilities for the ingress of immigrants and for the egress of the crops and products which they grow. Of course, at the present moment there is no encouragement to settlers to grow crops, because, if they grow them, they have no market within reach. The next memorial relates to what are called the loyal half-breeds. I do not know much about the subject myself, but my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) will be better acquainted with the particulars. It is contended that there were some loyal half-breeds who suffered losses, and, notwithstanding their loyalty, their losses have not been recouped. The Assembly now pray that His Excellency will be authorised to have such steps taken as will cause a reconsideration of the whole subject of the claims of half-breeds for losses during the rebellion, with a view to compensate those who proved themselves to have been loyal, with such amounts as may be shown to be equal to their losses. The next memorial relates to providing seed grain for any person in a part of the North-West Territories whose crops may have failed. In the district with which I am connected there have been no failures whatever, and I am not aware of any failure in crops along the line. But I suppose there must have been failure in some districts, or this resolution would not have been passed by the Assembly. I come now to a resolution which deals with a burning question in the North-West, that is the liquor question. Ever since I went in there that question has created great restlessness, and I think myself it has created unreasonable restlessness when we remember that no man went into the territory without knowing that it was a prohibitory territory. Every man that went there knew that prohibition obtained, and as I have often said to some of my friends who grumbled very loudly on this subject, it was one on which they had no right to grumble about, because they knew it was a prohibitory territory when they went in there. Notwithstanding this, however, the question has created a great deal of feeling. The settlers somehow seem to think it hard that they had to ask a permit from anyone, and I have heard men, because they were refused a permit, talk as though they had good grounds for flat rebellion. I will say this in passing: The hon. gentleman who is Minister of Interior, and who had the administering of that permit system, had one of the most difficult tasks to perform that any man could undertake. No one course would please everybody, and to do one's duty in refusing a permit to men who ought not to get it was sure to make enemies. I always sympathised with the hon. gentleman in the difficult task he had to perform in dealing with that permit system. Now, here is the position at present. The four per cent. beer has been admitted wholesale by a special permit. It is not strong enough for some people, and it is too strong for others; the consequence is that there is a great desire to have this question settled, both on the part of those in favor of high license and on the part of those strictly temperance people who would like to see prohibition established, even unqualified by permit. There is a great deal to be said in favor of settling this question rapidly. In the first place, we can grow in the North-West the finest barley that ever rewarded farmer's toil, and beer and whiskey are both brought in from outside. Over 7,000 gallons of whiskey was brought in last year by permit, yielding a revenue of over \$3,000 from permits; and yet the amount of whiskey brought in contraband from Montana Colonel Herchmer will tell you, is simply incalculable. Parties bring it in, cache it two miles from the town, and on moonlight nights

go out and bring it in in small quantities. In this way a large amount of money is being sent out of the territory, while beer is being brought in and drunk which we could manufacture there. Again, we had manufactories of what is called Moose Jaw beer, a kind of beer made from hops, without malt in it. The four per cent. beer coming from Winnipeg has shut all these up. Mr. Allen, the son of a Toronto brewer, had \$10,000 or \$12,000 invested in a brewery at Moose Jaw, and this man has been ruined by this four per cent. beer coming in. Now, what is to be done? There is a great desire on the part of many people for a plebiscite, but a plebiscite is not known to the British constitution, and it might be a doubtful way of settling this matter. Let me tell you that Mr. Bliss, who is at the head of one of the temperance organisations, visited the North-West last summer, and stopped at Medicine Hat, Calgary, and other places; and after returning to Winnipeg he issued a pronouncement in which he said that it was of vital importance that the liquor question should be settled in the North-West Territory, and that the morals of the community required that it should be settled—how? By prohibition? No, but by high license. This Mr. Bliss will, no doubt, be known to my hon. friend from Norfolk. The Legislative Assembly proposed themselves to take the opinion of the people on the subject, and to pay the cost of doing so out of their own funds; but the judges whom they consulted told them that would be *ultra vires*. Then they passed this resolution:

"That, in the opinion of this Assembly, a vote of the Territories on the question of license *vs.* prohibition should immediately be taken.

"That in the event of provision for the taking of such vote not being made by the Dominion authorities at the next Session of the Dominion Parliament, it is the opinion of this assembly that powers similar to those enjoyed by provisions under the British North American Act in respect to the liquor question should forthwith be granted."

Of course, if the power were granted before they could legislate, one of two things should be done. They should not be allowed to use the power until after their term expired and they went to the country, or a dissolution should take place, in order that they might go to the country, and have the question decided at the polls. That would, no doubt, be a constitutional course; and, as we have practically manhood suffrage in the Territories, such a vote would effect the same purpose as a plebiscite. The next resolution deals with a matter of the greatest possible moment to the Territories, immigration, and makes suggestions:

"Your Committee would further recommend that a sum of \$5,000 be voted from the general revenue fund of the Territories, and that this House, by every means at its disposal, press upon the Dominion Government the advisability of granting us the sum of \$10,000; both of said sums to be used for immigration purposes. With such sums at the disposal of this House, your Committee are of the opinion that greater results would be had, both to the Dominion as a whole, and to these Territories in particular, than can be had by the expenditure of a like sum under the general immigration schemes of the Dominion. We would suggest that two permanent officials, selected by this House, be located in Great Britain; also that four agents be appointed by this House, one being from each of the Dominion electoral districts, who shall be located for a period of three months at four of the principal points in Eastern Canada and the United States, as, say, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto and Chicago. We would further suggest that several pamphlets be prepared, giving a full description of the various localities suitable for settlement within these vast Territories, believing, as we do, that it is impossible in a single pamphlet to do justice to the varied natural resources of our Territories. We would report that we have made an estimate of the probable cost of the scheme. We propose, as follows:—

#### Salaries.

Two permanent officials in Great Britain, at \$100 per month, each .....	\$3,400
Four men located in Eastern Canada and Chicago, three months, at \$100 per month .....	1,200

#### Travelling Expenses.

Two officials in Great Britain, at \$5 per day, each...	3,600
Four agents in Eastern Canada, at \$5 per day, each...	1,800
Office expenses .....	2,000
Preparing and printing pamphlets .....	4,000

Total .....

The Government will perceive that they propose to give out of their own revenue \$5,000, if \$10,000 is given for the same purpose by the Dominion. Now, Sir, I cannot help thinking that greater benefits would result if the Local Government had to deal with this matter, and not the Dominion. The Department of Agriculture will necessarily deal very generally with the question of immigration; but if we had local agents controlled by the Advisory Board in Regina, their action would be focussed in certain channels, and the immigrants' attention would be directed, not to the North-West in a vague way, but to particular parts of the North-West having special attractions, and they would be put on board the train at Halifax and sent on to these destinations. The next resolution relates to half-breeds:

"The Assembly recommends that granting of scrip to half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-West Territories be extended to such half-breed heads of families and their children who, on the 15th day of July, 1870, were resident of non-ceded territory, and who have since moved to either Manitoba or the North-West Territories."

"The Assembly would further recommend that half-breeds residing in the North-West Territories on the 20th April, 1885, who were otherwise entitled to scrip, but who failed to comply with the conditions of the Order in Council of the 20th April, 1885, be granted scrip notwithstanding such Order in Council. As under the Half-breed Commission of the 20th of March, 1885, the Indian title, in so far as the half-breeds are concerned, only extends to those born prior to the 15th July, 1870, and as a number have been born to parents coming under the said commission of 1885, who, in the opinion of this Assembly, have equal rights to those already dealt with, this Assembly would draw the attention of the Dominion Government to the fact and urge that steps be taken to finally end all half-breed claims. This Assembly would also urge the appointment of judges of the North-West Territories as permanent commissioners, to adjust and investigate half-breed claims, as the system of the flying commission is very unsatisfactory to the people and unnecessarily expensive to the Government."

Now, I would state this argument to the House. Under the Manitoba Act of 1870, 1,400,000 acres of land were set apart for half-breed children. These did not extend outside of Manitoba. Therefore, the primitive contract made between the Government and the half-breeds did not extend outside of Manitoba, or to any other half-breeds or bands of half-breeds. We acknowledge the Indian title in the half-breed; we acknowledge that he has the Indian title. When we come to extinguish the Indian title with a band of Indians, what do we do? We make a treaty with them. We do not insist that Treaty six shall do for what we afterwards call Treaty seven. We do not insist that a treaty with the Blackfeet will do for a treaty with the Crees, but we act, as do sensible men in ordinary life; we deal frankly with the persons with whom we have to deal, in regard to the interests they control. Those half-breeds in the North-West were not in Manitoba at the time the Manitoba Act was passed, and the arrangement made to extinguish the Indian title in Manitoba. As we took no steps—and it was our fault that we took none—to extinguish the title in 1870 of the half-breeds in the North-West, and did nothing in 1885, how can we say to the half-breeds in the North-West in 1885: Now, we are going to deal with you as though you had been dealt with already in 1870 in Manitoba. I could never see the reason which would justify that position being taken, and I am perfectly certain the matter has only to be brought to the attention of Parliament and the Government to lead them to do what is statesmanlike and proper—to lead them to deal with the half-breeds to-day who were not in Manitoba and were not dealt with at that time, on the footing of the present, and on the same principle on which was based the settlement with the half-breeds in Manitoba, and give to the children that exist to-day what was given to the children in 1870. As a fact, the name of every half-breed child born in the country, up to the 20th April, 1885, is on record in the Department of the Interior, so that it is not necessary to do more than look into the affidavits. Then comes the third resolution in regard to the question of scrip:

"That the Dominion Government be requested to grant scrip to all those acting during the North-West rebellion as scouts under the Police Act."

I am happy to state that this matter of scrip, which has so often occupied our attention, is on the way to be satisfactorily settled by the Government. The next resolution relates to a body of men which is a credit to Canada. No Canadian visits the North-West without feeling proud of the Mounted Police. We have had English general officers visiting the North-West, and they looked with envy on that body of 1,100 men, each one of whom would be a model for a statue. These men who took part in putting down the rebellion, fought, when they had the opportunity, as gallantly as did the volunteers. They endured hardship, they did everything they had an opportunity of doing, and all they complain of is that they did not get more opportunity; and if they had had more opportunity, I believe we might have brought the rebellion to a close more rapidly and not less gloriously. Many of these policemen endured hardships, and it is no new thing for them to endure hardships. Their whole life, especially in the winter, is one of continuous strain, and there is no soldier's life as trying as the life of the Mounted Police, in the winter, up in the North-West. The Assembly passed this resolution:

"We would beg leave, respectfully, to point out that in great measure the services of this force were insufficiently appreciated in Canada, that the arguments advanced against their receiving such awards are, in our opinion, to a great extent, fallacious, and that we are confident such a bestowal will be hailed throughout the North-West as a satisfaction, and as an act of justice."

What they ask for is the same award of scrip as has been conferred on other corps, but I can tell you that many of the mounted police have told me they cared very little for scrip, but that certainly, as they had borne the brunt and heat of the day as well as others, they would like to have it; but they should also have a medal. Then comes a resolution with regard to the main trails. I do not expect to be able to clear up the mystery of the main trails and to enlighten Parliament on this recondite subject. The trails are from Macleod to Calgary, from Calgary to Edmonton and Athabasca Landing, from Swift Current to Battleford, and from Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert. These trails will require for some time to be kept in good order, and the Assembly reports:

"The condition of some of these trails at certain seasons of the year has proved to be dangerous to life and property, and communication between the different settlements made most difficult and supplies not only rendered much dearer but in fact almost impossible to obtain. Such a condition of affairs is a most important element in retarding settlement and the proper development of the Territories, and as the funds at the disposal of the Territorial Government are insufficient to make the necessary improvements and we consider the Dominion Government especially interested in those trails, we would therefore urge that the Dominion Government appropriate a special sum to be expended on the following trails: From Macleod to Calgary. From Calgary to Edmonton and Athabasca Landing. From Swift Current to Battleford. From Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert."

Now I come to a great question in the North-West. The resolution is very long but very important, which the council has passed, and I will ask the attention of hon. members while I read. It is as follows:—That it is desirable, in the interest of the settlers and of the settlement in the Territories, that the time of payment for pre-emption in arrears should be extended five years from the 1st of January, 1889, without interest, and on condition that homesteaders remain on and continuously cultivate their homesteads during that period:

"That it would be only just to those who entered the lands in the Territories, during the operation of the Act permitting second homesteading, that the right to second homesteading should in all cases be extended to them, provided they have continuously cultivated their first homesteads.

"That in the year 1885 a regulation was in force whereby persons entering for cancelled lands could secure only eighty acres for a homestead, and eighty acres as a pre-emption, and as this regulation was

Mr. DAVIN.

acknowledged to be unwise and unjust by its withdrawal, settlers in such a disadvantageous position should be allowed the same rights and privileges as other bona fide settlers, by being granted a full quarter section as a homestead."

The Assembly does not seem to be aware that in 1887 the late Minister of the Interior did away with the eighty acre homesteads and the eighty acre pre-emptions. What they do pray for, and what many contend should be done, is that those who have got the eighty acres homestead, and the eighty acres pre-emption, and have paid for the eighty acres pre-emption, should have the money returned, but since 1887 there have been no eighty acre pre-emptions or homesteads, the smallest being 160 acres.

"That, whereas in the years 1884, 1885 and 1886 persons entering for lands that had been cancelled, were charged, in addition to an extra fee for inspection, besides value for improvements that had been made, also an additional price for pre-emptions, varying from 25 cents to \$1 per acre, which additional price was demanded at the time of making entry;

"And, whereas there was no good reason, in the greater value of such lands, for the additional charge per acre;

"Therefore, the prices of such pre-emptions should be reduced to the prices charged for uncanceled lands in the same districts; and moneys paid thereon should be applied to the payment of such pre-emptions at the said reduced price.

"That, whereas it has been proved that, for the success of the settler, it is necessary for him to engage in both grain and stock raising, and it has been demonstrated that for this purpose the settler requires not less than 320 acres of land;

"And whereas from the fact that many settlers have been unable to pay for their pre-emptions, it has been shown that the prices for pre-emptions have been placed at too high a figure, thus practically depriving many homesteaders of the benefit of pre-emptions, which are essential for success in mixed farming;

"That, in cases where pre-emptions have been cancelled during the past three years, because settlers were unable to pay for the same, these lands should not be held open for homesteading until the whole matter regarding pre-emptions has been further considered.

"Therefore, it is advisable that the prices of pre-emptions be reduced to the following figures, viz.: For lands within twenty miles of an operated railway, two dollars per acre, and for lands at a greater distance from an operated railway, one dollar per acre.

"That, in the interests of the Territories, specially of the prairie districts, it is desirable that every possible encouragement should be given to tree-culture;

"Therefore, it is desirable that arrangements should be made, whereby tree planting, with continued and successful cultivation, should be permitted to stand in the place of grain cultivation, acre for acre, as fulfilment of homestead duties;

"That, in paying for pre-emption, tree planting be allowed to count at the rate of five cents for each tree planted by the settlers and found growing on their homestead or pre-emption for two years next preceding such payment.

"That the present system of having odd-numbered sections withdrawn for homesteading is pernicious; that it is an injury to settlers, inasmuch as, preventing close settlement, it throws additional burdens on them for carrying on schools and for necessary improvements.

"Above all, because the settlement of the land is of more value, and will bring more revenue into the Treasury, than the possible sale of lands thus withheld from settlement will, and because the throwing open of these sections for homesteading would be further inducement for emigrants to come to these Territories, seeing they would then be able to enjoy the advantages of close neighborhood to other settlers.

"That, should it be found necessary in future to withhold public lands from homesteading for railway purposes, it would be well to provide that alternate quarter-sections be granted instead of alternate sections.

"Therefore, it is advisable that arrangements be made, where possible, to throw open all odd-numbered sections for homesteading, seeing that this would be in the true interests of the Territories, and also therefore of the Dominion.

"That, as the large portion of the Dominion lands is in the Territories, it is most desirable, in the interest of the settler, the Territories and the Dominion, that a Dominion Land Board should be established at some central and convenient point in the Territories.

"That His Honor the Lieutenant Governor will be pleased to transmit a memorial embodying this report to the proper authorities at Ottawa, for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council."

I have troubled the House with reading this long document to them, but it is so important, and deals with matters which are so important for the settlers, that I may be excused. Remember, it is the voice of an Assembly elected by a suffrage practically extending to every man over twenty-one years of age in the North-West Territories, and, as you have really the administration of our affairs in your hands, it is only right and proper that I should bring the views of these people before you. One of the main questions dealt

with there is the second homesteading, and that question has two aspects. The first aspect is this: Men who come in under the Dominion Lands Act of 1883 came in with the right under that Act, when they got their patent, to get a second homestead. In 1886, on the 2nd of June, assent was given to an Act which took away this right that these people came in under. I consider that it was a most monstrous thing to do. It must have been done thoughtlessly, but it was a monstrous thing to do. In 1887, when I came down here, I put a little Bill on the paper, making some amendments to the Dominion Lands Act, and, amongst others, this relating to the second homestead. We saw my late lamented friend, the Hon. Thomas White, several times on that subject, my colleagues, the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Madowall), the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), and the late member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Perley), who has gone to another place.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Who says "Carried?" I hope there is not a gentleman in this House, either on the Reform or the Conservative side, who is so little aware of what his duties in this House are, and of what his duties as a member of Parliament are, as to hesitate to give whatever time is necessary to that great territory which you administer here. We saw the Hon. Thomas White several times, and we pressed, or rather I think I pressed, this question of the second homesteading on him. I rather think both my hon. friends differed with me on that, as well as the hon. gentleman who was then the member for Eastern Assiniboia. I may say here, in passing, if the House will excuse a personal word, that, when I have had to speak on this subject of the second homesteading before my constituent, I have stated on the platform what I say now, that my colleagues differed with me on this question of a second homestead, but I never introduced the subject without paying a tribute to the efficiency and the zeal of my colleagues, which I could not do here in their presence, because one can speak with more energy and enthusiasm behind the back of another than before his face. But, thereupon, some of those gentlemen who are always bent upon doing kind things and representing one exactly as one is, some newspaper would say that I had attacked my colleagues. This House is aware that it is not my custom to attack any man behind his back, especially men who are my personal friends. Well these gentlemen differed with me. However, I talked several times with the Hon. Thomas White about it, and I made an argument on going into committee on this Bill, just before we went to dinner, which I think irrefragable, and I call the attention of the Government to it now because it is an argument that cannot be got over. Under our legislation of 1886, men who never were entitled to a second homestead morally, that is to say, men who came into the country before such a thing as a second homestead was heard of, could get a second homestead, but not one man except those who came in during the eight days between the 25th May and 2nd June, who came in with that motive, could get a second homestead. I say that was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the position taken by the Government; and my hon friend, as you will see by the *Hansard*, rose up, after I sat down, and he said: "I have listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. gentleman, but he has not convinced me." However, I went over to him, I knew he was a journalist, and I knew very well that he would agree that such a thing as that would affect the public mind. I said to him: "Have you considered that argument?" He said: "I have, and I see the full force of it." Then I said: "You are going to act on it?" He said: "I do not think I can." Now I am not going to repeat the conversation that further took place between us; but he said: "I cannot act on it." Well, I got a little mad, that is to say, I got

a little aggravated; it is very seldom that I get mad, but when I do, it is merely a righteous indignation. I came over to my place, and after thinking for a time, I went over to him again and I said: "Well, look here, you have been very good to us, you have done nearly everything that could have been done by your department. You have got rid of that eighty acres, and that forty mile limit for uncancelled homesteads. You have done all that you could for us. Now put that on one year and I will be satisfied for the present, and we will let the Bill slide through the committee, making a few amendments." I know he would. "Well," he said, "I will risk it," and it was put on, as you will have seen. Of course, I may point out to you that the hon. gentleman admitted the principle for that year. He put in it on from 1886 to 1887, as you will find it in the Act passed in that year. I said, "Put it on one year, and make that 1887, instead of 1886, and we will be satisfied for the present." The reason that I did that was this: half a loaf was better than no bread. That would enable all that came in in 1884, all that were entitled to second homesteads that year, 1887, to get them. No man that came in in 1885 could get a second homestead that year. I said to him, moreover, that nearly all our people came in in 1884. I did not know, until I went back to the Territories, that a large number had come in in 1885 and 1886. Now, Sir, that is one part of the second homesteading. There is another side to it. We have what are called cancelled homesteads, that is to say, a man comes and enters for a first homestead. He does not fulfil the conditions. There are certain conditions as to residence, six months' residence each, conditions as to the building of a house, and conditions as to cultivation. If he does not fulfil these, if it be shown clearly that he has neglected these, the commissioner in Winnipeg will most properly give directions to have the homestead cancelled. The rule passed by the land board about these cancelled homesteads was this, that no man entitled to a second homestead could second homestead a cancelled homestead unless within forty miles of his original homestead. Well, as a large number of speculators had gone in in 1882 and 1883, as a large amount of land was cancelled, this was a very bad arrangement, because it prevented the man who was in the country from going and taking up a desirable spot that had been taken up by these land grubbers, and it allowed the man just coming into the country to take it up. Well, Mr. White agreed that that should be reduced to six miles; and after the land board had met it was arranged that a man could second-homestead a cancelled homestead within six miles. Now, Sir, what we say is this: What is the virtue of this six miles? The original idea, no doubt, in the minds of those who declared that you could not homestead a cancelled homestead, except it were forty miles distant from the original homestead—I have no doubt that the original idea was this: if we allow them to second-homestead a cancelled homestead near their original homestead, they will get some friend to homestead a desirable location, then leave it, and then they will go by-and-by and second-homestead it. I believe that the danger of that sort of thing was never as great as was expected. Nearly all the ideas, or a *priori* speculations, of politicians as to what would happen in regard to the North-West, have turned out to be groundless. One of the speculations about this second homesteading was this: that Ontario farmers would go in and homestead, would build a house, would cultivate the place, and then Englishmen, or Irishmen, or Scotchmen, would come in and buy their holdings, and they would go off and second homestead. Well, of course, that was a poor idea, because it would give you a perambulating settlement. I may say here that the very moment that fact was brought to my attention in 1883—it was in the autumn of 1883 when I first saw this second-homestead policy—I raised my voice against it, and protested against it. I saw that it was a dangerous

policy, and I condemned it as a bad policy. But I say that the fact of its being a bad policy does not always relieve you from your obligation that you entered into, which obligation you must carry out, even though it is under a bad policy. Now, Sir, it is not a good thing to drink champagne, for instance. If you drink enough of it, and drink it often enough, it will tear your liver to pieces. But if a man who is fond of champagne were to order some from Mr. Bate, and then, when Mr. Bate sent the bill, he were to sit down and write to him and say: "Dear Sir, drinking champagne is a mistake; it is bad for the liver; it is not conducive to general health; I have given up drinking champagne and as a matter of principle I won't pay your bill." Why, what would Mr. Bate say to him? He would say, "You are under obligation to pay, and I will hold you to it." Well, I will not trouble the House with the letters, but I have letters here from a number of these men who say they came in here having before their eyes pamphlets in which this very North-West Act of 1883 was quoted; they came in here with that promise of a second homestead playing on their wills, and what did they find? Why, they had scarcely fulfilled the conditions for getting a second homestead—three years it takes; on the 25th of May the clause was put in and it requires three years to perfect the conditions to get a second homestead; and on the 2nd June, 1886, the second homestead was done away with. They, of course, point out what a very unjust thing it is. You see how irritating it is to those who came in, in 1884, 1885 and 1886. The men who came in from the 25th May, 1883, or before, up to the 2nd June, 1884, could go, owing to the change that my hon. friend the late Minister of Interior made, and get a second homestead. The principle has been acknowledged. But men who came in in 1885 and 1886, with this same Act on the statute-book, cannot get a second homestead, because, as I tell you, the amendment that I was able to effect in 1887 only went the one year. Last year I did not bring it up, for a lamentable reason—because we had lost the man who had been such an ornament to this House. It may be said—I know that arguments of this kind are sometimes used—that this was permissive. I will say this for the late Minister, that he never attempted to press that objection; but I will call the attention of the Minister of Interior to the argument on that head. The 37th clause of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, reads as follows:—

"Any person who has obtained a homestead patent after two years' residence, or a certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, with the additional statement that there has been three years' residence, may obtain another homestead and pre-emption entry."

Of course it would be quite unworthy of a Government to rest anything on that word "may"; but if anybody attempted to do so, what have we? We have that declared by the statute to be a right, so that any difficulty on that head is entirely removed. If we look at section 2, chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes, we find that pre-emption entry means:

"The entering on the books of a local agent for a preferential claim to acquire by purchase, in connection with the homestead, and on becoming entitled to the patent for the homestead, a quarter section, or part of a quarter section of land adjoining such homestead; and existing pre-emption right means the right of obtaining, and right to such quarter section."

If we turn to section 3, what do we find? It is declared with regard to pre-emptions:

"And further, such person shall forfeit his homestead and pre-emption right."

So that in one part of the Act, in regard to a matter where it is said he may obtain pre-emption, we have it declared that that is a right. But mark the language of section 43:

"No person who has obtained a homestead patent or a certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or a member of the Dominion Lands Board, as in the next preceding clause mentioned,

Mr. DAVIN.

shall be entitled to obtain another homestead entry; but nothing contained in this clause shall take away the right of any person who, before the 2nd day of June, 1886, had received such certificate or recommendation for a patent."

So that the Act of 1886, in so many words, declares that it was taking away, not a possibility of getting a second homestead at the discretion of the Minister, but taking away a right which it acknowledges in express terms. It is hardly necessary to take up the time of the House with the second branch of the second homestead question, because the Minister can deal with that administratively. But I will say this, as I have pointed out before, that I can see no advantage and no magic in the six-mile limit, and I pointed out, when I had the honor of an interview with the Minister of Interior when I first came down, that one of the best settlers north of Pense, Joseph Young, who has cultivated every acre of his homestead and pre-emption cultivatable, has next to him a cancelled homestead, but he cannot enter on it. It would be a very desirable thing for him if he could do so, for he has two stalwart sons and a family, and he is one of our best farmers. He came into the country with nothing and he is a well-to-do man to-day, and in no year, not even in 1886, did he fail to have a crop; he has had a crop every year, but he is a thoroughpaced farmer and is a first-rate man. He cannot, however, homestead that cancelled homestead adjoining his own, and what is the use of his going away? He is forty-five years old and does not want to go away six miles. But that, I repeat, is a matter which can be dealt with administratively, and so I will not trouble the House further with it beyond calling attention to a petition I have here which was presented to the Minister. It was sent to him by a large number of agricultural societies, urging this question of second homesteading, and also urging that time be given for payment of pre-emptions. I will say this, as I said to the farmers, that I think there is no need of their being very anxious about their being allowed time. So far as my experience of the department goes, no *bona fide* farmer has ever been pressed for his pre-emption payment if he could show that he was going along in a *bona fide* manner. I have always found that Mr. Smith, and the department here, the moment they were satisfied that the man was a *bona fide* settler, were willing to agree to any reasonable representations made, provided the matter was all right. So I never felt nervous in regard to that matter. I will only add this further, that the farmers around Moose Jaw and elsewhere are very anxious they should be given five years in which to pay for their pre-emptions. I will make a further comment on this resolution, because there is one clause in it with which I do not agree. It reads:

"Should it be found necessary in the future to withhold public lands from homesteading for railway purposes, it should be provided that alternate quarter sections be granted instead of alternate sections."

In the same resolution it is stated:

"It has been proved that for the success of the settler it is necessary for him to engage in both stock raising and grain, and it has been demonstrated that for this purpose a settler requires not less than 320 acres."

So one part of the resolution is, inadvertently, contrary to the other. In one part it says that 320 acres are necessary, and in another part it states that alternate quarter sections should be given to the railway. I have here a long communication that I received this morning from the agricultural society of Moose Jaw, referring to this part of the resolution and strongly condemning it, strongly emphasising this view, that they require to summer fallow, to go into mixed farming, and that farmers cannot raise crops profitably in the North-West unless they summer fallow. Part of the land has to be fallowed this year while crops are raised on another part, and crops should be grown this year on land which was summer fallowed last year. If you do not adopt that you will not farm successfully, and

that is the way Mr. Young, to whom I referred a moment ago, farms. I want to say one word about the last part of that resolution, which asks for the establishment of a Dominion Lands Office in the Territories. This, I think, is a very important matter, and I may point out that the right hon. gentleman, in his report of 1882, declares it necessary to establish in the North-West a land board. However, when it was decided to establish this land board, instead of placing it in the North-West it was established at Winnipeg, in Manitoba. I think it would be a very wise thing to do what the Legislative Assembly suggests, and to move that land board to the North-West. At the present moment you are getting an enormous revenue from the North-West. This year I see gladly, by the report of the Minister of Interior, the revenue of the Department of the Interior is \$540,005. No doubt some of that comes from Manitoba, but the main portion of it undoubtedly comes from the North-West Territory, and as the principal business of the land board will be done in the North-West Territory, I believe that if it were established at Regina, instead of at Winnipeg, it would be a great improvement. The last resolution of these gentlemen deals with the question of responsible government. It says:

"That there is no permanent responsible body whose business it is to prepare legislation for the consideration of this Assembly, and in consequence its legislative functions cannot be satisfactorily performed. For instance, the Assembly has had to present an humble address to His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, praying that he may be pleased to appoint a Committee to draft during the recess certain measures deemed advisable by the Assembly; measures which it should be the duty of Legislative Government to submit. That on these and other accounts the Assembly believes the present system to be unsatisfactory. That, therefore, the Assembly recommends to His Excellency the Governor General in Council that full responsible government should be given to the Territories with the other powers, in addition to those already possessed by the Assembly."

And a further resolution:

"That the amount annually voted by the Dominion Parliament for the expenses of government, &c., in the North-West Territories, should be given in the form of a definite grant instead of a rate which lapses at the end of the fiscal year for which it is voted;

"That the said grant should be placed at the disposal and subject to the vote of the North-West Legislative Assembly;

"That although the North-West Territories have not been admitted into Confederation as a Province, yet they consider that the fact of their paying taxes to the Federal Treasury, under the same laws, rules and regulations and provisions as the people of other parts of Canada, and having been called upon to exercise the functions of local self-government by the Parliament of Canada, they are entitled to receive a return on the amount paid by them into the Federal Treasury of a sum similar to that received by the various Provinces comprising the Canadian Confederation;

"That they consider that a greater proportion of taxation per head is paid by the people of the North-West Territories than by the people of any other part of Canada;

"That the cost of administering the Government of the North-West Territories is much larger in proportion to the population than in any other part of Canada by reason of the greater area and more widely scattered settlements;

"That the maintenance and improvement of main trails in the Territories should be the subject of special consideration at the hands of the Federal Parliament;

"That inasmuch as the lands, timber and minerals of the North-West Territories are held for sale by the Federal Government, which deprives the North-West Government of any revenue from these sources, and the Provinces of Confederation, with the exception of Manitoba, having revenues from said sources;

"Therefore your committee are strongly of opinion that a largely increased grant should be given to the North-West Territories for expenses of North-West Government, construction of roads and bridges, the improvement of main trails, and other public improvements."

The House will be glad to know, sir, that the Advisory Board has worked wonderfully well. Although I do not think any more than do those gentlemen, or the members of the Assembly, that that board is as effective a machine of government as complete responsible government would be, yet, Sir, I had an opportunity of observing the chamber during its session and I will say this, that the Advisory Board and the admirable manner in which Governor Royal fell in with the idea of making it a sliding scale to responsible government worked admir-

ably and gave a new character altogether to the assembly as compared with the council. In the North-West Council, as my friend the Minister of Interior will remember, they discussed matters more like men in committee, but with the Advisory Board they at once fell in with the parliamentary practice, and the intelligence displayed by the gentlemen who are now members of that assembly and the capacity which they showed in their conduct of the proceedings, are fraught with the best promise for the future of that country. I wish to call the attention of the House for one moment to what might be called our claims on the Federal Government. Many gentlemen in this House and elsewhere think that we are always asking for something, and that we are, in fact, asking for too much. They think we are unreasonable in the North-West, while the fact is that we are entitled to a great deal more than we get.

Mr. SCRIVER. You are astonished at your own moderation.

Mr. DAVIN. My friend on the right says "we are astonished at our own moderation," and I have no objection to accept his language. The old council of 1887 petitioned for responsible government and the memorial set forth: That by the census of 1885 the population of the North-West Territories was 28,000, larger by 11,000 than that of Manitoba when she was admitted into Confederation. The population has much increased since that census, as evidenced from the new electoral districts erected. Manitoba was erected into a Province in 1870, and as we see in 33 Vic., cap. 3, sec. 25, she received \$30,000 in support of government, 80 cents per head of the population, which was estimated at 17,000, and the salaries of the Lieutenant Governor, judges, charges in respect to customs, postal, fisheries, militia, geological, penitentiary department, and so on, were all paid by the Federal Treasury. In 1882, according to 45 Vic., cap. 5, when the population of Manitoba, according to the census of 1881, was 69,954, that Province was allowed 80 cents per head on 150,000 souls, indemnity for want of public lands of \$45,000; and in 1870, because the Province was not in debt, 5 per cent. on \$472,000, making altogether \$238,000. By 48-49 Vic., cap. 50, she got swamp lands and 150,000 acres for a university and the indemnity for want of public lands increased to \$100,000. Now I ask the attention of the House to this argument. It is an argument of proportion, such an argument as we all have made when learning the rule of three at school. If Manitoba, in 1882, with a census population of 69,954, was allowed 80 cents a head on a population of 150,000, then the North-West, four years after, it was declared by the census of 1885, to have a population of 28,000, must be entitled to 80 cents a head on about 80,000 people. But take the ratio adopted after one year, and we are entitled to 80 cents a head on 70,000, or \$56,000; for government, \$50,000; and for want of our public lands, \$45,000. Then, if Manitoba with a population of 17,000, not having any debt, was entitled to 5 per cent. on \$472,000, the North-West Territories, with a census population of 28,000, would be entitled to 5 per cent. on \$774,000, or \$38,700; and as we have more land than Manitoba, our gross revenue should amount to \$239,700. We should also have 150,000 acres of land for a university, and money for our own lunatic asylum, as well as Manitoba. Now, Sir, the tone taken towards that western country is a tone which I believe will not be often taken in this House after hon. gentlemen come to see what its claims are; because at the present minute we must regard that western country as composed of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, all west of the great lakes; and what do you find? If you compare the amount that western country pays in customs duties with the amount paid by an old Province like Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, you

will find that it pays more; and the paper which was put into my hands a few days ago by the Inland Revenue Department shows that we drink a great deal more beer per head west of the great lakes, and pay a great deal more of inland revenue than the two Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick put together.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a bad sign.

Mr. DAVIN. It may be a bad sign, but it shows that the people there are a very prosperous people, and can afford to spend a good deal of money on the four articles of beer, wine, tobacco and whiskey. I find also that the banking business done, taking into account discounts, the amount of capital invested, and all the details of banking, shows well for the western country. Now, my right hon. friend, in reply to a question, told me a few days ago that he did not intend to bring in a Bill this year giving full responsible government to the Territories; but, in passing, I wish to say that when that Bill is brought in, or probably it might be done now, a large portion of territory should be given to the Local Government to be used by it for subsidizing branch lines of railway. I am not fond, as this House knows, of drawing comparisons with what is done in the United States; but I may state that when they organise a territory in the United States, they pay out of the Federal treasury all the expenses that we do, they give the territories the school lands and the swamp lands, as we have done in the case of Manitoba; but they do more than that. When Minnesota, Wyoming, Dakota and Montana were organised, each of these Territories got a large extent of territory for subsidizing branch lines. Minnesota, with 83,000 square miles (Assiniboia has 93,000 square miles), received land for subsidizing 1,800 miles of railway, and with the swamps, started in possession of one-third of the Territory. What does that policy enable these Territories to do? It gives them, while young, that nutriment and vital force, without which anything young cannot thrive. As the right hon. the Prime Minister is now acting Minister of Railways, I should like to call his attention to this fact. At this hour the Government of Minnesota receives an income of \$600,000 a year, 3 per cent. on the gross earnings of the lines of railway that it chartered and subsidised since 1849, when it was organised. But it may be said: "Ah, but those Territories were very populous. Not at all. In 1849, when Minnesota was organised, it had only a population of 6,000, and the aggregate population of all the four Territories at the respective dates of their organisation did not equal by five or six thousand the population of the North-West to day. That is a point which I submit as well worthy of the consideration of the Government, because I think we may err on the side of keeping the strings too much in our hands here at Ottawa, and not giving sufficient scope for the young giant, for which I plead here to-day, to develop his limbs. Now, it will be said to us, no doubt, you have got the Mounted Police. So we have, and we are very glad to have them; but elsewhere you have batteries, militia, and military schools, and we pay for those just as well as you pay for the Mounted Police; and before you know where you are, I believe in the next five years, you will find we shall have a population in those Territories which will be subscribing to your military schools, and batteries, and militia just as much as you are subscribing to the North West Mounted Police. And remember that in any case the cost of defence would fall on the Federal Government; so that you cannot fairly make anything of our having the Mounted Police. The feeling amongst the people, and especially amongst the members of this assembly, who now represent the people, is in favor of full responsible government. Now, I am not going to use the rhetorical language we sometimes hear in this House, and which I always regret to hear, used by men

Mr. DAVIN.

who should speak with the balance and restraint of statesmen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Simcoe says "hear, hear," but if he was rightly reported in a speech that he made not far from here, he himself fell into this same rhetorical exaggeration. We sometimes hear it said in this House, that we are not free unless we have the right to make our own treaties. My hon. friend was reported as having said that we were not free unless we were represented in the Imperial Parliament, and took up our full share of Imperial responsibility. Of course when the noun "freedom" or the adjective "free" is used in this manner, it is used in a purely rhetorical sense and not in the broad signification, in which constitutional writers use it. When people speak properly of being free, what they mean is that their liberty cannot be interfered with, without their being tried before their peers, that they are not taxed without representation. The various ingredients of civil liberty that we are familiar with, we have in the North-West, but I do not think we have all the advantages that you have here. We suffer there from some disabilities that you do not suffer from, but I regard our position as a free and liberal condition. Every man can there speak the thing he will. I believe the North-West Territories will develop at a rapid rate. I see by the report of the Minister of Interior that a far larger number of homesteads were taken up last year than the year before. In 1886, 214,960 acres in homesteads were taken up; in 1887, 319,500; in 1888, 420,333. From that you see the progressive rate of increase at which homesteads have been taken up. Now, with the crop we had last year and the report of that crop going all over the world—for we have had visits from men from every part of the world—I believe you will find that next year, instead of 420,000 acres being taken up, that number will be greatly increased. I believe that certainly 700,000 or 800,000 acres in homesteads will be taken up, and the increase will go on at the same rate. There are many documents to which I might refer to show the progress made by the North-West. I have not said one word about what the committee of Senator Schu'tz, now Lieutenant Governor, showed we possessed in the Mackenzie River Basin; and in the present report of the Interior Department, I see that Mr. Burgess refers in glowing terms to the Yukon River district. Take the report of two years back in which there is an account given of the Yukon River, and you will find that men make as much as \$500 a day mining gold in that district. They have made \$300 and \$350, and some \$500 in one day. I do not say that happened as a general thing, but still it shows the value of that region. In the North-West Territories we have a large area of prairie land, most fertile and most abundant in its yield; we have gold, iron, coal, all the fruits of the earth, the forest, and the finest cattle raising country in the world. I say that there is the place that the means will be found to make this country a great and contented nation. I always regret when, in regard to this country, anything like sectional feeling, arising from race or religion or from any other source, is developed; and it is a great consolation to me to know that up in the North-West, we are freer than in any other part of Canada from those prejudices of race and religion which are really more inimical to our progress than anything else. I desire to see this great Canada of ours peopled with French, English, Scotch, Irish, Germans—and in the North-West we have Germans whose settlements are perfect wonders as evidences of what can be done by thrift and energy—I desire to see all these elements moulded into one nation. What I hope to see and what we ought to aim at—French, English, Irish and Scotch—and it will come some day, is to have a United

Canada with a Canadian race inhabiting it, and I should like very much to say a few words especially to my French Canadian friends about the North West.

Some hon. MEMBERS: *En français.*

Mr. DAVIN. If the House will bear with me, since some of my French Canadian friends desire it, I will say a few words to them in their language, though I do so with a great deal of diffidence.

Je prétends, M. l'Orateur, qu'il est du devoir des Ecossais, des Irlandais, des Français et des Anglais de se fusionner pour former ici une race canadienne. Nous formerons ainsi une race plus grande que celle des Allemands, plus grande que celle des Celtes, plus grande que celle des Anglo-Saxons; une race qui réunira au jugement, à l'abnégation, à la discipline, à la sincérité du Saxon, la vivacité d'esprit, le goût des arts, le génie, l'ardeur, la puissance créatrice du Celte. J'espère que nous verrons cette race se développer en grandeur héroïque et recevoir du Nord-Ouest une inspiration de pouvoirs magnifiques.

Je me bornerai à dire en ce moment aux Canadiens-Français d'imiter l'exemple de leurs pères dont les faits et gestes dans le passé au Nord-Ouest sont dignes d'une admiration spéciale. Connaissions-nous nous-mêmes, rendons-nous compte de notre position, et prenons les moyens de fonder ici une nation canadienne. Et, M. l'Orateur, lorsque viendra le jour où nous aurons dans le Nord-Ouest une population plus considérable que dans les provinces d'Ontario et de Québec, lorsque le Nord-Ouest comptera au delà de 10,000,000 d'habitants, nous pourrons braver les contempteurs, les insulteurs et les intrigants, et peut-être adresser aux Wiman et autres les mots magnifiques qui s'échappent de l'âme du Cid quand il apprend que Chimène peut devenir le prix de sa valeur:—

“ Est-il quelqu'ennemi qu'à présent je ne dompte ?  
Paraissez Navarrais, Maures et Castellans,  
Et tout ce que l'Espagne a nourri de vaillants.  
Unissez-vous ensemble, et faites une armée,  
Pour combattre ma main de la sorte animée.  
Joignez tous vos efforts contre un espoir si doux ;  
Pour en venir à bout, c'est trop peu que de vous.”

What I have been saying in French, I can repeat in English in a word or two. I was emphasising the fact, that we should make ourselves here a patriotic people, and that instead of trying to emphasise the angles of difference that divide us, we should try to pare away the angles, so that by-and-by we might become one Canadian people, because we have the finest country in the world, and, when we have a larger population, with sentiments such as I have indicated pervading them, there is no power in the world that could affect us, but we could stand four square against all the blasts that blow. That is the best free translation that I can give of the magnificent words that Corneille puts in the mouth of the Cid.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will endeavor to say a few words on this subject before six o'clock. I am very much pleased that the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has brought up the question of the proper policy to be pursued by the Government in regard to the settlement of our vast domain in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD There will probably be an interesting discussion on this subject, and, as it cannot go on after six o'clock, I would suggest that it had better stand over.

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

### After Recess.

### THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Ujiga Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to “The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.”—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 48) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorize them to issue debenture stock.—Mr. Montarjeff)

### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman)

Bill (No. 59) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate “The Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.”—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 63) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the “Assiniboine Water Power Company.”—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it to be my duty as an independent member, to protest against this informal manner of passing Bills through this House. Bills have been passed through a stage which have not been printed in English and French, as the Rules of the House require; and I think we had better, in future, confine ourselves to the Rules, and not put Bills through in this rapid way.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, if any objection is taken, I must enforce the Rules, but I understood no objection was raised.

Mr. MITCHELL. I mention it for the purpose of stirring up the printers, so that we may have the Bills properly placed before the House, and be able to proceed with their consideration according to the Rules.

### PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 3) to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelties, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled “An Act respecting Cruelty to Animals.”—(Mr. Brown.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill to explain what it is he wants. We had a discussion the other evening on the second reading of the Bill, and I did not then ascertain. I find by reading the petition of the Society for the Prevention of



Cruelty to Animals at Hamilton, that certain statements are made. I will read the petition, so that the hon. gentleman may have an opportunity to explain to the committee what they do want. The petition on which this Bill was founded—I presume it is this, because it refers to a petition presented last year—sets forth :

"1. That at the instance of the above society (the Hamilton Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals), a petition largely signed was presented at the last Session of Parliament in favor of the passage of the Bill introduced by Adam Brown, Esq., senior member for Hamilton, to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and especially against the using of any live animal or bird as a target to be shot at.

"2. That your petitioners hereby respectfully request that the Bill introduced by Adam Brown, Esq., at the present Session, for the purpose of preventing cruelty to animals, and especially against using any live animal or bird as a target to be shot at, may be passed by your honorable body."

"3. That your petitioners are aware that great cruelty is practised towards live birds at shooting tournaments, and on other occasions, for the mere amusement of the parties participating therein, and your petitioners think that, in the interests of humanity, the law should be amended so as to prevent such cruelty being practised."

I should like, as a starting point, to request the hon. gentleman to inform the committee whether he follows that petition now or not, because hon. members will notice that the petition only speaks of one thing, that is, the shooting at animals or birds as targets, while the provisions of the Bill are much wider than that. It may enable the hon. gentleman to reply better to this point, if I call the attention of the committee to the present law. Either the hon. gentleman wants two things, or he wants one thing; he either wants what the petition asks for, or more than it asks for. Certainly the petition only asks, so far as it mentions any specific thing, the stoppage of shooting at birds or other animals as targets. If the hon. gentleman wants to go further, there are two matters in the Bill which, in my opinion, should be discussed, and placed before this House. Do I understand the hon. gentleman that he wants to cover both points?

Mr. BROWN. Go on.

Mr. TISDALE. I shall, then, be very happy to proceed. I suppose that I will have to confine myself at present to the first clause of the Bill. In referring to that particular part of the Bill not aimed at trap-shooting, I may say that I believe this House desires to legislate upon things that require to be legislated upon, and I do not think it is desirous of legislating upon theories or on unnecessary matters. Some hon. gentlemen say, "let the hon. gentleman have his Bill if it does no harm," but I hold that the House should not lose its time in legislating except where legislation is necessary. The first clause of the Bill of the member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) does not enlarge on the provisions of the present Act, which will be found at page 1987 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, but it goes on to specify the general provisions of the present law, and says :

"Section one of chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: 'An Act respecting Cruelty to Animals,' is hereby amended by adding thereto the following words: 'and the expression 'animal' includes any horse, mare, gelding, bull, ox, cow, heifer, steer, calf, mule, ass, sheep, lamb, goat, pig, hog, sow, dog or cat, and every other domestic animal, fowl or bird, or wild animal, fowl or bird, tamed or domesticated.'"

The hon. gentleman proposes to add to the clause in the present law the names of a number of animals that are evidently covered by the generic terms in the Act now in force, and that clause in his Bill is entirely unnecessary. The three subsections of his Bill, as I had occasion to remark in opposing the second reading, are open to precisely the same objection. I submit, with all seriousness, that this Bill is unnecessary. We all know, although the hon. gentleman will not admit, that it is a trivial Bill, and that it is aimed simply at the trap-shooting at pigeons, and if the hon. gentleman would bring his Bill forward in this particular, we would, to use a familiar expression, know

Mr. TISDALE.

what he was after. I take exception to those three clauses of his Bill in the interests, not of the cities or the towns, but of the larger body of constituents of this country, the farmers of the Province I come from as well as the farmers of the other Provinces. Until I read the present law I had no idea that we had such a severe law about the handling of animals, and I hold that if you go among the farmers of Ontario and Quebec and the other Provinces, and tell them that they are so cruel to their stock and the animals they use, that they need still more stringent provisions than those in the present Act, they would be justly insulted. I must read the three clauses for you :

"Section two of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following section substituted in lieu thereof:—

"Everyone who—  
"(a.) Wantonly, cruelly or unnecessarily beats, binds, ill-treats, abuses, overdrives or tortures any cattle, poultry, dog, domestic animal or bird; or—

"(b.) While driving any cattle or other animal is, by negligence or ill-usage in the driving thereof, the means whereby any mischief, damage or injury is done by any such cattle or other animal; or—

"(c.) In any manner encourages, aids or assists at the fighting or baiting of any bull, bear, badger, dog, cock, or other kind of animal, whether of domestic or wild nature."

I tell you that the people who own and use animals understand a great deal better how to treat them than those gentlemen who want theoretical legislation. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that in not a single petition in favor of the Bill have they dared to say that any such sad condition of things exists as would require further legislation against cruelty to animals. Let me read you the heading of what I call the theatrical petition; it says :

"Prevention of Cruelty. To the Hon. the House of Commons and Parliament assembled. We the undersigned citizens of Toronto, humbly pray that the Bill, introduced by Mr. Adam Brown, for the better prevention of cruelty to animals, be adopted by your hon. body."

I am sure you were all amused, as I was to-day, to see the thirty of forty petitions presented by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) or by those that he handed them to. We have all courtesy enough to hand in a petition when we are asked to. He had those petitions printed, and sometimes only twenty or thirty persons signed them. If the petitions amount to anything it will be noticed that those opposed to the Bill stated the reasons why they opposed the Bill, but the petitions of the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) which were theatrically flourished all over the House did not give any reasons why the Bill should pass. I do not believe in theatrical legislation. I believe in our getting down to common sense, and while I oppose this Bill in principle I object to being classed as one who is cruel to animals. Has the member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) shown a tittle of evidence that the people of this country are cruel to animals. No, he has not. He has brought in a petition from a very excellent society which I am in favor of, but I think that they should keep within their own sphere. The hon. gentleman has failed entirely in proving that part of his case which asks for severe additional measures to be passed by this House for the prevention of cruelty to animals. Let me point out that, under the laws of the Province of Ontario, you cannot shoot a single bird except a pigeon, or an injurious, destructive or mischievous bird, out of a trap, because there is a severe law to punish you for shooting anything but destructive birds or game birds. All other birds are protected inasmuch as you cannot shoot them at all, not even out of a trap. I ask for evidence why this House should be asked to put upon the Statute-books a record that we need stronger laws to compel the people of this country to treat the animals they handle well and there is no evidence forthcoming. We have had enough of theatricals in this matter and enough talk to show that it is the intention to pass this Bill not upon common sense, or by arguments in its favor, but because of personal and individual influence, a proceeding which I strongly object to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TISDALE. Well, if I am out of order, I am willing to submit; but I do say this is the fact, for I mean it, and I am one of those men who, when I have to discharge a duty, mention things plainly. This excellent society, which is going out of its way to ask for theoretical legislation without having a case, has induced the hon. gentleman to adopt its views for the time being and to represent them in this House. Some hon. gentlemen say that it will do no harm to pass this Bill. I say it does a great deal of harm to put a law on the Statute-book that is not necessary, and that is why I object to this Bill. I object also to being attacked as a cruelty-to-animals man. I love animals, and take good care of them; I have grown up in a farming community, and among people who know how to take care of animals, birds as well as dogs, cattle and horses. I have shot birds, and do not think it cruel to do so. But I have had ladies coming to me in the corridors and asking me not to oppose Mr. Brown's Bill. I object to all this. I tell you I do not come down here for that purpose. As I said the other night, and I feel it still more strongly to-night, if we do not put our foot down on this class of legislation, which comes before us day after day and week after week, the important interests of this country will be neglected. I have never shot a bird out of a trap, but I do not consider it cruel to shoot a bird. I have seen many more cruel deaths of birds which these humanitarians do not object to; I have seen them put to death when their necks had to be wrung two or three times; and yet these people consider that merciful, while shooting is cruel; and any gentleman who stands up here and says it is not cruel to shoot birds is put in the position of being declared cruel. To bring the matter to a question, I move, seconded by Mr. Small, that the Committee now rise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to say a word on the first section of this Bill, because the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House and has entered into a general discussion of all the features of the Bill, has perhaps misunderstood or unintentionally misrepresented the nature of the first section. When the House compares this section with the section it is intended to amend, I think it will be relieved entirely of the hon. member's apprehensions that this is a Bill aimed at the farming interests of this country. I know, as far as my own section of the country is concerned, that there is no farmer who desires to torture birds, and that is the one provision contained in the first section. The first section of the existing law undertook to give a definition of the words used in the Act, and by some oversight it only defined the word cattle, whereas continually in the provisions of the Act the word animal is used, and it is proposed in the first section of this Bill to define the word animal, which includes in its ordinary sense any description of birds, which do not come under the designation of cattle. This is done, not at all for the purpose of saying that nobody shall shoot a bird or wring its neck or kill it, but that it is an offence of cruelty to animals to unmercifully treat a bird as well as any other living animal. That is the nature of the section the hon. gentleman has attacked.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no desire to split hairs with the hon. Minister of Justice. I am quite satisfied that he understands the question of law better than I do. But possibly I did not sufficiently express in detail what I intended the House to understand. I am quite prepared to concede that there is an enlargement of the provision to make it affect birds; but the latter part of my argument was that the birds are entirely merged in the protection already afforded by the law of Ontario, which prevents the shooting of birds at all.

Mr. MULOCK. How has this Parliament jurisdiction to deal with this class of property?

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think it can deal with insectivorous birds, because the Province of Ontario has dealt with them, and its law has not been disallowed. In this Bill there is an enlargement, but in my view it is not substantial, because, under the law of Ontario, you cannot destroy or trap or catch birds, or even interfere with their eggs.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is not this dealing with a question of property and civil rights?

Mr. TISDALE. I am bound to concede that this House has jurisdiction in regard to cruelty to animals; but the case of birds has already been seized by the Provincial Legislature. Conceding for the sake of argument that this House has jurisdiction, though I do not concede that, I submit that the present law of Ontario is a broader and stronger law, and, therefore, this Bill brings the question down to animals and domestic birds.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the attention of hon. Minister of Justice to the question of jurisdiction. It is true, we legislated upon the subject before; but, so far as I recollect, our legislation was not subject to discussion on this point. So far as wild animals are concerned, they are considered for the time being the property of those on whose lands or possessions they are found; and, applying this rule to the public lands of Ontario or any of the other Provinces, they would be under the jurisdiction of the Province as an incident of its proprietary rights. So far as fish are concerned, there is a provision here that the regulation of the sea coast and inland fisheries are under the control of this Parliament. Now our courts have held and the Supreme Court here has held that every regulation of this sort is a police regulation, and is an extension of the municipal power conferred upon the various Provinces under the British North America Act. Under this Act, the Provinces are authorised to legislate on the subject of municipal matters. One of those matters is the prevention of cruelty to animals. The preservation of peace and good order in the community, the prevention of immoralities, and all those offences which to some extent disturb the peace and good order of the community, but which are, in their moral character, below the rank of crimes, are under the control of the different Provinces, and the Provinces are authorised by the 15th sub-section of section 92 to impose punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for the enforcement of any provincial law. Now the Provinces, as far as I know, certainly Ontario, have legislated upon the subject. It is quite true that, so far as the Territories of Canada are concerned, beyond the limits of the Provinces, a law such as we have put on the Statute-book may operate, but that is not what the hon. member from Hamilton is aiming at. He wishes to have a law for the entire Dominion, and I submit for the special consideration of the Minister of Justice the question whether this is not a police regulation falling within the municipal authority of the different Provinces of the Dominion. I think it clearly is. The Provinces so legislated before the Union, and have so legislated since. There is on the Statute-book of Ontario, and, I believe, of the other Provinces, a measure similar to that. It has been amended from time to time, and in Ontario, I understand, a measure relating to this subject is now being amended during the present Session of that Legislature. If that is so, what is the object of legislating here on the subject? I am quite sure that in many respects we have been exceeding our powers by legislating in matters properly belonging to the Provinces. I do not think that practice ought to be encouraged, and it would be well this Parliament should be sure of its authority before undertaking to put the measure on the Statute-book. I am not considering the question of the wisdom of this legislation. I might agree in everything said by those who support the Bill. I think cruelty to animals ought to be discouraged; but, at the same time, it

is important that legislation should be left to those bodies, to which, by the constitution, it is entrusted; and if we follow that rule, it does seem to me that, except, so far as the Territories are concerned, we should not undertake to legislate on the subject here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In reply to the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), I must say that when that hon. gentleman was explaining what the law was, I presumed he was referring to the Dominion Statute. With regard to the Ontario law my recollection is—and I speak subject to correction, for my recollection is not distinct as to its provisions—that the Province of Ontario has legislated on this question with reference to the preservation of useful birds and not in any way for the purpose of preventing cruelty to animals. With regards to remarks of the hon. member from Bothwell, I feel, with all deference to his arguments, as positive that this matter is within our jurisdiction and not within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, as if we were dealing with the crime of high treason. Now, the powers the Provincial Legislatures possess are not, as he quoted them from memory, the imposition of fines, penalties, or imprisonment for the enforcement of any law of the Province, but “for the enforcement of any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within the class of subjects enumerated” in the section the hon. gentleman referred to, and none of the matters enumerated have any bearing on this question any more than they have on any other branch of the criminal law. It is true the creation and establishment of municipal institutions are within the province of the Provincial Legislatures alone, and the hon. gentleman argues from that that everything which tends to the peace, order, quietness and security of a municipality comes within the control of the Local Legislature. If that were so, every offence against the law would be exclusively within the control of the Provincial Legislatures. But I take it, unless it immediately concerns the creation or maintenance of municipal institutions, everything which is an offence, unless it is an offence against a provincial statute, made in relation to those subjects, is a matter only for our jurisdiction. If I am mistaken in my view of the provisions of the Ontario Act, and if the Ontario Legislature has deemed it wise to legislate to prevent cruelty to birds, I would ask the hon. gentleman why it is that a provision of that kind, which he deems salutary for Ontario should not be extended by us to the rest of Canada if we have the power to do so; and as to the question of power I have made my argument. As to his argument that we are infringing on provincial rights because we are dealing with wild animals which may be found on the property of a Province, he is a little wide of the subject. We are not dealing with the question of property. We are making it an offence to a man to act cruelly to his own property, and we have the right to say that a man shall not ill-treat his horse, under the penalty of being sent to the penitentiary, just as we have the right to declare that he shall not injure his wife or one of his children under the penalty we choose to inflict. We might as well argue in the latter case that we are disturbing the relations between husband and wife, as to argue in the former that we are interfering with the rights of property in the Provinces. We are not dealing with any question of property at all, and surely we have the right to say that a man shall not be cruel to his horse just as we have the right to say that he shall not be cruel to his own family.

Mr. TISDALE. I have looked into the law of Ontario and I do not think the hon. the Minister of Justice has quite understood one of the points I made. My point is that the Province of Ontario having passed a law prohibiting cruelty to animals, and the Dominion Legislature having tacitly conceded that such law is within the jurisdiction of the Province, we have not the right now to legislate on the same

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

subject for the Province of Ontario. If any of the other Provinces have not legislated on this subject, we might do so as regards them, but as regards the Province of Ontario that question is settled. The Ontario law is:

“It shall not be lawful to shoot, destroy, wound or injure, or to attempt to shoot, destroy, kill, wound or injure any bird whatsoever save and except eagles, falcons, hawks, owls, wild pigeons, black birds, king fishers, crows, jays, English sparrows and ravens and the birds specially mentioned in “The Act for the protection of game and fur-bearing animals.

“It shall not be lawful to take, capture, buy, sell, expose for sale, or have in possession any bird whatsoever, save the kinds hereinbefore or hereinafter excepted, or to set wholly or in part any net trap, springs, snare, cage or other machine.

“It shall not be lawful to take, injure, destroy or have in possession any nest, young or eggs of any bird whatsoever.”

With the exception of certain birds which are named, I maintain that it is an impossibility under the law of Ontario to be cruel to these birds, because you cannot catch them or shoot them or trap them or even have them in your possession, and therefore I contend that there is no necessity for this measure unless it is from a sentimental view desired to make further provision for that which is already provided. I do not profess to be an authority on provincial jurisdiction further than this, that, any Province having passed such laws, and those laws not having been disallowed, this Government has conceded that the subject is a matter of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), because, if his view is correct, the construction of the British North America Act would depend on which Legislature got first in the race. The question is, in which Legislature is the power vested, and that is a rather important question. The jurisdiction must be either in the Dominion Parliament or in the Provincial Legislatures. It cannot be in both. I must say that the argument of the Minister of Justice commends itself to my mind, that this is an offence coming within the criminal law, which is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. A question might be raised that it is a matter more of a local and private nature, and that it therefore comes within the purview of the Provincial Legislatures, but it seems to me that, this Legislature being seized of the criminal law and having exclusive jurisdiction over that law, would have the right to make this an offence. I therefore think that the jurisdiction is rather within the Parliament of Canada than the Provincial Legislatures. Still, it is possible that a conflict might arise if you have the two Acts on the Statute book, and it is a matter which should be carefully considered. I am rather inclined to be in favor of this Bill, but I would like to see the last line in regard to wild animals and wild fowl eliminated from the section.

Mr. MULLOCK. Sub-section three of section three purports to give one person the right to destroy another person's property. I fail to see how this Parliament can assume to interfere with any man's property in that way. To give, even through the medium of justices of the peace, the right to one man to destroy another man's property is, to that extent, robbing a man of his property. It is assuming that this Parliament can indirectly or directly take from one person and give to another. There is no pretence, in the language of the last clause, that it is in any way brought within the criminal law. Jurisdiction is not attached to the clause in any way through the medium of the criminal law, so it is simply a bare proposition that this Parliament has the power to divest a man of this property in favor of another man, and, therefore, I think that the last clause, which the Minister commended to the House when the Bill was up for the second reading, and which has some merits in itself, is really contrary to the interests of the public.

Mr. BROWN. Having somewhat exhaustively discussed the subject on the second reading of the Bill, I do not propose to occupy the attention of the committee for more

than a few minutes. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has taken a strange position to-night. He conveys the insinuation that the friends of this Bill impute acts of cruelty to farmers. Nothing is more remote from my intention than that. Farmers are most kind to their animals. It is in the large cities that acts of cruelty exist, and it is there that the humane societies are working to get amendments to the law. I stand here as the spokesman of the various humane societies in Canada. When my hon. friend tells this House that I got the petitions printed in Ottawa, and sent them to Toronto to get them signed, he is very far astray. I sent no petitions to Toronto, or to Hamilton, or anywhere. They have come to me, and they have been numerously signed by good and kind-hearted people in every part of the country, and the only opposition to the Bill has emanated from some of the gun clubs. I am rather proud of the charge which my hon. friend threw across in this direction, that he had been assailed by ladies in the lobby to vote for my Bill. If we were to entrust all measures of kindness and humanity in regard to dumb animals to the ladies, the good cause would be safe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. You may laugh if you like, but it is true I do not envy the hon. gentleman who thinks that the sympathy of the women of Canada is a thing which he has a right to sneer at. I leave the explanation of the Bill in the able hands of the Minister of Justice, but I state that acts of cruelty have been practiced for which the present law does not provide, and that this Bill, which I have introduced, and which I hope will become law, makes such provision as will effectually put a stop to many barbarous acts of cruelty, which, not only in regard to those who are concerned, but in regard to the surroundings in connection with these debasing sports, so called, are calculated to do harm to the people of Canada. I want the House to know the motives which led me to bring this Bill forward. The subject is exciting attention throughout the whole land. My hon. friend spoke of my spreading these petitions, among members of the House; I did so, and had I not a right to do so? These petitions came from Toronto and were presented by the members for that city and others, and to-day a petition was presented from the Women's Humane Society of this city. Appended to that petition are names of ladies who would be an ornament to any country in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Name!

Mr. BROWN. I may tell hon. gentlemen that the name of the patroness of that society is the Lady Stanley of Preston, and the ladies who are on the managing committee of that society are ladies of which any country or any city might well be proud. The hon. member for Ottawa to-day had the honor of unrolling, in presence of the members here, a petition signed by a large number of the leading people of this city. I stand in my place here to-night and I say that of all the gun clubs in Canada, perhaps the St. Hubert's Gun Club of Ottawa is the most influential, and I venture to assert that the majority of the gentlemen composing that club are humane men, and they would support my Bill individually. My hon. friend has said that there was no cruelty in killing pigeons for food. I only object to killing them for the mere sake of killing. I tell him that I have known of cases of cruelty at pigeon matches where money was put up; and, as a rule, at these pigeon matches money is put up, and wherever there is a stake of that kind there is a general desire to see that the trapper is of the right sort, and if the birds do not get lively the trapper makes them lively. I have on my desk now the highest authority for stating that, at a match shot in Canada, one of the trappers had cayenne pepper in his pocket to put in the eyes of the poor birds to make them lively. There was cruelty, and it is to prevent such cruelty that this Bill is

introduced. I could go on for an hour giving you similar instances. I appeal to the House to support this measure, calculated as it is to reflect great credit upon the members and much good to the country. My hon. friend says he is a humane man, but yet he sees defects in this Bill, the very object of which is to encourage humane actions. If he is of opinion that it will do no harm and is in the right direction, why should he object to it? He is the champion of a few gun clubs; he has a well known still hunter who sits beside him who does not speak much, but all the same he is a good hunter. Sir, I venture to hope that the good sense of this House will support this measure and pass it. The passage of this Bill will show the people of Canada that the sentiments of their representatives are in favor of further prevention of cruelty to animals.

Mr. BERGIN. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman who has last spoken and the Minister of Justice, have fallen under the flatteries, and the persuasions, and the blanchishments of the ladies in the lobby, and I would not be at all surprised to find upon investigation that the fair ladies who so won the hearts of the susceptible Minister of Justice and the member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) had on their bonnets wings taken from birds for the purpose of adornment. Sir, I do not believe that all the kindness of heart in this country is centered in the so-called humane societies. We have in this country various associations, and we find that in the so-called humanitarian associations the cranks generally rule. Now, Sir, we in this country are the descendants of the sons and daughters of Great Britain; our fathers came to this country from England, Ireland and Scotland, inheriting a taste for sport which every true born Briton loves, and we hope to continue to perpetuate in this country the sports which our fathers loved and which they introduced here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They did not introduce this.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by introducing this, but if he means that we did not introduce trap shooting from the old country then he is very much mistaken. There were pigeons shot in the old country by men of as kind hearts, eye, and as strong brain, and as truly loyal, as are any in Canada to-day. Sir, I repeat that this Bill is a charge of cruelty against the farmers of this country. The farmers, in almost every county in this country, almost immediately after the crops are in, every year have their turkey shooting matches, and is it not as cruel to shoot turkeys, eye, and more so, for they are much larger and may be supposed to suffer more? Is it not as cruel to shoot turkeys as it is to shoot pigeons? Are we, by passing this Bill, to deprive the young farmers of this country of their favorite pastime? Because under this Bill they will not be permitted to shoot turkeys at the usual season of the year; and besides you will deprive other people of their sport outside of the men who shoot pigeons and turkeys. Is it right to worry a fox?—I am speaking now as if I belong to one of the humane societies—is it right to worry a fox? Yet large sums of money are expended every year in keeping up our hunt clubs in Toronto and Montreal, which are a credit to this country. Is this sport to be put an end to because some people think that it is cruel to shoot pigeons from a trap? It is a thousand times more cruel to worry a fox to death with dogs. Sir, I have no doubt that the hon. member for Hamilton who to-day placed himself before this country as the man of the kind heart, who would scorn to be guilty of any cruelty, has forgotten that there is such a sport as fishing. He is, I believe, one of the most ardent fishermen in this country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He fishes with butterflies.

Mr. BERGIN. I have not the least doubt of it. Yet if the hon. member for Hamilton is not a fisherman himself, I know the majority of his neighbors are, and that there are

hundreds of gentlemen in this country who do not yield in kindness of heart to any one here, who visit the different fishing rivers in this country and kill their salmon and enjoy the sport. And is it to be supposed that the gentleman who kills 15 or 20 salmon a day is able to consume all this salmon? They kill them for the sake of killing, as the hon. gentleman says; and I repudiate entirely, on the part of those who oppose this Bill, any such thing as an intention to be cruel towards either animals, birds or fishes. And now a word about some of the officers of the humanitarian societies; I speak of what I have seen since this Legislature met. I have seen ladies who are prominent in these humanitarian societies, riding behind horses who have been clipped and exposed to the winter's cold, being in fact almost naked. I have seen these humanitarians driving lame horses in their carriages, and if it be cruel to shoot a pigeon, I think it is quite as cruel to drive a horse whose foot is so sore that it is difficult for him to put it to the ground. I have seen those horses standing before shops in this city for from half an hour to three-quarters of an hour, in the coldest weather, with the wind blowing upon them, and nothing to protect them. Yet, forsooth, we are to be told by people who are guilty of these things that they are the only people who are opposed to cruelty in this country, and they denounce us who are sportsmen because we indulge, in a legitimate way, in that which has come to us honestly from our fathers.

Mr. BARRON. I have no doubt that under this Bill it will be impossible for any one to clip his horse. The only question will be as to whether or not it is an act of cruelty. This Bill, I think, originated with the Humane Society in Toronto. They have published a book, which is used throughout the schools of Ontario, and in this book they state that they have already placed in the hands of Mr. Lees, a member of the Provincial Legislature, a Bill similar to this, and in that book they state the different acts of cruelty, one of which is the clipping of horses. I have no doubt that under sub-section *a* of section 2 it will be impossible for any one to clip his horse. It will rest, I repeat, with the magistrate to decide as to whether such is an act of cruelty. Some say it is and some say it is not. Having had some little experience I hold that it is not an act of cruelty, that it is absolutely necessary that some horses should be clipped in winter.

Mr. BERGIN. Is it necessary to have their tails cut off?

Mr. BARRON. That is another act of cruelty for which people may be tried under this Bill. I think myself, that docking a horse's tail as is sometimes practiced is an act of cruelty, and when persons not only simply cut the tail off but dock it so that the tail shall assume a particular shape, that is an act of cruelty.

Mr. BERGIN. It is fashionable all the same.

Mr. BARRON. I repeat that I do not think clipping a horse is an act of cruelty. In winter it is absolutely necessary, especially with long-haired horses, because we know that a horse in a state of perspiration will get cold if it stands and the perspiration is allowed to freeze on its coat, all of which can be avoided if the horse is clipped. My chief objection to that Bill is that in that particular it will open the door to all sorts of litigation, and it will leave in the hands of the magistrates the power to say whether horse clipping is or is not an act of cruelty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think some hon. members of the committee will be very apt to vote for or against the Bill from some misconception, because, judging from the remarks of my hon. friend, he has hardly gathered the meaning of the amendment proposed. The clause against which his speech was made is not a new clause; it was explained the other night. That clause has stood as the

Mr. BERGIN.

law of the land for some time. The hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill seeks to amend the law in three particulars. It proposes to amend the interpretation clause by extending it to cover some additional animals, and it provides in sub-sections *a* and *f* certain new offences. I think that in committee, probably, if we reach that far, these offences will have to be more specifically defined, but I do not see why any humane person should object to the punishment of a person who, having the charge or custody of an animal, unnecessarily fails to provide the same with proper food, drink, shelter and protection from the weather. I do not see why a person who, having the charge or custody of an animal, wantonly and unnecessarily leaves, disables or abandons such animal, should go scott free. We have already placed a law on our Statute-book on this subject, and if the jurisdiction lies with the Parliament, as appears to be the general opinion, it is an exclusive jurisdiction, and if we determine to have a law on the Statute-book we should not approach it with any feelings of maudlin sentiment, but should look at the question as sensible men, and make the law, if possible, a perfect law. There is a provision against keeping animals or birds as targets to fire at. I do not believe true sportsmen are of the opinion that it is necessary to keep animals or birds as targets. I have been a member of a gun club for some years, and we have used clay pigeons, as have many other gun clubs. The two objections raised against this Bill are, first, on the ground of jurisdiction, and second, that the Bill goes too far. The first is untenable, and the second is really aimed at the law on the Statute-book, and not at this Bill at all.

Motion that the Committee rise agreed to: Yeas, 68; nays, 67.

#### RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The first clause provides that—

"All railway trains for the conveyance of passengers shall be drawn up at the stations or other stopping places so as to enable passengers to alight from the car on to a platform which shall be constructed at each station or stopping place."

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that all railway companies have platforms at their stations and that if they neglect to land passengers on the platforms it is directly the fault of the company. This clause will only cause railways to be more careful and will not cause them any additional expenditure whatever. We know that very serious accidents have occurred through the carelessness of the companies in landing passengers at the stations. I have in my mind now a case where a young man was killed in my own constituency but a short time ago. The North Simcoe Railway is now owned by the Grand Trunk Railway, and at the town of Orillia they have two platforms at the station, one platform connected with the station and another between the two sidings. The platform near the station is much lower than the outer platform and it is necessary to have a descent on the platform so that baggage can be taken on to it. A short while ago an able and energetic young man was returning home after attending his legal duties in Toronto and he was going down the declivity of the platform when he slipped and fell as the train was moving. Both his legs had to be amputated from the result of the injuries he received and a short time afterwards he died. All the papers in the county as well as the Toronto papers had articles on this unfortunate accident, and I can give you no better idea of the loss caused by the death of this young gentleman than to read an article from *The Switch*, a paper published in the town of Barrie:

"It is not beyond the functions of *The Switch* to record the sad event which has deprived the county—yes, the Province—of a promising and

in many respects brilliant citizen in the person of Mr. Albert D. Kean, of Orillia. Though on the short side of 30 years of age and only about five years in the practice of his chosen profession—the law—he had already made a fine record and had won a position that would surely place him in the upper story of professional success. Those who knew him had high respect for his many good qualities of head and heart. A shrewd business man, a thinker and tremendous worker at all times, with due regard to all the relations of life adorning the social circle with his intellectual vivacity, indefatigable in church matters for its advancement and prosperity, his private life without blemish, exercising with all a practical charity that will ever be remembered to his credit, he almost seemed to have a premonition of a short existence and accordingly crowded into the short space allotted to him the work of an ordinary lifetime. We sympathisingly record our feeble tribute to a citizen's worth, and regret deeply that the brotherhood of a few days since has been severed by one of those casualties that now and then render families stricken and cause communities to reflect on that great transition inevitable to all of us."

It is not necessary for me to refer to any other case at the present time and there is no doubt that if we had had a law on the Statute-book to compel the railway company to land Mr. Kean upon the platform that his life would have been spared to his family and friends. I can recite a number of instances of this kind to my personal knowledge. I know that in the city of Toronto and at other places on the lines of the different railways they are very careless in landing their passengers. A short time ago I went to meet a friend at the Union Station in Toronto, where one side of the station is occupied by the Grand Trunk Company and the other by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I found that the whole siding on the Grand Trunk was occupied by empty cars and the train could not reach the station but had to stop at York Street, where the passengers had to alight, and I had to proceed there to meet my friend. I have several letters on this matter, but there are two which I consider of special importance and which I shall read to the House. This is a letter from Mr. J. Greenshields, who lives, I believe, in the city of Kingston, and who is a personal and political friend of the leader of the Government. It is as follows:—

"TORONTO, 12th February, 1889.

"H. H. COOK, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I see by the Parliamentary reports that you are about to introduce a Bill to compel railway companies to compensate passengers for damages done to baggage, which is caused through negligence of the companies in not providing proper means for the loading and unloading passenger's baggage. Anyone who has had occasion to travel on any of the roads must know the dreadful usage the property is subjected to. In very many places passengers with baggage instead of being put off at the platform are compelled to get off on a siding and have to cross another track in order to get to the platform. Negligence or carelessness cannot be charged to the employees of the road as they have no means to obviate the trouble as they are not supplied by the employers. I trust you will be successful in your endeavors, and see your Bill passed through and become law, as at present the travelling public have little or no redress. Another thing I think would be a move in the right direction that is to have the outside of the stations better lighted. If necessary I could give you the names of some of the stations where things could be made more pleasant for the travelling public.

"Very truly yours,  
"J. GREENSHIELDS."

I have another letter from a gentleman of the name of Sturgeon Stewart, who represents the Byam Manufacturing Company of Canada, in which he says:

"I am pleased to learn that you are introducing a much-needed measure for regulating and governing railway corporations regarding the better protection of life and property. A few days since a train-load of passengers were landed in this city two hundred feet from any platform or building, with a freight train on one side and a ditch eighteen inches deep on the other, with a high fence beyond. Passengers had to jump two or three feet from the steps and find their way out as best they could; and a lady with two children came almost being run down by a moving freight train, but for the timely intervention of some of the passengers who observed its approach. Instances of a similar character are almost of daily occurrence in this city. Regarding the protection of property handled by railway companies, something is required to put a stop to almost criminal carelessness in this direction. Our travellers are much inconvenienced and our company frequently sustains severe losses by the destruction of our travellers' sample cases, the loss and inconvenience of which cannot be readily computed in dollars and cents. In the interests of the public, your Bill should receive the hearty and unanimous support of the entire House."

Now, these are the opinions of two gentlemen who are constantly travelling on some of the railroads in Canada. We can put a stop to accidents of this kind by compelling the railway companies to land their passengers at a platform at each station. We cannot legislate perhaps to prevent such terrible calamities as that which has occurred near Paris to-night; but we can legislate so as to compel the railway companies to attend to the travelling public as they should. I know that since I introduced this same Bill last year, the Grand Trunk Railway Company in particular, who were very careless in this respect in the past, have mended their ways to a large extent. I remember a few years ago, when I introduced the Bill to provide for the package of frogs, the railway companies took great exception to it; but after the matter had been agitated for a few years, the Northern Railway Company packed their frogs of their own accord; and even if this Bill should not pass this Session, if the railway companies believed that the Parliament of Canada would eventually take this matter in hand, I am satisfied that they would begin to treat passengers as they should be treated. But so far as I am concerned I do not propose to wait; I propose that we shall put an Act on the Statute-book to which the railway companies will be amenable. The next clause refers to the treatment of baggage. We know very well how our baggage is smashed on the railways. Let any one travel through Canada or the United States with a new trunk for a distance of three or four hundred miles, and he will find on the completion of his journey that his baggage has been so roughly used that very often it is broken. I do not think your baggage would sustain as much damage in a year's travel in Europe as it does in Canada in a week. This is due to nothing but the grossest carelessness on the part of the railway companies, and they should be made to take better care of our baggage. The third portion of the Bill relates to the penalty imposed; and I do not see how any hon. gentleman can take any exception to the measure, because the penalty is not excessive. The only effect the Bill will have will be to make the railway companies attend more closely to their duties, and it is in the interest of the railway companies to do so, now that we have so many rival roads. I must say that the Grand Trunk has improved since the opposition of the Canadian Pacific Railway was established between here and the city of Toronto. It has better cars than it had before, they are kept cleaner, and the company has evidently come to the conclusion that unless it deals in a better way with the public than it did before, it will not have as much of its traffic. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. While I think the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is entitled to credit for his desire to amend the Railway Act in any direction that will bring greater comfort or convenience to the travelling public, still I believe that in amending any Act we should always keep in view the importance of making our legislation such that in the ordinary course of events it can be carried out and obeyed. Now, I apprehend that if this Bill were to become law, it would be utterly impossible for the railway companies in this country to comply with it. If such an Act were to become law it would be utterly impossible to keep within bounds. Take the first section, which reads as follows:—

"1. All railway trains for the conveyance of passengers shall be drawn up at the stations or other stopping places so as to enable passengers to alight from the car on to a platform which shall be constructed at each station or stopping place."

Under that section, in the case of a train composed of say twenty cars, the train would have to stop in such a position that all the passengers could get out on the platform. To accomplish this it would be imperative to place a constable or other officer, at the end of every car to prevent passen-

gers alighting until car after car was brought up to the platform. Not to say anything about the expense, it would be practically impossible to carry this out in the case of trains that stop at flag stations, where there is not usually the convenience of a station or platform. Railway companies would either have to forego stopping at these places and thus deprive the public of a great convenience, or they would have to build a platform at each station, or other stopping place, no matter how insignificant. This would be a great drawback, especially in the case of new railways. In travelling through the North West, a couple of years ago, I noticed that along the whole length of some lines there was scarcely a regular station or platform, and the passengers were glad to get out at any convenient point. Shippers had their stuff piled and discharged at such points without either a platform or station. If this Bill were law, these companies would be unable to let their passengers off where it suited them, without breaking the law, and I am sure the travelling public would consider it a great deal more inconvenient to be obliged to land on a platform perhaps miles away from the nearest point to their destination, than to be let off at such point, although there was no platform. This Bill would necessitate the building of platforms at every casual place where a train happened to stop, or the number of stopping places would have to be greatly diminished. Again, railway companies conveying excursionists often stop at different places or pleasure grounds. One year a place may be selected at which the train stops, and another year the public may resort to a different place. If this Bill became law, the company would be liable to a penalty if the passengers were discharged where there was no platform, even though the passengers desired it. Often when trains were coming into cities inconvenience would result on account of passengers not being allowed to get out at street crossings nearest home because there was no platform, and therefore the company would not leave itself liable to a prosecution for violation of the law by allowing such passengers to leave the train unless at the regular stations. I think, therefore, it will be seen how utterly impossible it would be for any railway company to keep within the bounds of this measure. That part of the Bill which relates to baggage is not so objectionable, but I understand there is a law already which provides for proper care in the handling of baggage.

Mr. TISDALE. Had the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill taken the trouble to consult some lawyer, he would have discovered that the common law covers both the matters his Bill provides for. Last Session a great deal of time was taken up by the Committee of the Whole House in passing the general railway law, and all these matters were carefully considered, so that I cannot help thinking the hon. gentleman would consult the best interests of the country and also save the time of the House if he would withdraw this Bill. Surely after the exhaustive discussion which was given last Session to railway matters it is rather early now to bring in further amendments to the railway law. The common law meets the case. The common law requires railways to give proper accommodation to all classes of passengers. Now the common law has been the law for a great many years, and unless there is some special principle or some technical rule concerning which a statute can be framed, it is much better, according to the opinions of the great judges who have administered law in all parts of the Empire, to leave these matters to the general law than to try to improve them by some technical statute. Although, therefore, both the matters dealt with by the hon. gentleman are popular in one sense, the law is as strong in regard to them as any statute the hon. gentleman can frame. Last year we ventilated these matters very fully, and I do not see any improvement which the hon. gentleman can suggest to-day, but I can see that great detriment will be

Mr. SPOULE.

caused should his Bill pass. In the part of the country where I live, local railways were built, induced to stop at some places, and I know that a similar state of affairs exists in the hon. gentleman's section, where there were no platforms at all, not because it suited the railway companies to do so, but because it accommodates the people in the rural districts. The trains stop at road crossings where it would not pay to have a platform, and sometimes it is by considerable pressure that the company are induced to do this. On some railways in the western part of Ontario, there are over 50 stations which are an accommodation to the people. If the hon. gentleman's Bill passed, these stations would disappear and every one of them would be shut down, because it would not pay to have platforms there. The law therefore would prevent the very object the hon. gentleman has in view. It would do more harm than good, and certainly have the effect of causing great inconvenience.

Mr. BARRON. I do not profess to be as familiar with the circumstances and necessities of railways as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I am quite aware of the fact that he has a great deal to do with the different railways throughout our country, and is more or less interested in them, and perhaps speaks somewhat from a railway standpoint. But when he criticises my hon. friend's measure on the ground that is quite unnecessary, because the common law of the land provides a remedy, I must inform the hon. gentleman that in this respect he is mistaken. The common law simply deals with the question of negligence, and the question which would have to be decided under it would be whether the company was guilty of negligence or not. The judge would have to decide that, and he might declare that under the circumstances negligence could not be attributed to the company. But this Bill states what is negligence. It does not leave it to a judge to say what is or what is not negligence, but it provides what will be negligence on the part of a railway company, and says that, unless a railway company does this, it will violate the Statute law of the land. I think, therefore, that the point taken by the gentleman who preceded me is not well taken. I think it is well that the Statute law should provide that the railway company should deliver passengers at the station. Moreover, I think it should provide that railway companies should handle baggage more carefully than they have in the past. I ask hon. gentlemen if they have not seen again and again the employés of a railway bundling the baggage out, throwing trunks out indiscriminately and baggage being smashed by the way in which it has been thrown on the station. I suppose it is quite true that the parties who suffer might have some remedy at common law, but I think it is infinitely better that the Statute should point out that such an act is negligent rather than that it should be left to a judge to say whether the act is negligent or not. I, therefore, think the point taken by the hon. gentleman who preceded me is not a good point, and that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is right in proposing this measure.

Mr. TISDALE. I rise to make a personal explanation.

Mr. COOK. You had better occupy the whole time.

Mr. TISDALE. I rise to make a personal explanation and I think I am in order. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Barron) said I was interested in railway companies. I desire to state that I have not a dollar's worth of interest of any sort in any railway in the world. That is all I wish to say. In my career in this House, so far as it has gone, I have never made a reflection of that kind upon any hon. gentleman. I rely upon arguments, and, though I do not think the hon. gentleman meant to make a harsh insinuation, I object to that style of discussion from either side of the House, and I hope that in future the

hon. gentleman will inform himself as to the facts before making such a statement.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member seems to be super-sensitive. He speaks like a man who has a guilty conscience. I did not say he had a money interest in railways, but I said he spoke from a railway standpoint, and I say so still. I never intended to say that he was interested in railways from a money point of view.

Mr. TISDALE. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to speak more broadly. If he did not intend that, he should say so, and I will accept his statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. After listening to the arguments on both sides, one is impressed with the fact, that there are inconveniences which this Bill seeks to remedy. The inconveniences, undoubtedly, are caused by the carelessness of companies in failing to draw up their trains at regular stations, and at places for which they have sold tickets to passengers. No doubt, that is frequently done through carelessness, and, so far as it can be remedied, it should be remedied. The other disadvantage is the careless handling of baggage, which we have all witnessed. It is true, that this Bill only attaches penalties to the infraction of the common law. If any inconvenience occurs to a passenger by the train not stopping at the proper place, or by his baggage being injured, he has his remedy at common law. It may or may not be expedient to attach penalties to these acts in addition to the common law remedy for damages, but I call the attention of the House to the fact, that the Bill will introduce greater inconveniences, as my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says, than those which it proposes to remedy. I will mention some of them for the consideration of the promoter of the Bill, if he thinks fit to go further with it. It is customary, I think, on all railway lines, and certainly on the more important lines, to have stopping places at certain seasons of the year for the convenience of business people. That is so also with regard to a few families living at a little distance from the regular station, for whose convenience the railway company makes a stoppage where there is no regular station. Then, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just said, there is the case of long excursion trains, which cannot be brought up in many cases to the small platforms at which the passengers are to land. But, under the provisions of this Bill, it would be necessary that, at every one of these stopping places which are temporary and merely for the convenience of individuals where no business is transacted except the getting on and off of passengers, the railway company must erect a platform. That, of course, would be utterly impracticable, and would lead to the closing of every one of these accommodation stopping places and, in that way, would inflict a greater inconvenience on the public than the inconveniences which the hon. gentleman refers to. The first section of this Bill says :

" all railway trains for the conveyance of passengers shall be drawn up at the stations or other stopping places so as to enable passengers to alight from the car on to a platform which shall be constructed at each station or stopping place."

So that, at every one of these temporary stopping places for the convenience of persons travelling in certain seasons of the year, the railway company would subject itself to a penalty for according that accommodation. Further, at many of these occasional stopping places, there are steep grades, and, under the provisions of this Bill, if the train passed the stopping place or platform, it would be absolutely necessary, for the mere convenience of one or two passengers, to back the whole train on a steep grade, and in many cases that would involve a great deal of delay and expense. In fact, on these two grounds, the Bill would practically close all stopping places of that description.

Then, we have the cases which exist in Toronto, Hamilton and some other cities, where, for the convenience of passengers, they are allowed to alight from, and to enter the train at a momentary stopping place on the streets. That would also have to be stopped, because it would be impossible to put a platform on the streets. Then it often happens that the platform is so near the highway that it is absolutely impossible that the baggage could be taken from the train, and the train could pass on so as to allow the passengers to alight from the passenger cars without the train standing on the highway, and the Act passed last Session makes it an offence for a train to stand across a street for more than three minutes. Now with regard to the second section, I think it is open to a good deal of objection, to part of which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman has not had his attention called. The Bill says :

" Passengers' baggage shall not be thrown or cast from the baggage car to the platform, but proper appliances shall be provided on which baggage, not removed by hand, shall be removed undamaged from the baggage car to the platform."

The hon. gentleman means, I suppose, that passengers' baggage shall not be thrown out carelessly but that it shall be removed with care. But he has made it a penal offence if baggage is found in a damaged condition at all; that is to say, if the baggage is found, on its removal from the baggage car to the platform, to be damaged, the company is liable to this penalty. It surely ought to be enough to impose a penalty if the damage occurs through any fault of the company's officers. Under this clause I think the burden would clearly be upon the company, and not upon the owner, to show that the baggage was not damaged through any fault of their officers. Then the third section says :

" For each neglect to comply with the provision of the two sections next preceding, the railway company shall, in addition to any other liabilities, incur a penalty which shall be recoverable by any person who sues for the same."

Now it sometimes happens that the railway companies are not at all at fault for the carelessness of those who act as baggagemen. It sometimes happens that railway companies take the utmost care to have the baggage properly handled, and they impose fines upon baggagemen for using violence. I know several cases of baggagemen having been dismissed for wilful disobedience to the orders of the company in that respect; and yet this Bill, instead of imposing a penalty upon the person who has been guilty, namely, the baggageman himself, who has violated the orders of the company, makes the company liable to the penalty. Taking all these circumstances into consideration, I would suggest that this Bill be read the second time, without the House considering itself bound to the principle of the Bill, and that it be referred to the committee which I named the other evening for the consideration of other Bills imposing penalties. It would be better to have it considered there than in the Railway Committee.

Mr. COOK. If there are objections to the Bill, I am willing to take the course suggested by the Minister of Justice. I quite appreciate the objection taken to the second clause by the Minister of Justice, but I do not think the objections made by other hon. gentlemen are quite so well taken. At the same time the Bill might be amended by striking out the first clause so that it would not interfere with cars stopping upon the highway and letting out passengers at a place where there would not be a station. The object I have is to compel the railway companies to land their passengers on the platform instead of between two trains. It often happens that passengers have to pass between two trains and cross the track to get to the platform. Last year, in introducing a similar Bill, I believe I did not mention that the railway companies have a practice of landing passengers between freight trains. For instance, you may take any of the stations on the line of a road where two freight trains meet and the passenger train



passes them; the company finds it more convenient to run the freight trains on two opposite tracks and let the express, with the passengers, pass between them, so that the passengers getting off there have to cross the track to get to the platform. All I want to do is to compel them to run their freight trains on outside tracks so as to bring the passenger train up to the railway station next to the platform. Of course if the train happens to be a long one, longer than the platform is, a provision can be made to meet that case. I do not wish to put the company to any unnecessary expense, but I think that they should treat the public in a manner in which the public ought to be treated. I have much pleasure in accepting the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice as to the disposition of this Bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Another strong objection to that Bill is that under present circumstances the railway companies are bound to provide proper means and appliances for discharging passengers from their trains, and if, from any negligence or carelessness on the part of the company, an accident occurs or any person suffers damage, he has a remedy. The difficulty in this case would be that if by chance a train, long or short, did not draw up to the platform, though no one was injured thereby, yet the company would be liable to the penalty. There you see you are imposing penalties on companies for no damage done, and you put them at the mercy of a common informer who might wish to bring an action against them. In many instances when a long train comes to a station, the company will discharge the first cars and then haul up the train farther, and it is impossible to keep the people in, as they will pass out in order to reach the platform. At present, under our existing law, if a person suffers damage from the negligence of the company in not having proper appliances for alighting, &c., he has a remedy against the company, and, generally speaking, the company suffers pretty severely. But in addition to that, if by neglect, either by overrunning the platform, or having a long train, or through some other cause, one of the cars connected with the train is not opposite the platform, still the company is liable to a penalty at the suit of any common informer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the hon. member who has charge of this Bill, as he has taken a great deal of interest in it, should be put on this special committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection.  
Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### ASSESSMENT OF SALARIES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. ELLIS moved that Bill No. (18) to authorise the assessment of incomes of persons in the service of Canada be read the second time. He said: The object of this Bill is to authorise the assessment of persons having a salary or income, in the service of Canada, for municipal or civic purposes. As is well known at present, through some presumed prescriptive right, the salaries of persons in the service of Canada can not be assessed for any purpose, such as schools, or streets, or police, or fire, or for any of the purposes for which the salaries or incomes of other citizens are taxed. I think it has been decided by the Ontario courts that there is no power, either under the municipal or the provincial laws, to assess the salaries. It seems to be only right and fair that employés of the Dominion Government who live in cities and who enjoy all the privileges which the city affords, including police protection and public schools and like advantages, should pay a fair share of the assessment wherever incomes are assessed in Provinces. In some places, I am aware, there is no income tax,

Mr. Cook.

and in such instances the Bill will not apply. In those cases all persons are reached under the system there existing. Where the assessment is levied wholly on real estate the whole population is reached in that way, but in places where there is an income tax there is an unfairness committed by exempting employées of the Dominion Government. The object of the Bill is to remove that unfairness. It is supported by the general voice of the country, and there seems to be no good reason why the civil servants of Canada should be exempt from the assessment. The very fact that superannuation is provided for them on their retirement gives them an advantage which is not enjoyed by other persons, and I think this is a further reason why the House should agree to the passage of this measure. As regards officials drawing comparatively small salaries, I may remark that most of the assessment laws provide an exemption so the law would not bear too harshly on them. The object sought to be attained is to make the local law applicable to all cases.

Mr. RYKERT. I think this Bill cannot go to a second reading, for two reasons. We have a Rule of this House which requires all Bills that involve a charge on the people or on any class to originate in Committee of the Whole. On page 523 of Mr. Bourinot's work there is the following:—

"It is the invariable rule that all measures involving a charge upon the people or any class thereof should be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, Rule 88, Order.

"If any motion be made on the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned until such future day as the House may think fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereon."

The Rule stated also applies to the imposition of any state tax or charge upon the people or any class thereof. Then there is another reason laid down also in Mr. Bourinot's work:

"It is now a fixed principle of constitutional government that all propositions to impose taxes shall be made only with the assent of the Ministers of the Crown and with their sanction."

Under these circumstances I contend that this Bill should originate in Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AMYOT. I have another reason against further progress being made with this Bill. I do not see that this House has power to deal with assessments to be levied for municipal or school purposes. That is a subject wholly within the jurisdiction of the Local Governments.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have some little doubt as to the power of Parliament to deal with this subject, but, if it is possible to do so, I think that the employés of the Dominion Government should be made liable with other persons for these provincial and municipal taxes. It does not really affect Ottawa alone, but also every city throughout the Dominion, as the courts of the different Provinces—I know this has been the case in New Brunswick and Ontario—have decided that the salaries of these officers are free from assessment. In fact it is carried out to a very great extent, and a large number of the employés of the Intercolonial Railway are free from any local or town or county assessment, and as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has stated, even from paying school taxes. It was never intended that all these persons should escape; and as the courts have decided that the Local Legislatures have no power, then the question arises as to whether we have power in this Parliament. The question is not that mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) that this Bill proposes a tax in the sense he has put forward, but the question is, can we delegate the power to Local Governments to make the assessment? It is doubtful to my mind whether that can be done, because the effect of this Bill is that as the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures having together the power of the

Imperial Parliament vested in them, and as the courts have decided that the power to deal with this question does not rest with the Local Legislatures, then it must rest in the Dominion Parliament. If this can be done and if this proposal, which is a just one, can be carried out, all the employés of the Dominion would be compelled to pay their share of taxes which confer a benefit on them in common with other denizens of towns and cities.

Mr. RYKERT. I have taken objection to the Bill on a point of Order, and I ask your ruling on it, Mr. Speaker. I contend that this Bill must originate in Committee of the Whole House, as it involves a charge on the people and a tax on a class of the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear that this Bill must originate in Committee of the Whole. The Bill, as I understand, states that there is a certain class who are not liable to assessment, and they shall be made liable to assessment. It, therefore, appears to me the reason of the Rule would apply in this case as in any other.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is an abstract resolution so far.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the Civil Service would find it a concrete process very quickly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is nothing in the Bill that provides for taxation; it does not provide any tax. I do not think we have power to do what the mover asks this House to do, but that is a different question. With regard to our power to pass this Bill, I do not think the objection of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is well taken, because the Local Legislatures would still be the parties to exercise that power. This is not power to tax. When this question is before the Local Legislatures, supposing this Bill to pass, they will then have the question of taxation before them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argues from the theory on which this Bill proceeds, rather than on its actual provisions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have not looked at the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman would give attention to section 2, he would find that this is its exact provision, and that a certain class of the people not now liable to taxation shall hereafter be liable. It enforces a liability upon them. It says:

"An official or employé in the service of Canada so assessed shall be liable for the payment of the amount assessed; and the laws and regulations for the assessing, levying and collecting of taxes on salaries or incomes, or on both, in force in the place or locality in which any such official or employé is a resident, shall apply to such official or employé in the same manner as to any other person taxed in such place or locality upon salary or income, or on both."

We all know that those laws are in existence now, and the moment this Bill receives the Royal Assent hundreds of persons in this country will be immediately taxed to the same extent under the provisions of this Bill as if they were taxed by a Dominion officer. If the decision be correct now, these officers are exempt by this Legislature, and I fully agree with the hon. gentleman opposite that we have not the power to legislate in this way. If we possess the authority to deal with the subject we have no power to delegate that to the Provincial Legislatures which have their powers from the British North America Act. The change must be accomplished in another way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have no power to tax for municipal purposes, and we cannot confer the power to tax for municipal purposes, because if we could it would be an indication that the power is vested in us. And it is not vested in us. Of course if we are to touch on the merits of the question I will give you my views upon it, but we must discuss the regularity of the proceeding before we discuss the merits of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. First, this being a charge upon a class of the people it must commence in the Committee of the Whole, and there is the other point that it must be on the recommendation of the Crown.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me ask the hon. gentleman how he considers this is a tax on any class of Her Majesty's subjects. The first clause removes the disability to tax a certain class. It says:

"From and after the passing of this Act, the salaries or incomes, or both, of officials and employés in the service of Canada, derived from their employment in such service, shall be liable for assessment for civic, municipal and school purposes in the places or localities in which such officials and employés reside, in the same manner and to the same extent as the salaries or incomes, or both, of other residents of these places or localities, derived from other sources."

They are not liable to taxation by any provision of this Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let me ask the hon. gentleman one question. Is there any difference between imposing a burden and removing an exemption? I think not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No civil servant would be liable by virtue of the operation of this Act. He might be liable by some Acts of a Provincial Legislature consequent on the operation of this Act, but the liability arises entirely by virtue of some other legislation and not by virtue of this Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. The general principle that all measures having the effect to impose some new charge on the people must originate first in the Committee of the Whole House is admitted by both sides. The only question then is as to the application of this general principle to this special measure. I read that by the first clause of the Bill it is provided that the salaries of public officials may be assessed, and, furthermore, in the second clause, that if they are assessed at present, or if they be assessed in future, that such assessment shall be legal. It is clear to my mind that the effect of this Bill, the moment it becomes law, will be to legalise all assessments so already made or to be made. I must hold, therefore, that the Bill comes under the operation of the general rule, as imposing new charges on a certain class of the people, that is, the public officials and employés, and that it must originate in the Committee of the Whole, and, furthermore, emanate from the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand, Sir, that you rule on the other point, that this Bill should receive the assent of the Crown? I hardly think that this is correct. As you have ruled on one point, you might as well rule on the other, and I do not think the Government would be impartial persons, as the Bill would tax them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled that the Bill is out of order.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved that the House resolve itself, on Monday next, into Committee of the Whole to consider further Bill (No. 3) to make further provision as to the pre-

vention of cruelty to animals and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act concerning Cruelty to Animals." He said: Certain hon. gentlemen who approve of the principle of the Bill have taken exception to certain clauses, and I am quite prepared, in committee, to make such explanations which I hope will be satisfactory, especially with reference to the two last clauses, to which my attention has been particularly drawn. If my explanations are not satisfactory in committee, I am prepared to make some modifications in the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE moved in amendment that all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted: "Bill No. 3 be considered this day six months." He said: Hon. gentleman can quite understand that I do not propose to make a speech on this question, but simply wish to explain the necessity for the amendment. The necessity is that unless this amendment be carried, the hon. gentleman, if defeated to-day, can again renew his motion. I wish to dispose of the whole question.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have an opportunity of bringing this Bill before the House again. There is no doubt a good deal of good in it, and if what is bad can be expunged in the committee, I would be disposed to vote for the measure. I opposed the Bill the other night because the hon. gentleman would not accept my advice, but after his remarks of to-day, I feel disposed to give him another opportunity of pressing his Bill.

Mr. TROW. I would ask the ruling of the Speaker on the point, whether once the Committee of the Whole has disposed of the Bill, the Bill is not without the jurisdiction of the House. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported that the committee do rise, without asking leave to sit again, and it strikes me forcibly that effectually disposes of the Bill for this Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reason why the committee rose without making a report was that there was nothing to report. Now, the proper proceeding has been taken by the hon. member from Hamilton, and that is to give another order for the House to consider the Bill again in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The Bill is not now before the House, and therefore the amendment of the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale) to have it read six months hence, is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that the Bill be further considered on Monday next in Committee of the Whole House, and the amendment, I think, is quite correct, that the order be made that the Bill be so considered this day six months.

House divided on amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Audet,	Gauthier,	Moncrieff,
Bain (Soulanges),	Geoffrion,	Montplaisir,
Beausoleil,	Gigault,	Mulock,
Bergeron,	Godbout,	Neveu,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Perry,
Bernier,	Guay,	Préfontaine,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Prior,
Burdett,	Ives,	Purcell,
Cameron,	Joncas,	Putnam,
Cargill,	Jones (Halifax),	Rinfret,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Labelle,	Riopel,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Landerkin,	Robillard,
Casey,	Landry,	Rykert,
Oasgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Ste. Marie,
Ohoquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Small,
Oimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Cockburn,	La Rivière,	Taylor,

Mr. BROWN.

Cook,	Lavergue,	Thérien,
Corby,	Lépine,	Tisdale,
Doullombe,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Couture,	McCarthy,	Turcot,
Daoust,	McCulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Davies,	McGreavy,	Vanasse,
Danison,	McIntyre,	Wallace,
Desjardins,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Dessaint,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Doyon,	Marshall,	Wilson (Rigby),
Dupont,	Masson,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Bothwell),	Yeo.—21.
Fiset,		

NAYS

Messieurs

Archibald,	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Ellis,	McNeill,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gr),	Madill,
Baird,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mara,
Bernard,	Fisher,	Meigs,
Béchar,	Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bell,	Gillmor,	O'Brien,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Haggart,	Perley,
Bowell,	Hale,	Platt,
Bowman,	Hall,	Porter,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Robertson,
Brien,	Holton,	Rowand,
Brown,	Hudspeth,	Scriver,
Burns,	Innes,	Semple,
Campbell,	Jamieson,	Skinner,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Smith (Ontario),
Carpenter,	Kirk,	Somerville,
Charlton,	Kirkpatrick,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Lang,	Thompson (Sir John),
Colby,	Laurie,	Tupper,
Colter,	Laurier,	Waldie,
Curran,	Lister,	Watson,
Daly,	Lovitt,	Weldon (Albert),
Davies,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Weldon (St. John),
Davin,	Macdonald (Huron),	Welsh,
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	White (Cardwell),
Dewdney,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Renfrew),
Dickey,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	McKeen,	Wood (Westm'd).—91.
Edgar,		

Mr. SPEAKER. There being a tie, I shall vote nay, so as to leave the question before the House.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 91; nays, 92.

House divided on motion of Mr. Brown:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Archibald,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,
Armstrong,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Madill,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Mara,
Bernard,	Foster,	Meigs,
Béchar,	Freeman,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bell,	Gillmor,	Moffat,
Boisvert,	Guillet,	O'Brien,
Borden,	Haggart,	Paterson (Brant),
Bowell,	Hale,	Perley,
Bowman,	Hall,	Platt,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Porter,
Brien,	Holton,	Robertson,
Brown,	Hudspeth,	Rowand,
Burns,	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell,	Jamieson,	Semple,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Carpenter,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Charlton,	Kirk,	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Kirkpatrick,	Somerville,
Colby,	Lang,	Temple,
Colter,	Laurie,	Thompson (Sir John),
Curran,	Laurier,	Tapper,
Daly,	Lister,	Waldie,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Weldon (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Dewdney,	McDonald (Victoria),	Welsh,
Dickey,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Edgar,	McGreavy,	Wilson (Lennox),
Eisenhauer,	McKeen,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Ellis,	McMullen,	Wright.—98.

## NATS :

## Messieurs

Amyot,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Audet,	Fiset,	Moncrieff,
Bain (Soulanges),	Flynn,	Montplaisir,
Beausoleil,	Gauthier,	Munlock,
Bergeron,	Geoffrion,	Neveu,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Perry,
Bernier,	Godbout,	Préfontaine,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Prior,
Bryson,	Guay,	Purcell,
Burdett,	Hickey,	Putnam,
Cameron,	Ives,	Rinfret,
Cargill,	Jones,	Riopel,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Halifax),	Robillard,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Labelle,	Rykert,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Casgrain,	Landry,	Small,
Choquette,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sproule,
Chouinard,	Langelier (Quebec),	Taylor,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thérien,
Cockburn,	La Rivière,	Tisdale,
Cock,	Lavergne,	Trow,
Corby,	Lépine,	Turcot,
Coulombe,	Mackenzie,	Tyrwhitt,
Couture,	McCarthy,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McOulla,	Wallace,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Wilnot,
Denison,	McKay,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Elgin),
Dessaint,	Marshall,	Wood (Brockville),
Doyon,	Mason,	Yeo.—92.
Dupont,	Mills (Bothwell),	

Motion agreed to.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 87) to amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.—(Mr. McGreevy.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Edmundston and Florenceville Railway Company.—(Mr. Latdry.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 91) to permit the conditional release of First Offenders in certain cases.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 92) relating to Bills of Lading.—(Sir John Thompson.)

## POSTAL SERVICE AMENDMENT ACT.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) to amend the Act respecting the Postal Service. He said: There are several important amendments in this Bill. The first change introduced is for the purpose of compelling steamboats navigating Canadian waters to carry Her Majesty's mails, or persons travelling with them, at such rate as the Postmaster General may order them to be carried, or on such terms as the Governor General in Council may prescribe. The object of this clause is, instead of giving subsidies to different lines of steamboats for carrying the mails, to fix the price of carrying the mails in all inland waters on some fixed principle, either by the weight of the matter carried, or according to distance, or in some other form that may be prescribed by a board selected for that purpose, or, in other words, to give the Government the same power of carrying the mails on the inland waters as they have now on the railways throughout the Dominion. The second clause is an amend-

ment of section 2 of the Post Office Act. This section has been amended so as to include decoy letters, that is, letters posted by the inspectors or other officers of the department. It was thought that decoy letters did not come within the ordinary meaning of letters, and it is for the purpose of punishing parties who steal them the same as when they steal other letters. There is another verbal change which is intended to include parcels which are mailed in English post offices. The third paragraph is an amendment to section 9 of the Act, letter *d*. It is for the purpose of excluding immoral publications, or immoral photographs, and to make the punishment the same and the forfeiture the same. The second paragraph is an amendment to section 9, letter *k*. It is repealed, and it gives the Postmaster General power to prescribe and enforce the rate at which registered letters are carried throughout the Dominion. The object of the clause is to give the Postmaster General power to increase, if thought necessary, the rate placed on registered letters carried from one section of the Dominion to another. The intention of the department at present is to raise the rate and make it similar to the English and American prices for carrying registered letters. Section 20 of the Act allows an increase in the weight of letters to be carried for three cents from half an ounce to an ounce. Section 21 of the said Act is repealed, and a clause is put in which raises the rate of drop letters from one cent per half ounce to two cents per ounce, nearly doubles the rate of drop letters, and makes it similar to the rate in the United Kingdom and the United States, on the same class of letters. In no part of the world that we know of are drop letters posted and delivered at the same rate that they are in Canada. It makes a letter delivered to a postmaster as a drop letter, pay the same charge as similar letters in the United Kingdom and the United States, whether there is a city delivery or not. Section 25 of the said Act is repealed, and the rate of postage on periodicals printed and published in Canada, and issued less frequently than at intervals of seven days remains the same, but it prescribes that a newspaper must be issued at periods not less than seven days, so newspapers can only pass free that are published either daily or weekly, and all published at longer intervals pay a fixed rate of one cent per pound. The next clause amends the definition of a newspaper to make it correspond with the definition in England. The clause afterwards authorises the Postmaster General to make arrangements with foreign countries as to parcel post. The clause after that is for the purpose of making more clear what a dead letter is. The next clause is one that has been amended to suit the altered relations between the Customs Department and the Post Office Department, and to secure the payment of parcel posts passing through the post office, and to facilitate the transmission of the same; also for the purpose of preventing the annoyances to which persons are sometimes subjected at post offices on account of the customs duty. The rest of the clauses regulates the manner and mode of making the printed return to Parliament, in order to make it in accordance with the system on which the post office is managed now, and to eliminate from it all returns which are made at present by the Auditor General.

Mr. TROW. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that he increases the rate upon drop letters generally 100 per cent.?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the Minister whether he proposes to make any provision respecting letters that are not fully paid, whether they cannot be forwarded and the amount collected at their destination, the same as in England? It is frequently very inconvenient, and sometimes attended with a great deal of loss to parties who put on the stamps all right enough, but from the want of adhesive property in the stamps, they get knocked off, and

the letters are returned to the writers after considerable delay. It appears to me, that the public service would not be injured if the hon. gentleman would provide that letters here, as in England, in such cases, should be delivered, subject to the double postage, or whatever postage the department might see fit to put upon them.

Mr. HAGGART. The matter has been very fully considered in the department. All letters which are insufficiently prepaid are forwarded, and a double rate of postage collected when they arrive at their destination. The objection to the system proposed by my hon. friend from Halifax is this: if you allow a letter to be forwarded which has no postage stamp at all, you revert to the old system of sending letters without postage stamps at all, and impose upon the party receiving them, perhaps a double postage. The proposition is that, when a letter is insufficiently stamped, it shall be forwarded to its destination, and a double penalty attached.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is not the old law.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the Postmaster General propose to make any change in regard to registration stamps?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It has been announced that the present stamp was to be discontinued, and the ordinary two cent stamp substituted. The present system often causes considerable inconvenience.

Mr. HAGGART. That change has been already made, that is, departmentally made. An order has been given by the department to the post offices, that where a two cent stamp is attached for registration, the letter will not require the registration stamp. The intention of the department is to increase the registration fees, and to make them similar to the fees in Great Britain and the United States, and at the same time to provide more security for the transmission of registered letters than at present, and also to compel the registration of all letters which include valuables.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The proposition to increase the postage on drop letters is a very serious one, and the hon. gentleman should inform the House, before the Bill proceeds very far, of the grounds on which the Government are asking such an important increase.

Mr. HAGGART. As this is a money Bill, it must, of course, be introduced by resolution, and when it is before the House I shall be able to explain the reasons.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one feature of the Bill which is decidedly objectionable, and that is the increased cost of forwarding registered letters. It is well known that a very large proportion of our people send small remittances, such, for example, as remittances to mutual insurance companies, by registered letter. The registered letter is growing in favor in Canada and is being largely adopted, especially for small amounts, and it is a pity that the present arrangement should be disturbed. The proposed increase would press on a class who are not well able to bear an additional drain for increased postage. It is unfortunate the present arrangement should be disturbed, when it has given satisfaction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Another matter I should like to bring before the notice of the Postmaster General is the possibility of reducing the rates charged for money orders. At present the rate is too high, and great convenience would be caused to the public if it were reduced.

Mr. CASEY. What is the increase in the charge on registered letters?

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. HAGGART. There is no amount fixed in the Bill; it is proposed to give power to the Governor in Council to increase the amount.

Bill read the first time.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 94) respecting Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. Dickinson.)

Bill (No. 95) relating to the Supreme Court.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

#### GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have received an engineer's report on the works connected with the railway of the Great Northern Railway Company, comprising that part thereof extending from the Villages of New Glasgow and Ste. Sophie, in the County of Terrebonne, through the Parish of St. Lin, in the County of L'Assomption; if so, what is the conclusion of the said report? have the Government made any payments, in view of the said works, and what is the amount of such payments, if any?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the first question of the hon. member, my answer is: Yes, in 1885. To the second question, enquiring as to what the conclusion of the report is: it implies slight works, and the road is completed so as to allow running on it at a rate of twelve miles an hour. To the third question: \$25,088 has been paid.

#### SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDWARDS) asked, When the report of the engineer who made an examination of the Ottawa River between Ottawa and Grenville, as to the effect of putting sawdust and mill refuse in the river, will be brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report of the engineer acting on behalf of the lumber merchants was received by the department on Tuesday last. The report of the engineer who had been sent by my department the year previous, was not made and received by the chief engineer until that officer, the first assistant engineer, had been called before the committee of the Senate and examined there. He gave all his information to them, and the whole matter was published and delivered to the public. Copies of the plan were furnished to the engineer, Mr. Fleming, who acted for the merchants lately and who conducted the examination on their behalf.

#### CUSTOMS APPRAISERS.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether the positions as appraisers held by the late Louis Bilodeau and by Honoré Plamondon have been filled, and if so, who are the persons appointed? Have the persons appointed appraisers in place of the said Louis Bilodeau and Honoré Plamondon salaries commensurate with the importance of their duties?

Mr. BOWELL. Appraisers have been appointed since the death of the late Louis Bilodeau and Honoré Plamondon, but they were not specially named as filling the vacancies caused by such deaths. The appraising staff now comprise three officers in place of two when Mr. Bilodeau and Mr. Plamondon were serving. The salaries of the present appraising staff at the port of Quebec are considered to be commensurate with the services rendered.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, What are the salaries paid to customs appraisers in the cities of Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. BOWELL. The salaries paid to the appraising staff at Montreal range from \$600 to \$1,500, and at Toronto from \$800 to \$1,600. I might add that if the hon. gentleman would refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he would be able to find the name of each and the amount he received.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether there are, in the Quebec custom house, appraisers for groceries and dry-goods; and if so, who they are?

Mr. BOWELL. The appraisers at the port of Quebec have not been appointed to any particular branch of the service, but to the appraisement of any goods that may be received at the port, and for which they are considered the most qualified.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether the Government are aware of the existence, in the Quebec custom house, for five years past, of several vacancies which have not been filled up; and that the mercantile interests of Quebec are suffering seriously from the fact that the said vacancies have not been so filled up?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government is aware that vacancies have occurred at the Quebec custom house during the past five years, some of which have not been filled. It is not aware that the mercantile interests of Quebec are "suffering seriously" from the fact that such vacancies have not been filled up. The department is, however, aware that persons who are applicants for positions in the Quebec customs office have made representations that the staff should be increased. It is considered, after full investigation by the Government, that the staff at Quebec custom house is ample to serve all legitimate requirements of the port. There are on the permanent staff at Quebec, at present, 41 officers; in 1878, there were 43 officers.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, How many appraisers are attached to the Quebec custom house; what are their names and their respective salaries?

Mr. BOWELL. The appraising staff at the port of Quebec at present consists of one appraiser, one assistant appraiser, and one acting appraiser. Their names are: F. Martineau, appraiser, salary \$800; James G. Watters, assistant appraiser, salary \$700; A. V. Dion, acting appraiser, salary \$900.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT HALIFAX.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to enquire when the papers connected with the dismissal of Mr. Ross from the collectorship of the port of Halifax are to be expected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They will be brought down without delay.

Mr. LAURIER. Can you say nothing more definite than that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say they will be brought down soon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Really, considering that my hon. friend asked for those papers a month ago, it does seem to be very extraordinary that papers of that sort cannot be produced sooner than within a month, with all the resources at the disposal of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had asked the question when the Minister of Customs was in his place, he would have got a more positive answer.

Mr. LAURIER. I will ask the question again to-morrow.

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Davin for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying for all memorials addressed to the Government by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories which sat recently at Regina.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say a few words on this motion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I propose to review very briefly the leading points in the policy of the Government with reference to the administration of North-West affairs in connection with the sale and management of public lands. It is a matter of the utmost importance to this country that that vast stretch of wilderness should be settled, and I presume, Sir, that all parties of Canadians are ready to unite in recommending and approving any policy calculated to produce that desirable result. I must further say that I consider the policy of the Government from the time its first regulation was issued in July, 1879, down to the present moment, as having been a policy not calculated to secure the development of that great country. It has been a policy not conceived and not carried out in the interests of the settlers who live in that country or who may be induced to go there. The Reform party of this Dominion—the Opposition in this House—challenged this policy of the Government as long ago as April, 1880, and for nine years we have continued to protest against the course that the Government have chosen to pursue with regard to the administration of our great public domain in the North-West. The regulation issued on the 9th July, 1879, provided for the setting apart of five belts upon each side of the assumed line of the railway. The first belt was to be five miles wide, the second belt was to be fifteen miles wide, the third belt twenty miles wide, the fourth belt twenty miles wide, and the fifth belt fifty miles wide. Lands in the first belt were to be held at \$6 per acre, in the second belt at \$5, in the third belt at \$3.50, in the fourth belt at \$2, and in the fifth belt at \$1 per acre. The lands not set apart for homestead and pre-emption were to be sold upon credit, requiring the payment of one-tenth down and the balance in nine equal annual instalments, bearing interest at 6 per cent. It was then held by the Opposition that the opening for sale upon credit of a vast amount of land at \$1 per acre, requiring the payment of only 10 cents per acre upon the land, the granting of easy terms on the balance, and the sale of this land in unlimited quantities, was a policy calculated to foster and produce speculations in this land. These regulations were modified on the 14th October, 1879. The lands under the modified regulations in belt "A" were held at \$5 per acre, in belt "B" at \$4, in belt "C" at \$3, in belt "D" at \$2, and in belt "E" at \$1 per acre, with the same policy continued as to selling upon credit, and with the same objectionable feature of the policy in encouraging speculation in the public lands of the North-West. There was one modification of those regulations in May, 1881, and on the 1st January, 1882, regulations were issued which, I believe, are still in force. Those regulations provided two schemes for colonisation, which were in point of fact, two schemes calculated to still further promote the operations of speculators in these public lands. Colonisation "plan No. 1" provided that lands in alternate sections could be purchased by colonisation companies at \$2 per acre, the price at which they were held to settlers, with a provision that upon compliance with some requirements as to settlement, a rebate of one-half should be made; the effect of this being to give the colonisation companies—organisations of capitalists—an opportunity to buy lands at half-price, and this led to a good deal of speculation. Plan

"No. 2" provided for the sale of the entire amount of land in townships at \$2 per acre for cash, with the same provision as to rebate of one-half of the amount paid, upon compliance with certain conditions. Here was a policy which could not be said to have been conceived or executed in the interests of the settlers; here was a policy in both those instances, to sell the public lands in unlimited quantities at a dollar per acre on credit, and a policy which encouraged the organisation of those colonisation companies that were practically calculated to promote speculation in the lands of the North-West, and that were not conceived in the interests of the settlers. The Opposition challenged this policy as early as 1880. On the 5th April, 1880, the following resolution was moved with regard to the Government's land policy:

"Mr. Charlton moved that the House do now go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

"1. Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the proper policy with reference to the disposition of the public lands of Canada should be, as far as practicable, to sell such lands to actual settlers only, on reasonable conditions of settlement, and in lots or quantities limited to the area which can be reasonably occupied by a settler; and that the sale of public lands to speculators, free from conditions of settlement, is impolitic and calculated to injuriously affect the settlement of the country, by keeping large quantities of land locked up for years, and by obliging the settlers thereon ultimately to pay a price much larger than that which is paid into the public Treasury for the same."

"2. Resolved, That, as under the existing regulations respecting the disposal of public lands, for the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway, large quantities of fertile lands are being offered for sale, and sold to speculators at one dollar per acre, for one-tenth cash down, and the balance in nine equal annual instalments, with interest at 6 per cent. per annum—terms which enable the speculator to obtain control of lands for a cash outlay of ten cents per acre; thereby, not only in effect, loaning to the speculator on the part of the Government, nine-tenths of the capital required for speculative investments, but giving rise, as experience shows, to great expense in the keeping of accounts, and to indefinite delays in the realisation of the stipulated price; that, so long as the system of selling public lands to speculators without conditions of settlement or restrictions as to quantity is continued, the price at which such lands are sold should be paid in full in cash, at the time of sale."

It was moved in amendment by Mr. White, of Cardwell:

"That all the words after 'That' be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: 'the policy of the Government for the disposal of the public lands in Manitoba and the North-West, is well calculated to promote the rapid settlement of that region, and to raise the moneys required for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, without further burthening the people, and that it deserves the support and approval of this House.'"

Well, Sir, that policy received the approval of the House by a vote of 120 to 40, but the allegation of the amendment, that the policy was one calculated to promote the rapid settlement of the country and to raise the moneys necessary to pay for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been belied by subsequent events. So far from its promoting the rapid settlement of that country, there are to-day, according to the estimate made by the Government, but 132,000 settlers in Manitoba and but 100,000, including Indians, or about 50,000 whites, in the North-West Territories—a population of from 170,000 to 180,000 settlers who have gone into the whole of that vast region during the nine years that have elapsed since the question was discussed in this House; and so far from realising the \$58,000,000, or any portion of it, that we were told was to be realised by 1891 from the sale of lands, we have realised nothing. The sale of lands has not paid the expenses of management; and in place of having any considerable sum to apply to the liquidation of the expenses incurred by the Government in the construction of the railway, we are actually out \$70,000,000 in hard cash, the sum given to the railway in the form of bonuses, the cost of the portion which was constructed and handed over to the company, and the \$10,000,000 given to the company in exchange for a portion of its land grant. Now, it is evident that the predictions made by the Government with reference to the results that would follow the inauguration of this policy in 1879 have not been fulfilled; that, in point of fact, the whole thing has proved in a great

Mr. CHARLTON.

measure a flat failure; that we have not induced settlement to the North-West; that the country has not prospered; that something has been the matter; and I shall show, a little further on, that in addition to its policy towards the settlers, the Government has erred in other matters. The Opposition steadily adhered to the policy it laid down in 1879. On the 16th of March, 1881, when the Dominion Lands Act was under consideration in this House, amendments to that Act were moved in the following directions. The first was by Mr. Mills, who moved:

"That the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to amend the fourth clause by providing a limitation of the area of land which may be sold by the Government to one person."

Which, of course, was lost. It was moved by Mr. Charlton:

"That the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to amend the fourth clause by enacting that except or otherwise provided by resolution of this House, all lands shall be disposed of subject to conditions of actual settlement."

Which, of course, was lost. It was moved by Mr. Holton:

"That the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to amend the fourth clause by providing that the unappropriated even-numbered sections in each township shall be disposed of only upon condition of actual settlement."

Which was lost. Mr. Blake then moved:

"That the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to amend the fourth clause by providing that the price of Dominion lands, sold without conditions of settlement, shall be payable in cash at the time of sale."

Which was lost. All these amendments were in the direction of the public interest. There was not one of them that did not contain a principle that ought to have been embodied in the Bill, without the necessity of any amendment being offered by the Opposition at all, and the passage of these amendments in the negative was in every case detrimental to the interest of the country. Then, following these challenges of the Government's land policy, we have other votes on record with regard to the same matter. On the 27th of March, 1882, the leader of the Opposition in the House challenged the policy of the Government with reference to the disposition of coal lands and pasture lands, by the following motion:—

"That the future of the vast Territories of the North-West is largely dependent on the supply of fuel at a moderate rate;

"That the present information as to the country and the coal areas is not sufficient to warrant Parliament in creating long-enduring interests in large quantities of coal areas;

"That the regulations as to coal lands laid on the Table make no provision for the application, as a general rule, of the just principle of public competition to the acquisition of those valuable lands, and thus leave open the door to disadvantageous cessions of the public domain for the benefit of individuals;

"That the said regulations make no adequate provisions to check the consolidation of large blocks of the coal lands in a few hands and the consequent restriction of competition and enhancement of the price of coal;

"That the said regulations make no adequate provision to secure any working of the coal mines by the lessee;

"That the said regulations provide, by arrangement, for 21-year leases, renewable, for the creation of interests of longer duration than prudence at this time would, as a general rule, lay down;

"That they make no proper provision for the settlement of the terms of renewal;

"That the said regulations do not become operative, if disapproved of by this House; and the House is responsible for their coming into operation;

"That this House disapproves of said regulations."

Which was lost on a division. Then Mr. Blake moved:

"That in the opinion of this House the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse, and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate considerations to favoured individuals;

"That it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits."

That liability to abuse was fully realised in the history of the granting of timber limits since the year 1882. We have still further an amendment moved to Bill No. 145, relating to public lands of the Dominion. In 1883, on the 2nd of May, Mr. Charlton then moved:

"That the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same by striking out all after the words 'Governor in Council' in line five, sub-section one, section twenty-four, and substituting the following: 'provided that all sales of agricultural lands shall, unless under exceptional circumstances, applicable to particular lots, be made on condition of actual settlement by the purchaser, and in quantities limited to the number of acres which can be reasonably occupied by one settler.'"

Now, the line of the Opposition as developed was, first, and that was the primary point in the principle they adopted, that the sale of lands in the North-West should be made to actual settlers only, subject to conditions of settlement. That was a salutary and just provision which would have effectually prevented the operations of speculative companies in that country, and in failing to adopt it the Government are largely responsible for the evil consequences that have followed in the settlement of the country and the dissatisfaction that has existed there. Then, the Opposition took ground distinctly in favor of the competitive principle with regard to the placing of coal lands, pasture leases and timber limits. The Opposition have always held that these being the property of the public, it was the duty of the Government to secure as large a return from them as possible. We held that the granting of pasture leases at one cent an acre, without inviting competition, that the granting of coal lands and of timber limits upon the terms on which the Government did grant them, without inviting competition, was detrimental to the interests of the people, and not consonant with the principles of just and honest government. What do we find with reference to timber licenses? We find that at the time the last return was made, over 25,000 square miles of timber limits had been granted by Order in Council, at a uniform rate, without reference to the value of the limits; and hon. gentlemen know that in many cases these limits, which were granted for \$5 per square mile, without inviting competition, were worth vastly more in many cases than the small amount received by the Government. It has been ascertained since that an hon. member of this House was interested in a limit for which \$50,000 was received by those interested, but which had been obtained from the Government for the sum of \$250. The whole system was rotten, and the Government failed to secure for the country the large revenue that would have been secured from the sale of timber lands, coal leases, or the leasing of pasture ranches. The only restriction imposed with regard to pasture ranches was, that no friend of the Government could have a lease of more than 50,000 acres. The leases should have been put up at auction, and the Government should have taken pains to secure for the property the price it was worth, and that public competition alone could determine. The system adopted of selling timber licenses at a uniform rate of \$5 per square mile when, perhaps, in the one case they might be worth a hundred times as much as in another, and of leasing pasture lands at one cent per acre, and of granting coal leases on the terms on which the Government granted them, has worked in the interests of the friends of the Government, but not in the interests of the people. We have had attempts made to justify the conduct of the Government; we have had feeble attempts made to show that the development of the North-West should be considered on the whole as satisfactory. I deny *in toto* that that is the case. I maintain, on the contrary, that the policy of the Government has been uniformly in the interest of the speculator and the moneyed man, and uniformly against the interest of the settler and the poor man. By the system of credit sales of unlimited areas at one dollar an acre, requiring but the payment of ten cents per acre down, the policy of the Government with regard to colonisation companies has enabled the latter to obtain large areas of land at but half the price which the settlers must pay, and by their system of leasing of pasture lands, timber lands and coal lands; by all these things they have militated against the

interest of the North-West. Then the Government have steadily persisted in charging prices to the population of the North-West much higher than those charged by the United States. They have steadily persisted in homestead regulations less liberal and less productive of settlement than those of the United States. They have seemed to be unaware of the fact that our public lands, as compared with those of the United States, are remote; they seem to be unaware of the fact that a settler going to the lands of Manitoba or the North-West would necessarily pass almost through, or very nearly by, a territory offering vast acres of public land at great inducements to settlers, and that, other things being equal, settlers would be more liable to take up land in Dakota than in our North-West. Yet, in face of the fact that in the Territory of Dakota public lands within the limits of the railway grants are sold at \$2.50, and outside of the railway grants at \$1.25 per acre, and that this land is more eligibly situated, being nearer the railways, nearer markets, where agricultural implements and other goods can be more readily and cheaply obtained, and offering attractions to the settler infinitely greater than those offered in our North-West,—as if those inducements were not enough, the Government, in order to shut out immigration more effectually, must place our lands at a figure higher than lands can be obtained in the United States, and their policy in this respect has been very effective, as shown by the immigration returns. Now, we have here a memorial from the North-West Assembly, and these men upon the spot, knowing the wants of the country, petition the Government in exactly the line the Opposition has advocated for nine years past. They ask the Government to make the price of pre-emptions within twenty miles of the railways at \$2 per acre, and outside of that at \$1 per acre. If the Government were to do that they would then be offering inducements to settlers somewhat better than those offered by the United States Government, and would have some show of securing that settlement we desire and which it is necessary we should have, and which we never can have with higher prices on our side besides the other disadvantages to settlers. What we want in the North-West is not that friends of the Government may make money out of timber limits, not that friends of the Government may acquire cattle ranches and coal mine licenses and timber licenses at low rates, but what we want is the entry of settlers who will bring that country under cultivation; and in order to secure settlers we have to consider their interests. That is what we have not yet done. The policy of the Government has been, practically, to leave out of view the interests of the settler in the North-West. Now I hold, without detaining the House much longer, that the true policy of this Government is to make the inducements for settlement in the North-West greater than those offered by the United States. Our policy is to offer our lands cheaper than the American Government offer theirs. Our policy is to give homestead regulations at least as attractive as those in the United States. In the United States, the homestead settler can take up public lands wherever he can find them. The checker-board system is not adopted there, that system which has created the isolation of one settler from another, and has made it difficult for the settlers to have schools, and roads, and other advantages. But the homestead settlers in the United States can take lands in bodies and in blocks wherever they can find them. The United States will grant lands to homestead settlers without restriction as to location, their policy being to get settlers to take up the lands and have the wilderness converted into a cultivated country. Let our Government adopt that policy in our North-West. If a homesteader wants a piece of land, let him take it where ever it can be found belonging to the Government. If he wants to buy land, sell him that land at a reasonable price, \$2 an acre within railway limits, and \$1 an acre out-



side. If the Government would adopt that policy, we would see a larger movement of settlers to the North-West than we have in the last nine years. We would not have in the next nine years the beggarly showing which we have for the last nine years, of an influx of 132,000 people to Manitoba and 40,000 to the North-West. I believe that we have not, by 25 per cent., as many native-born Canadians in the North-West as there are in the Territory of Dakota in the United States. The reason is that the settler in Dakota has had greater inducements held out to him, while the policy of this Government has been such as to repel him from our North-West. It is time that a change should be made, and I hope that the hon gentleman who now occupies the position of head of the great Department of the Interior, who has lived in the North-West and must necessarily know the wants of that country and the feelings of the settlers in that country, will administer the affairs of that department in a different spirit, in a spirit favorable to the settlers, and that, under his administration, we may secure for that great country the influx of a great body of settlers, and the development of its resources.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As this is a question which interests particularly those members who come from the North-West, I will ask permission to occupy a few minutes of the time of the House in regard to it. The range which has been opened before us is extremely wide, as the memorials of the North-West Assembly embrace a great many subjects, but these are all of great interest to the settlers in the North-West. The question of the Dominion lands, to which the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has referred, is one of great importance, because, of course, the settlers come in there with the intention of settling on the land, and making their living upon it as farmers. I do not think, however, that we can find very great fault with the land laws as they stand, or, at any rate, with the new regulations which I understand the Minister of the Interior is likely to introduce, in order that things be made so much easier and better for the settler so that it would be difficult to improve upon them. Of course, it is a matter of very great importance to have the land for the settlers as cheap as possible, but at the same time, we have to bear in mind that a great deal of money is being spent on the development of the North-West, and that country must bear to some extent, its share of the cost. The price of land at \$2 and \$2.50 an acre is not too high. If land is worth 20 cents an acre, it is certainly worth \$2, and I do not think any settler who has occupied what he considers a good location, when he has got his patent, would sacrifice it for such a small sum as \$2 an acre. In addition to this, the only thing the members from the North-West would urge upon the Government is this. As a rule, the people who come in there are not very rich. They have hard times before them for the first few years, and, if they are not able to pay for their land within the stipulated three years, they should be given a certain time within which to pay, and the interest should not be too high. For my part, I should like to see the interest thrown off altogether, but this cannot be done, because the sale of land, whether it is by the Government, or by individuals, is a business transaction, and must be carried on in a business manner. While on this land question, I must refer to the remarks made by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Davin), in regard to second homesteading. He referred to a discussion which took place in this House on that subject in 1887, and he urged that the granting of second homesteads should be extended for a longer period to settlers now in the North-West. I should be sorry to see this done. In 1887, when this matter was before the House, I took the same stand, and, when I returned to the district of Saskatchewan, I found that my conduct was endorsed by the people there. What we ought to consider is what is the proper spirit of the

Mr. CHARLTON.

Homestead Act. I understand it to be to encourage people to settle upon the lands who will become actual settlers and who mean to make their homes in the country, and to reside there with their families, but, if you give a homestead to one man and allow him to throw it up and to take another homestead in another place, you are creating a class of speculators. When this was before the House, I compared two of the prominent cities of the North-West, Winnipeg on the one hand and Prince Albert on the other—and I compared the country which surrounded those cities. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) smiles at the idea of comparing Winnipeg with Prince Albert, but I think that I compared the two cities which were most fit for comparison. If you go out from Winnipeg for many miles around, you will find a large proportion of the country unsettled. These lands were scriped by speculators, and the land remains unsettled, but, in the country surrounding Prince Albert, you will find that it is occupied by men who are making improvements on their farms, and I do not think there is any comparison at all between the country surrounding those two cities. I know that the people of Winnipeg have endeavored, to the best of their ability, to get the lands immediately surrounding the city into the market. Winnipeg has to depend now, to a great extent, on its wholesale business. The retail business is small, because there are so few people surrounding the city, and it is principally confined to those who live in the town. I believe that, if you wish to have prosperous towns, you must have the country settled close up to the town, so as to give a retail business first and a wholesale business afterwards. One of the memorials from the North-West Council, to which I desire to call special attention, is a memorial to the Dominion Government praying them to make such arrangements as to ensure the immediate construction of a railway to the settlements on the North Saskatchewan. I am in hearty sympathy and accord with that memorial. In the preamble they first state that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway had cut off the markets of those settlements, and that, in consequence of that, the people were unable to find means of getting rid of the produce which they raised. The consequence was that they were being brought into a most undesirable state of poverty. I do not want to enter into great details at this time on that subject, because I am happy to state that arrangements are being carried on by a certain railway company pointing towards the construction of the road to Prince Albert and Battleford, which I hope will be concluded next month, and which will give the needed railway communication. If those arrangements are not concluded at that time, I shall have a motion to lay before the House, and shall then have an opportunity to go further into details in regard to the subject. I will simply say now that I cannot urge too strongly on the Minister of Interior and his colleagues that there is a great necessity, in fact an immediate necessity, that the land grants for railways in that country should be located at once, if any work is to be carried out. It is absolutely necessary that those who invest their money in these undertakings should know exactly what security they have got, and it is impossible for them to tell what the security is worth until they know where these lands are, the lands being security for building the railways. Another question to which I wish to refer is that of granting scrip to the half-breeds of the North-West. This question has raised a great deal of discussion in the House before. The half-breeds in the North-West have petitioned to the North-West Assembly, and the North-West Assembly has petitioned the hon. gentlemen who form the Government of this country, that scrip should be granted to the children of all half-breeds who were born before March, 1885. They consider that they are justly entitled to it, because an arrangement was not made with the half-breeds in the North-West until 1885, when scrip was issued

to them. We know that the half-breeds in Manitoba were settled with in 1870, but the half-breeds in the North-West were not settled with until 1885; and, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) very wisely and very well pointed out, the half-breeds in the North-West were a different class, in a way, from the half-breeds in Manitoba, they were in the same position with regard to the half-breeds in Manitoba as the Blackfeet Indians would bear to the Cree Indians; consequently, when a settlement was made with the half-breeds in Manitoba, it did not follow that a settlement was made with the half-breeds in the North-West—in fact, it rather follows that a settlement was not made with them, as no steps were taken to settle their claims. I should like, therefore, to hear the hon. Minister express himself in a manner that will enable me to say to my half-breed friends in the North-West that they are likely to get scrip; because no settlement has been made with them, they had no word in making the treaty as to surrendering their rights; they accepted what was given them, but with this protest, they demanded that this scrip should be issued to all children who were born at the time of settlement. The next question I wish to come to is the liquor question. Ever since representation was granted to the people of the North-West in the local assembly, this has been a question of more or less interest. I was a member of that assembly some years ago, in the earlier days of representative government in the North-West, and memorials were forwarded to Ottawa every year on this question. I think it is only natural that this should be the case, when you consider the relative position of the people in the North West and the people in the rest of Canada. On this question there is an arbitrary Act which applies to the people of the North-West, and to them only, affecting their comforts and their every day life; and this arbitrary Act was passed by a Parliament in which the people to whom alone it applies had no voice. Consequently, I maintain that it became an unconstitutional Act as soon as representation was given to the North-West in this House. The hon. members who, with me, have represented the North-West in this House, for the last three Sessions, have always been directing attention to this matter, and the North-West Assembly has now placed itself on record with regard to it. What they demand is that either this question be submitted to a popular vote, so that the people themselves may decide it, or that the North-West Territories be placed in the same position as the older Provinces in respect to the license question, and the admission of liquor into the Territories. I, myself, would go even a little further, and say that there is a third alternative which, I think, would be better still, and that is, to refer the liquor question to the North-West Assembly, and give them power to deal with it. My reason is that I believe that the people of the North-West are sufficiently intelligent to know themselves a great deal better than anyone else what would be best for them in this respect. At the same time, if a license system is established in the North-West, it would be necessary, I presume, to follow the rule that applies to other Provinces, and to grant the fees, &c., collected for licenses within the Territory to the North-West Government; so, I think that, perhaps the fairest way of settling this question would be to give the North-West Assembly power to deal with the liquor question. While I am on this subject I would point out that there is a great difference between the way in which the liquor question stands in the older Provinces, and the way in which it stands in the North-West. In the older Provinces the people themselves have been allowed to say whether any restriction should be imposed; but when this restriction has been imposed under the Canada Temperance Act, although liquor is not allowed to be sold at the bars in those counties which are under the operation of that Act, still liquor can be manufactured in those counties, and exported from

them. In older Provinces you can manufacture liquor and you can export it, but in the North-West you are allowed by a permit from the Lieutenant Governor, to import it, but you are not allowed to manufacture it, and that is a very remarkable difference. Now, we who live in the North-West think that we ought to be allowed to manufacture the liquor that we are now allowed to import. We think that long ago we might have been allowed to manufacture the beer that was imported into the country, and I believe that if we had been allowed to manufacture beer and sell it, it would have been a very admirable thing, and probably would have prevented, in a great measure, the agitation that has now arisen throughout the North West for an alteration in the liquor laws. Now, I just want to return to the question of the land board. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia thought it would be better if the land board were transferred further west, and located at Regina. For my part, I think it would be a very admirable thing to have the land board in a central place in the Territory, but if we want to make it convenient to the people I am sure that the present location of the land board in Winnipeg is a great deal better, because at present Winnipeg is most accessible to the people in all parts of the Territory. People coming from the northern districts, such as Touchwood Hills, Prince Albert, Batoche, and along the line of the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, when they come from their homes and reach a railway, would have to go back to Regina. The usual tendency is to go east to do their business, but in that case they would have to go west to Regina, and then resume their journey again, retracing the distance they had already travelled. The land board is a great deal more accessible in Winnipeg, because it does away with this extra travel. I also wish to say a few words with reference to scrip being granted to the North-West Mounted Police. During last Session of Parliament this matter came up on a motion of my hon. friend for West Assiniboia, and it was promised at that time that this question should be reconsidered. I urged at that time, very strongly, that this scrip should be given to the police, because I believed they deserved it. They are, as everybody knows, a very fine body of men. They did their duty at the time of the rebellion, but before the rebellion occurred they did a greater duty than they did even then, for they did a great work for Canada. It is well known that before the Indian Department was organised throughout the North West, the mounted police were stationed at posts throughout that vast territory, and I believe the credit, in a great measure, is due to the police for having handled the Indians so well as to control the country without shedding a single drop of blood. This is a matter of very great importance, although notice has not often been called to it, and therefore it may appear to be a very small matter. I believe the mounted police, from the very first day they entered the country up to the present time, have done their duty thoroughly, and are as much entitled to scrip for services rendered during the rebellion as were the provisional corps sent up there from Kingston, Quebec, Toronto and other places which received scrip. They are all alike enrolled to serve the interests of the Dominion at large, and whether they serve in the North-West or in the older Provinces, still they are doing their duty by their country, and if rewards are going I think it is only a matter of justice that all the corps should be rewarded alike.

Mr. WATSON. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length on this occasion. We have listened with interest to the remarks of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the other members who have spoken to day. I have simply to say that I must back up, in a great measure, the sentiments of my hon. friend, the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with regard to the past policy of the Government in dealing with public

lands in the North-West. It has always been contended by me since I have had a seat in this House, that the lands of the Dominion should be administered in the interests of the Dominion at large. It is to be regretted that we have not a larger population in the North-West and Manitoba to-day, and I hold that the land regulations of the Government have had much to do with the lack of population there. The system pursued by the Government of granting large tracts to colonisation companies, and of making large reservations that were held exclusively for sale, has had a great deal to do with the sparse settlement that exists in the North-West to-day. I am pleased to be able to state that the land regulations of to-day are better than the regulations that prevailed a few years ago, and I was also glad to learn from the Minister of Interior, in an interview I had with him this morning, that some changes will be introduced during the present Session which will considerably improve the land regulations of the North-West. In regard to the price of land referred to by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), I entirely differ with him in regard to that matter. It is a bad policy to place the land at such prices that actual settlers cannot afford to buy them and enter into the actual work of farming. The price of \$250 per acre to the actual settler is too high for any man to pay for land in the North-West, to be devoted exclusively to farming purposes. As I have always contended, having some knowledge of the early settlement of that country, I hold that all the lands, odd and even sections, in the interest of Canada, should have been administered for the actual settlers instead of holding them for sale. I know that as regards a considerable portion of the country I represent, the land sales of 1880-81 proved a curse to the settlers. The odd sections were sold by public competition, and the average price realised was about \$2.60 per acre, the upset price being \$2.50 per acre. Speculators entered into a combination to pay as little as possible over the upset price, and the lands were sold at that figure. I know they have been held by the speculators who purchased them and who hold them to-day, and they are waiting in order to try and realise the amount they paid at that sale.

Mr. WILSON. They cannot do it.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman owns some of the land himself. He purchased it at \$2.60 per acre and has never had an opportunity of realising that price for it since. This has prevented settlement. In regard to land grants for railway companies, I believe it is necessary for the Government to give large tracts to encourage railway building, for the country can only be opened up by the construction of railways, and it is necessary to give a portion of the public domain for their assistance; but instead of giving land grants as in the past, I would suggest to the House and the Government that a different policy should be pursued, and that instead of giving alternate sections the Government should give alternate townships. This would be in the interest of settlement. Out of a township of thirty-six sections there are only sixteen sections available for homesteading; two sections belong to the Hudson's Bay Company, two sections are public school lands, and all the remaining odd sections are reserved for sale or for railway grants. That being the case, there are only sixteen sections in a township of six miles square that are available for homesteaders. I submit, from what knowledge I have in regard to settlement in that country, that it would be much better, in the interests of the settler and of settlement, to reserve for railway purposes, or for sale, alternate townships instead of alternate sections. I have stated that I had been informed that some amendments were to be introduced to improve the land regulations of the North-West, and I will reserve anything further I have

Mr. WATSON,

to say until those amendments are before the House, and until they have been acted on by the Minister of Interior. I must say, however, that I approve of the principle that has been adopted by the Minister of Interior in consulting the members for Manitoba and the North-West with respect to the regulations in force in that part of the country, and I am glad to know that some matters which I have brought before this House and the department for years are now being acted upon, particularly with respect to settlers being allowed to procure dead timber for fuel, and some other matters which I suppose will be explained by the Minister of Interior.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I speak under very unusual circumstances to-night. It is not often that we have such a beggarly array on the other side of the House. I do not know whether or not the announcement that I was about to address the House after recess is the occasion for my hon. friends of the opposite side of the House staying away.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are more pleasantly engaged elsewhere.

Mr. DALY. Be that as it may, I am glad to see that they have left the warhorse of Prince Edward Island here, and he will probably know how to take care of me. I regret, however, that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is not here, because I would not have spoken on this occasion had it not been that that hon. gentleman got on his feet and made some remarks which I did not think it right to pass without making some reference to, and correcting his statements. During the three Sessions that I have been in Parliament that hon. gentleman has taken occasion upon every opportunity to discuss the affairs of the North-West and Manitoba, and to make attacks upon the land laws in force there. He has reiterated here this afternoon what he stated last year and the year previous, and I learn from gentlemen who sat in this House before I did, that he repeated this afternoon what he stated during Sessions before this present Parliament opened. I do not see what is to be gained by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) standing in this House and continually reiterating and making statements which have been refuted, time and time again, from the floor of Parliament. I have had occasion during the past two years, as I have the occasion now, to refute the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and particularly the allegation which he made this afternoon that the land laws of the United States were far more liberal to the settlers than the land laws of Canada at present in operation in Manitoba and the North-West. I showed the hon. gentleman last year that this was not so. I proved to him the year previous that it was not the fact, and my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) did the same, but, notwithstanding that, he gets up and makes a general statement against the land laws without giving us any particulars to support it. If, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, the land laws of the United States are more liberal than the land laws of Canada, why does he not make some specific statement to bear out the allegations he makes? Are the land laws of the United States more liberal than the same laws of Canada? I say that they are not as liberal as our laws, and I will prove it. All that we require is that if a young man comes to Manitoba he should be 18 years of age, and that he should have not homesteaded previously. That young man goes to the land office, he says that he is eighteen years of age, that he had not homesteaded previously, and he is given his entry. He goes out to the land, performs six months duty in each year for three years,

and at the end of that time he gives notice to the nearest land agent that he wants to apply for his patent. He has not to travel thirty, or forty, or fifty miles, as the case may be, to the nearest land office, but on receipt of that notice, which he sends, an inspector is sent out, and that inspector takes the evidence of the settler and the evidence of his neighbors to show that he has fulfilled the conditions. The consequence is that within a very short time the report of the inspector is made, and the settler receives a notification from the land office to the effect that his land is recommended for patent. Now, Sir, if the settler in the North-West is a foreigner, we do not ask, when he goes to the land office, that he should become a subject of Her Majesty the Queen. We do not ask him to forswear allegiance from the country whence he came, but if a young man goes to a land office in the United States they require that he should be twenty-one years of age and in addition, if he is the subject of a foreign nation he is required to take the oath of allegiance to the President of the United States, and to forswear allegiance from the country from which he came, and particularly the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. As I have stated before, the young settler requires to put in three years homestead duty in our lands in Manitoba or the North-West Territories. But if a young man requires a homestead in Dakota or the Territories of the United States, he has to put in five years. We offer to settlers 160 acres of a homestead, and 160 acres pre-emption, but they have no such regulation in the United States. A man cannot pre-empt after he has homesteaded, and his pre-emption means that he has gone to the land office and sworn that he is 21 years of age, that he has put in six months' residence on that pre-emption, and then he buys it at \$2.50 an acre. The best way I can describe the matter, so far as this question of pre-empting lands in Dakota is concerned, is to read an extract from the very able pamphlet of W. A. Webster, which is now in the hands of most of the members of this House. At page 5, Mr. Webster says as follows:—

"The land laws here are greatly abused. To enter on land one must be a citizen 21 years old, and must reside on the land five years before he can get his patent; but the homesteader takes advantage of a clause in the Act, which allows him to commute, after six months' residence, by paying \$2.50 an acre, if, during these six months, he shall have built a habitable house and cultivated ten acres of land. Now, this is the practice: Four young men enter for the land at the land office. They go to the place where the four corners of their sections meet, and there build a sod cabin 12 feet square, as a joint house for all four. They dig four holes a few feet deep and call them wells; borrow a yoke of steers and plough a few furrows around the house, and call that forty acres; sleep a few nights in the cabin and 'prove up;' mortgage their homesteads to the speculators and get money to get their patents. If they have a few dollars left they look on that as clear gain, put them in their pockets, go off to some other county where they are not known and go through the same operation again and again, while the speculator gets the land and tries to sell it for \$10 an acre. One man told me that he had homesteaded nine times and was going to do so once more. The remains of those cabins are to be met with all over the prairie, without a sign of life about them. One of those deserted cabins, with a board nailed across the door, had a notice on it, of which the following is a verbatim copy:—

"Four miles from a nayber,  
 "Sixty miles from a post opis,  
 "Twenty miles from a ralerode,  
 "A Hundred and Atey from timber,  
 "250 feet from water. God bless our Home.  
 "We have gone east to spend the winter with my wife's relations."

Now, Sir, it is not necessary for me to quote further from this pamphlet. I have met men in Canada who have lived in Dakota, and I have met men who are coming across again from the States to Manitoba and the North-West, and they curse the day that ever they set foot on American soil. I heard the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), the other day, say that Canadians were returning from Dakota and Minnesota. There is no question about that fact, for they are making entries at our customs house every day. When the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated this afternoon, that our land laws were not as liberal

as the land laws of the United States, that gentleman must have known, from the reiterated statements of myself and other members of the North-West, who probably know more about these matters than he does, that he was stating what was not correct. I cannot understand why, Session after Session, he should make that statement, if it were not for the fact that he is more interested in peopling the American North-West, than he is in peopling the North-West of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that we have a very poor showing as regards the population in Manitoba and the North-West. He stated to the House this afternoon, that the population of Manitoba is 132,000. Now, Sir, according to the census of 1885, only three years ago, the population was 108,000. So we have increased 24,000 people in population in three years. I do not think that is a bad showing, and if the hon. gentleman will examine the ratio of increase according to the census returns of the United States, he will find that our percentage of increase is as large as the percentage of increase of any state in the Union. Now, as regards immigration, I do not think that the member for South Norfolk will say that the Government is pursuing a wrong policy, as I contend they are, in not voting a larger annual sum for immigration. I think the hon. gentleman holds the same ideas with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in effect that the Government should not be blamed for not making a larger appropriation for immigration. Let us consider where the population of Dakota and Minnesota come from. It comes from the people of the Eastern States as well as from foreign countries. Immigration from foreign countries has been flowing into Dakota and Minnesota for the last thirty or forty years. I contend that the best immigration agent for any country is a man who comes to our country and prospers and who goes back to the land from which he came and tells the friends amongst whom he lived in his early days, of his success. Give us the same length of time Dakota and Minnesota have had to populate, and I maintain that in Manitoba and the North-West we will have a larger population than they have to-day. I was told by an agent of the Local Government of Manitoba in Ontario, a month ago, that there were over 2,000 Manitobans in Quebec and Ontario. Those 2,000 men will do more to populate our country—and possibly to depopulate your older Provinces down here—than all the immigration pamphlets you could have printed. If we look at the Argentine Republic, which is seeking to increase its population, we will find that it is spending five million dollars this year on immigration. It is making every possible effort to take people there. What I maintain is, that if our Government gave us a more liberal immigration grant, our population would probably increase at a greater ratio. But, however that may be, I am perfectly satisfied that it is only a matter of time when our population will be just as great as that of Dakota and the other western territories of the United States. Any hon. gentleman from that country will tell you to-day that we have a contented, a happy and a prosperous people. When I tell you that the little town I come from, although scarcely seven years old, in 1887 shipped 8,000,000 pounds of freight, you will come to the conclusion that we have made great progress. We, last year, shipped 1,500,000 bushels of wheat. All that ought to be required of the members of this House, either those from our Province, or those from the other Provinces, is to have faith in our great North-West—to believe that it is only a matter of time when that country will be peopled; and if the people who are to come in should be of the same class as those there now, we shall have the fairest Province in this great Confederation. The hon. gentleman, by his remarks this afternoon, would give those who are imperfectly informed to understand that it is better for a man who wants to emigrate to go to Dakota, or some other part of the United States, than to go to

Manitoba, or our own North-West. That must be the natural conclusion to be drawn from his remarks, because he made the general statement that Dakota and Minnesota were more prosperous than the Canadian North-West, and that their land laws were more liberal. Let any American newspaper man or railway man take the speech of the hon gentleman, and he could obtain half a dozen emigrants with it. Now, what is the condition of the people of Dakota, as compared with the condition of our own people? Take the matter of taxation. Mr. Webster states in his pamphlet, among other things, at page 14:

"And I further affirm that there is no emigration from Manitoba to Dakota, for the above and other reasons; and, further, the near future of Dakota, financially, is not of the kind to inspire confidence in the mind of a thoughtful immigrant farmer. On the 1st of June, 1887, the farm mortgage debt of Dakota was \$45,000,000. That sum, if equally divided, would be a mortgage of \$400 on every family in Dakota. But all are not farmers; so much the worse for those that are. At the same date the average six mortgages on six sections of 160 acres was \$800, drawing an interest of 10 per cent. Add to this the county debts, averaging \$30,000, and the thoughtful farmer can see why taxes are high, and why it is hard to make wheat growing profitable in Dakota."

He says with regard to Manitoba:

"I know of no country in which municipal taxes are as low as in Manitoba. Nature made the roads, leaving only the bridges for the municipalities to build."

In this connection, I may say that our municipal taxes in Manitoba in the last few years have been very much reduced, and there are several municipalities in the county of Brandon that have balances in the bank. The city of Brandon, on the 1st of January, after providing for the interest on its coupons and for every other demand, had \$3,500 to its credit in the bank; the municipality of Elton had \$4,000; and the municipality of Cornwallis had \$1,500. The municipality of Oak Lake and the municipality of Blanchard, in the county of Marquette, had also large balances in the bank. If the municipalities are prosperous, I think that is good evidence that the people must be prosperous. Now, I say in answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that our land laws are far more liberal than those prevailing in Dakota and the western States; and it does not behoove him, or any other member of this House, to make the general statement he has made. Our land laws have not been all that we could have wished them to be; but if any hon. gentleman imagines that the land laws of the United States are perfect, all he has to do is to go to the library to find volume after volume of the decisions of the land officers at Washington, and to find that they have had more trouble with their land laws than we have had. There are certain matters that we would like to have changed, but we are glad to have as Minister of the Interior a gentleman who has spent eight or ten years of his life in the North-West, and is conversant with our wants and requirements; and as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) said this afternoon, from the interview that we had with the hon. Minister to-day, we are satisfied that he is desirous of giving the settlers of that country all that is required to make the land laws of this Parliament satisfactory to them. I do not wish to state anything of what occurred at that interview; but as the representative of one of the constituencies of Manitoba, I am well satisfied with what the hon. Minister promised. When the new land regulations are laid before the House, we shall have a full discussion of the question, and I will reserve any further remarks I have to make until that occasion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad indeed to hear the glowing accounts given by the hon. gentleman of the prosperity of the North-West. I am sure it is a matter of great satisfaction to us all to learn that the prospects of the country are so bright. We shall indeed be pleased to see a large influx of population into that country. I also listened with great interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He put

Mr. DALY.

the case of the settlers in very plain and pointed terms, and endeavored to show what changes were, in his opinion, necessary in the land regulations. I think it will not be denied that things occurred in that country which we have to regret, and that mistakes have been made in connection with the land regulations. It was a very unfortunate arrangement by which the Government permitted large sections of that country to be taken up by colonisation companies and withheld from actual settlers for years, so that many persons who went in there were prevented from settling where they wanted to. If the arrangements had been such that the actual settler could have gone in and taken up land wherever he wished to locate, I believe a larger population would be there than there is at present. These are matters that we have to deplore, and I earnestly hope, along with the gentlemen who have spoken, that the Minister now in charge of that department will make such changes as will give the actual settler greater advantages than he has enjoyed in that country hitherto. But while we are prepared to lend our hearty encouragement to every movement that will tend to fill that country with population and promote its development, that would tend to bring it up to the standard where I would like to see it, a great populous and wealthy country. There is another side of the question that has not been touched by any hon. gentleman opposite, the question of expense. I hold that in their arrangements the Government have expended enormous sums of money for the purpose of meeting the wishes of political friends and finding soft and easy resting places for those who were pressing upon them for lucrative positions. When we come to consider the condition of things as we find them by the Auditor General's Report, we have to deplore the fact that an enormous amount of money has been expended compared with the amount received in return. I find that we expended altogether last year, including the expenses of the Winnipeg board, and the expenses west of Winnipeg, as follows: Dominion lands, outside service, \$149,536.61. We expended on the Half breed Commission \$6,714.39, and we expended on the registrars, of whom we have seven, \$13,386.32. Now this is in all an expenditure for officials in the North-West, including the Land Board at Winnipeg, and all west of that, of \$169,637.32. Now, what were our receipts? Our entire income last year from the sales of lands, mainly coal lands, ranching grants, and all other sources was \$267,973.51, leaving a balance to our credit of \$98,336.18. That virtually means that for all the money received in the North-West, we have actually paid out 60 per cent. for hired service, agents, inspectors, travellers, and the like. I want to give a resume of the account, as it now stands, for the last year. As I stated before, we have expended \$149,534.61 under the head of Dominion lands account. That includes contingencies. Then we have expended in the Department of the Interior, inside service, salaries here at Ottawa, \$35,011.43; on surveys, \$136,009.02; salaries at Ottawa, Dominion lands, \$76,604.67; contingencies at Ottawa belonging to Department of Interior, \$22,137.02. In all we have expended in the Department of Interior, including the expenses in Ottawa, and the expenses in the North-West, and the surveys, \$420,744.76. Now, let us look at the receipts. We have received from Dominion lands and ranching leases, &c., \$217,688.01; from ordnance lands, \$36,239.88; from the registry office, \$7,212.02; fines and forfeitures, \$7,065.76; and other fines \$372.79; in all we have collected \$267,973.50. Deducting that from our expenditure, we are actually at a positive loss in the operation of the Department, including the surveys for last year, of \$166,172.22, but allowing that the surveys performed last year, which cost \$106,000, should be charged to capital account, we are actually at a loss of \$60,172.22, on last year's operations. Now, to give the House a little idea of the manner in which this condition of things is brought

about I will just give you the list of the different receipts and expenditures of the Dominion land agencies in the North-West :

	Receipts.	Expenditure.
Battleford.....	\$ 245 38	\$ 4,899 32
Birtle.....	9,088 14	2,402 16
Calgary.....	18,538 99	10,447 53
Coteau.....	1,277 95	1,651 58
Dufferin.....	12,368 60	2,456 40
Edmonton.....	8,603 58	6,270 88
Lethbridge.....	1,288 80	1,553 95
Little Saskatchewan.....	5,655 43	2,590 90
New Westminster.....	36,154 20	10,032 31
Prince Albert.....	4,389 90	7,219 48
Regina, Qu'Appelle.....	5,852 19	8,149 92
Rocky Mountains Park.....	2,951 58	1,203 01
Souris.....	14,574 56	5,675 96
Touchwood.....	403 65	536 11
Turtle Mountain.....	12,042 68	3,404 39
Winnipeg.....	59,204 74	85,206 34

In all the North-West, we collected during the last year for lands, ranching grants, coal dues, and for all purposes that come within the range of Dominion lands, \$192,640.43, and we actually expended for the services of registrars, inspectors, agents and others, \$153,740.24, leaving a net balance to our credit of \$38,900.15. I will give you a little idea of the expenses at Winnipeg. They are really surprising. To begin with, Mr. William Pearce, superintendent of mines, has a salary of \$3,200; Mr. H. H. Smith, commissioner, has a salary of \$5,000 a year; Mr. Rufus Stephenson, inspector of colorisation companies, gets \$3,000; and I venture to say that there are people in the Province of Ontario who will make a declaration before any judge or jury that Mr. Stephenson was not in the North-West altogether four months, and was in his comfortable home in Ontario at least eight months of the year for which he drew \$3,000 as inspector, and over \$3,000 for expenses. Then we come to Mr. D. J. Macdonnell. He is employed in the Land Office at Winnipeg, and gets \$3 a day. Mr. J. M. Gordon, inspector of agencies, receives \$2,000 a year. Mr. Dolbear receives \$3 a day. Mr. Burpé receives \$1,800 a year; and so it goes on. The total expense of the Land Board at Winnipeg is \$30,745.57. But we have seven agencies in the North-West, and to give an idea of the expenses of these agencies, I will read some of the items. Mr. E. T. Smith, the agent at Brandon, has a salary of \$1,200 a year. Mr. W. H. Hiam has a salary of \$1,200 a year. Mr. A. W. Reynolds, in the same agency, receives \$3 a day. Mr. C. D. Rickards has about the same salary, and there are a lot of other men. At Calgary, we have Mr. Amos Rowe receiving \$1,200. Mr. Meyer receiving over \$1,000 a year. Mr. Michael Harris the same, and Mr. McQuilken receiving about the same. In addition to that, there is Mr. T. A. McLean, registrar, receiving \$1,200 a year, and Mr. Rochester receiving \$3 a day, and many others. The sums paid in that agency run up in the same ratio. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can expect that the people will put up with the extravagance which exists in the North West. It appears to be filled up by officials who never did anything and, since they have been sent there, do nothing. At Prince Albert, I find that Mr. J. McTaggart, agent, receives \$1,200; Mr. Schmidt, clerk, is employed at \$3 a day; Mr. Sproat, registrar, receives \$1,200; and Mr. Waggoner, crown timber agent, receives the same amount. In addition to that, \$240 is paid to Mrs. E. W. Sproat for rent for the registry office, and there are a number of other officials who receive smaller salaries. At Regina, Mr. W. H. Stevenson, agent, receives \$1,200; A. J. Fraser, clerk, \$1,095. There is also there a Mr. P. M. Barker, instructor of registrars. This is a most peculiar thing. We have only seven registrars in the North-West, and, in order to give these men information as to how they should do their duty, we have to send up an instructor. I do not know for a certainty who this Mr. Barker is, but I think he once lived in Orangeville, and

I think he is related to the hon. member for Simcoe. If I am wrong, I can be corrected. However, Mr. Barker is there, and for instructing the registrars in these seven offices he receives \$1,600 a year and travelling expenses. I say it is an outrage on the people of this country to ask them to put up with this condition of things. The Government have inaugurated a most extravagant course in the North-West. The average salary paid at the different offices, leaving out Winnipeg, where the cost is over \$30,000 a year, is \$7,700 for each of the 16 agencies. I think it is time that a host of these unnecessary officers were discharged from the service, and that the Government should cut down the expenses within reasonable and decent limits. When we consider the glowing statements that were made in this House from year to year, as to what would likely be the result in the North-West, we cannot forget what Sir Charles Tupper stated we might expect. The Premier, when he was trying to induce the House to pass the vote of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, said he had made a careful calculation based on his extended experience and also on information received from other sources, and that he was in a position to assure the House that we might reasonably anticipate that by the year 1890 we would have gathered out of that country \$71,305,000. Instead of that, in 1889, we find that we are \$160,000 short of expenses. Then Sir Leonard Tilley in his Budget Speech delivered shortly before he left us, gave a very glowing account of what he looked forward to as the result of our enterprise in the North-West. He told us that he had carefully made out his figures, and he was a little more careful than the First Minister, but he said he believed that by the year 1891 we would have a net balance from the North-West of \$53,693,251. If it had not been for these statements, if it had not been for the assurance given by men of experience and possessing, as they did largely, the confidence of the people of the country, I say that the people would never at the last election have endorsed the course which hon. gentlemen took in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are perfectly willing to acknowledge that it was a necessity, that it was desirable that it should be built, but the course of extravagance which was followed in building it, and in the way in which money was dealt out in order to keep members of this House in line, was nothing short of a disgrace, and the people were deceived in regard to the prospect of the result of the building of that road. Instead of our getting seventy-one millions as we were promised in 1890, or fifty-three millions as we were promised in 1891, we find a large balance chargeable to that country for managing expenses alone, and we do not take into account the immense amount of money which was spent on the unfortunate war there, in which about \$8,000,000 were spent unnecessarily, because, if the proper steps had been taken, that war would not have occurred. We do not take into account the cost of the Mounted Police, the number of which was raised from 500 to 1,000. The expense of that force last year was \$860,000, and \$876,000 was expended for feeding Indians. Putting these sums with the amount on the debit side for the administration of the land office alone, we find that we are over \$2,000,000 short on the transactions of last year. When these men from Manitoba and the North-West are urging extended and liberal action towards that country, I think it behoves the people to cry a halt in the expenditures there. There are a number of useless officials in the North-West who are enjoying a good time at the expense of the country, and the sooner they are removed, and the staff cut down to the number required for the necessities of the service, the better for the people. When a short time ago the leader of the House, who is not at present in his seat, characterised it as being a "happy hunting ground for political hacks," he called it really what

it had been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is time we should put a stop to it. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen should feel ashamed that a man like Rufus Stephenson should be foisted upon this country, both he and his son, he himself drawing \$3,000 a year and travelling expenses, and a son in an office in Winnipeg drawing \$2,000; and I do not know how many more relations he has living upon the country, I believe that every relation he has will be provided for at the public expense if this Government continues much longer in power. Now, Sir, I say it is time that we called a halt; it is time the Government were in a position to announce to this House that they intend to stop the extravagance that exists in the North-West. We shall be glad to encourage them in the direction of securing an increase of settlement. We do not deny that it is absolutely necessary in the interest of this Dominion that the country should be settled. We will offer then every encouragement, we will say every word we can in its favor. I believe myself it is going to be a great country, I believe it is the best unsettled country on the continent of America to-day. But I am sorry to say that by the blunders of this Government, by the manner in which that country has been handled and operated in the interests of political friends, by the manner in which her resources have been squandered, timber limits, land grants, and one thing and another having been used for political purposes, to serve political ends, that country in the past has been cursed, and I hope that curse will now be removed, and that in the future every inducement possible will be held out to the people of the old world to come there and make comfortable homes for themselves, and that the restrictions that have weighed upon settlement there, and have driven people across the border, will be removed. I say, that so far as the older sections of the country is concerned, we cannot afford to go on and spend recklessly, in the way we have been doing, the money of the people of this country in a manner that is altogether unnecessary. I claim that it is quite unnecessary. I claim that no man who will go through that country, as I went through it, and see on every hand fellows in official position, fellows occupying easy quarters and drawing large salaries, but will come to the conclusion that that country has been cursed. I hope the Minister, now in charge will put in the pruning hook at once, and that whatever the evils of the past may have been in regard to officials there, these evils will now be put a stop to. Why, Sir, there are evils in other directions. I am sorry to say, that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is no exception, because I see that the organ of which undoubtedly he is chief—or used to be, and I suppose he is still—is getting \$5,000 a year for printing. It appears that every one who supports the Government thinks he must get some little picking, some little advantage for himself. Now, I say we have had enough of this thing, it has just gone far enough, in the interests of the people of this country, and I hope that the members of this House will stand shoulder to shoulder, and persistently sit upon this thing, and not permit it to exist any longer, cut off these unnecessary and extravagant officials, and come down to a common sense position. The course that we have been pursuing in the past in the North West, has been a curse to the country; we have cursed it by our land regulations; we have cursed it by our mining regulations, by our railway regulations and in other ways; now let us remove all the restrictions and give the people an opportunity to rise, let us take off the unnecessary burden put upon them in the way of officials that are now roaming around that country, and cut down the expenditure to what is actually necessary. Then I believe that the country will prosper and will go on prospering. But I believe if you do not do that, if you allow this horde of officials and these monopolies to continue to exist as they have in the past, the same curse will con-

Mr. McMULLEN.

tinue to rest upon that country. Now, I consider it my duty, in the interest of the constituency I represent, and the Province from which I come, to make these remarks. I do not offer any objection to one word that has been said by the representatives of that country; I give them credit for advocating the cause of their country; they would not be doing their duty if they did not advocate it, but I also hold that it is our duty to keep control of these things. We, in the older Provinces, have an interest in that country, because we have to help to bear the burden, we have got to pay the taxes, we have to contribute towards the enormous sums that will annually fall upon the shoulders of the people of this country to meet the annual expense and the enormously increased interest on our public debt, to pay for the improvements that have been made up there; and I say it is our duty to raise our voice in the interests of the people and to declare that we object to see the taxes increased from year to year, that we object to see imposed upon them new burdens which cannot be rolled away for many years to come. I hope the course of this House will show the Minister of Interior that we desire him to put in the pruning hook, and let us begin at once to do what we ought to have done long ago.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). In speaking upon these resolutions passed by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West last November, and that have been laid upon the Table by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I wish to say he has echoed my sentiments exactly. In the first part of his speech he also gave us a glowing description of the agricultural capacity of the North-West. There was one industry, however, which he did not speak of, and that is the ranching industry. We have in the district of Alberta, as you all know, a large expanse of open prairies, where we can graze cattle the year round. We have in the northern portion of the territory some of the finest, if not the very finest, farming land that lies out of doors. All we require is a railway in the North Saskatchewan country in order to develop that immense wheat country. Speaking of the ranching country, I may say that in the southern portion of Alberta you will see herds of cattle which have been put into that country during the last five years. There are at present, I suppose, about 130,000 horned cattle in the district of Alberta. The first year we had to import cattle, but last year I suppose the district of Alberta exported 5,000 head of steers, and probably as many more were consumed for home consumption, making 10,000 head of steers, while, five years ago, we had to import all the beef that was used in the country from the United States. Now these 10,000 head of steers, at \$40 a piece—which they would bring at least, while many of them brought \$50—would make \$400,000 for that new industry that has been established in the North-West. Then we have another industry that has just been established in that country, and that is the raising of horses. We have at present, I presume, at least 20,000 in the district of Alberta, and I wish to remind the Minister of Agriculture that in his quarantine list he has left out horses. I see he has discriminated against all other animals except horses, I wish he would include horses on the list in his quarantine regulations. They are raising a great many horses in the vast country to the south of us, and we know at the present time there is some disease amongst horses on the south side of the line; therefore I think the Minister ought to put horses on the list, but I would not advise him to give as many days as he does in the case of cattle. Then within the last few years in the district of Alberta there have been large tracts of land held by speculators from the east who never intended to put stock on them. The present Minister of Interior, since he assumed office, has thrown open at least 1,500,000 acres which, otherwise, would not have been opened to settlers, and this has

brought a great many people to our section of the country with a view to settling there, while previously no one thought of going there as it was considered that if the land was leased a man could not settle on it. This action of the Government has removed all cause of complaint in that direction. There is now sufficient land of the very finest class thrown open to which settlers can go and have the advantage of being near towns where they can carry on mixed farming and enjoy the best advantages. The first resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly reads as follows:—

“That this Assembly regards the question as of first importance and urges the Dominion Government to take immediate action in giving an outlet by railway to the pioneer settlements of the North Saskatchewan.”

Edmonton, Prince Albert and St. Albert are old settlements, I suppose Fort Edmonton was established 100 years ago, and all that these towns and the outlying country require is railway communication to make them, as I have said, the Garden of Eden. The next resolution is with respect to the half-breeds resident in the electoral districts bordering on the North Saskatchewan. The North Saskatchewan runs both through my district, that of Alberta, and the Saskatchewan district. There are a great many half-breeds who live on the border of the Saskatchewan River, having settled there in old days. The resolution to which I refer reads as follows:—

“Whereas it has been represented to this Assembly by some of its members that among the half-breeds resident in the electoral districts bordering on the Saskatchewan, who preferred claims for losses during the rebellion of 1885 before the Commissioners on such claims, and whose claims have been rejected, some, who were known to have been loyal, had their claims rejected, while others who were known to have been directly implicated in the uprising have had their claims allowed. That such apparent discrimination has given rise to a wide spread feeling among the half-breeds referred to that those who remained loyal have not received the justice intended by the Government at the hands of the Commissioners. Be it resolved, &c.”

I think that a commission should be appointed, as the resolution sets forth, consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories, so that all claims may be wiped out, and not be brought before Parliament year after year. The next resolution upon which I will touch was passed on the 23rd of last November, and it sets forth:

“That in the opinion of that Assembly a vote of the Territories on the question of license *versus* prohibition should immediately be taken.”

This is one of the most burning questions of the North-West. The people should be allowed to decide whether they would have free whiskey or high license, or have the liquor as in the Eastern Provinces. Liquor is now brought into the country, and the Government derive no revenue from it. I have no doubt, if a vote of the people were taken to-morrow, every man in the business of selling liquor would vote against free whiskey and with the temperance party, simply because to do otherwise would be to destroy his means of livelihood. There are in Calgary to-day not less than 25 saloons selling liquor. Neither the town of Calgary nor the Dominion Government derive any revenue from that sale. It will be asked, where does the liquor come from? It comes from British Columbia, Manitoba and Montana. Under these circumstances, it would be better if the people of the North-West were allowed to have a vote on this subject, or at least be placed on the same footing as the people in other portions of the Dominion, so that they could pass the Scott Act or not as they desired. It is certain that you can never prohibit the sale of liquor in the North-West as long as it is manufactured. I hope, therefore, that the Government will take this resolution more especially under their consideration, and will endeavor to deal with it in such a way that we can have this question settled either by the vote of the people or by the Dominion Parliament. The next resolution takes up the question of immigration. I think the Government should without doubt grant more

liberal aid to immigration to the North-West than they have given hitherto. There should be immense quantities of pamphlets circulated through all portions of Europe, the United States and even Eastern Canada. I venture to say that the United States Government have sent out ten car loads of immigration pamphlets to one sent by the Dominion Government, and the reason why their country has been settled is because it has been advertised. With regard to placing agents in Great Britain and the United States, I fully agree with the resolution and the remarks of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is asked that the sum of \$15,000 be placed at the disposal of the Territories, and this would be a mere drop in the bucket as compared with other expenses that are going on, and it would benefit the country tenfold. The next resolution deals with the subject of the settlers being allowed to use dry wood for fuel. That, I believe, has been already arranged, and I have simply to say that the people of the North West should be allowed to burn up the dry wood that is going to waste without paying revenue to the Dominion. There is another question I wish to urge upon the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that is the appointment of a hide inspector at McLeod and Calgary. At the present time when so many cattle are being shipped out of the country, it has become very important that all the hides should be inspected before the cattle leave the country. Even if a man kills meat on the prairie he should be compelled to bring in the hides, so that it would be known whether he had killed his own animals or those of his neighbors. The cost would be but very light and it could easily be paid out of the revenue, by simply putting a fee upon our hide inspector. In this same resolution the Assembly recommends as follows:—

“As under the Half-breed Commission of the 20th March, 1885, the Indian title, in as far as half-breeds are concerned, only extends to those born prior to 15th July, 1870, and as a number have been born to parents coming under the said Commission of 1885, who in the opinion of this Assembly have equal rights to those already dealt with: This Assembly would draw the attention of the Dominion Government to the fact and urge that steps be taken to finally end all half-breed claims.”

We all know that there are quite a number of half-breeds in the North-West Territories who when this treaty was made with them in 1870 were in Manitoba, but before they were settled with they moved to the North-West. Those people were not settled with until 1885 and then only those who were included in the Treaty of 1870 had their claims met by the Government, leaving the children born between 1870 and 1885 out of the treaty. There is no reason in the world why those children should not receive the same benefits as the other so long as their title is not extinguished. If the Government had paid everyone of them in 1870 there would probably have been no rebellion in 1885. I would strongly recommend to the Government that this matter should be attended to at once and that the claims of those excluded from the treaties should be considered in the same way as the claims of the others, viz., by a commission of the judges of the North-West Territories. The Assembly also recommends:

“That the Dominion Government be asked to grant scrip to all those acting during the North-West Rebellion as scouts under the Police Act.”

They also recommend that the North-West Mounted Police, who rendered valuable services during the rebellion, should be rewarded. I think that this is a very fair request to make to the Government. There is not the slightest doubt that any one who acted as a scout during the rebellion, as well as the members of the North-West Mounted Police force should receive the same compensation as others. They are certainly better entitled to recognition at the hands of the Government than many of those who received it. I cannot see why the scouts and the Mounted Police should not be treated the same as the militia and volunteer forces. They did as good work as any of the others, and they should



receive the same reward. They have been precluded from even the small recompense of receiving medals, with the exception of just a few who were in actual combat. I know that some of the home guards who never left their homes at all were presented with medals, but the police and the scouts who took an active part were left out in the cold. Whether the police were in action or not, I hold that every man of them who was in the field should at least receive a medal. Those medals would not cost much; I suppose not more than \$1.25 each, and that amount would never be felt by the Dominion of Canada. Another resolution of the Assembly says:

"We, your committee, find that several trails are made use of for carrying Her Majesty's mails, as well as being the main highways leading from one settlement to another. We find that certain streams, rivers and sloughs on those trails form strong impediments, not only to settlement, but interfere, to a great extent, in the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails, besides causing an increased expenditure of that very important item.

"The condition of some of those trails, at certain seasons of the year, has proven to be dangerous to life and property, and communication between the different settlements made most difficult and supplies not only rendered much dearer, but, in fact, almost impossible to obtain.

"Such a condition of affairs is a most important element in retarding settlement and the proper development of the Territories, and as the funds at the disposal of the Territorial Government are insufficient to make the necessary improvements, and we consider the Dominion Government especially interested in those trails, we would, therefore, urge that the Dominion Government appropriate a special sum to be expended on the following trails, viz.:—

"From Macleod to Calgary.

"From Calgary to Edmonton and Athabasca Landing.

"From Swift Current to Battleford.

"From Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert."

I call particular attention to the necessity for improving the trail between Macleod and Calgary. There are four rivers on that trail which during at least four months in the year are almost impossible to cross, and only one, at Elbow River, is bridged at the present time. I would urge on the members of the Cabinet, and especially on the Minister of Public Works, to see that an appropriation is put in the Estimates for the bridging of these streams. The work is most important to the people of that district, and it should not be neglected. The same remarks apply to the trail from Calgary to Edmonton, and the trail from Lethbridge to Macleod. This latter trail is only a short distance of thirty miles, and we have two of the largest rivers of the North-West to cross on it, which at all seasons of the year are unfordable. In the spring when the ice is soft and coming down, it is almost impossible to get across this river in any way. Not only are those rivers dangerous to property, but scarcely a spring passes that there are not lives lost there. Permit me to make some comments on the statements of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) with regard to colonisation companies in the North-West, for I have some experience up there, and I know something about the condition of things in the Territories. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the two colonisation companies in the district of Alberta have been a great benefit to the country, instead, as he would try to make out, an injury and a disadvantage. There are only two companies in operation at the present time in the North West, as the lands held by the others have been thrown open, but I can say that these two companies have been a boon to that section of the country. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the expenses incurred in connection with the administration of affairs in the North-West and it is a subject which he has been constantly growling about in this House. It has got to be a chestnut with the hon. member and I have heard him singing the same old song for the last three years. If we ask for the expenditure of public money up there it is because we need it to develop our great country, and whatever is expended on us now is in a sense only borrowed money, for in a few years we will be able to pay it back to the Dominion Treasury one hundred fold. The hon. member has

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta).

spoken of the high salaries paid to Dominion land agents. They get the small sum of \$1,200 a year each and when a man has to board himself out of that in the Territories it cannot be considered in any sense a high salary. Why, we have to pay a cowboy \$600 a year and board him into the bargain, and if he is a first class man we have to pay him \$1,800 a year and board him too. Talk about \$1,200 a year to a Dominion land agent who must be an educated and intelligent man, who knows the country, when we have to pay sometimes nearly double that to a good cowboy. I should say that the Government ought raise the salaries of the land agents to \$1,500 a year and then it would look more like decent pay. The hon. gentleman has also spoken of the office expenses of those registry offices. What does he want to do with them? Does he want to close them all up and let them take care of themselves? I suppose that would be his remedy and that would be his policy to bring population and settlers into the North-West Territories. There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite who are constantly complaining in this House about the expense of feeding the Indians. I have lived a good while in the North-West and I know more about the Indians than some of the hon. gentlemen who pretend to dictate to us the way in which we should treat them. Let me tell those members that they will find it a great deal cheaper to feed the small number of Indians that we are feeding at the present time than to have constantly a row on our hands. It is a good deal easier to feed the Indians than to fight them, a fact which they have learned in the United States, and of which they have bitter experience. I shall not take up the time of this House further on this question. There are other matters effecting the interests of the North-West which will be brought to the attention of Parliament and the members interested in that district will probably have an opportunity of referring to them again.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House with any lengthened remarks on this subject to-night, because I think several opportunities will be afforded before the close of the Session for dealing with almost every subject touched on by hon. gentlemen to-day. I think, by this time the House will have found out that there is more than one "funnel" through which we can obtain very valuable and interesting information, with regard to North-West matters. I am sure, we feel very much indebted to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for bringing up these questions, and not only making hon. gentlemen acquainted with the resolutions passed by the Legislative Assembly last autumn, but affording an opportunity for an expression of views by hon. gentlemen who are interested in our western country, and giving myself and the Government an opportunity for giving a greater and more intelligent consideration to the several matters included in his resolution. The hon. gentleman went over these resolutions *seriatim*; but I do not think an extended reply will be expected from me, because hon. gentlemen are aware, that all these memorials are now under the consideration of the Government, and the Government's reply to them, will in a very short time be forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor for the information of his Legislative Assembly. The hon. gentleman was kind enough, in connection with the resolution which he considered of great importance, the prohibition resolution, to say, that he sympathised with me during the years that the permit system was placed under my control. All I can say in reference to that is that I did not find the duty a very pleasant one, and I sympathise with my successor who is now in my shoes in dealing with it. I shall only be too glad to see some change made in that respect. As I said to my constituents last autumn when addressing them, I do not care much what

change may be made, because I think no change can be made that will not be an improvement on the present system. During the seven years that I occupied the position of Lieutenant Governor, I carried out the duties connected with that disagreeable portion of my office to the best of my ability; and in looking back over those years, I do not consider that if I had to perform those duties over again, I could perform them with greater justice or conscientiousness than I did. In regard to another important matter which has been referred to by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), namely, the appeal made on behalf of the half-breeds, I may say that the Government are giving very serious attention to that matter, and I am sure that they feel inclined to do all they possibly can to carry out the views expressed by my hon. friends from the North West. With regard to the appeals also made on behalf of the scouts and the Mounted Police who were engaged during the rebellion, for scrip, that is a matter which it appears to me should receive the favorable consideration of the Government, and I shall exercise what little influence I have to bring about the wishes of my hon. friend. With regards to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I may say that I do not agree with him in the views he has expressed with regard to our land laws. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) spoke very freely on that subject, when I think my hon. friend from Norfolk was not in the House, stating that on several occasions he has differed from the hon. gentleman on the subject of our land laws as compared with those of the United States. He, as well as some other hon. members, consider our land laws as liberal if not more liberal than those of the United States. However, I am not as well acquainted with those laws as the hon. gentleman opposite; but it does appear to me very singular that hon. gentlemen should differ so much in that respect. One feature of the United States land regulations may be more liberal than ours, for while within the railway belt, some 50 to 80 miles on each side of the railway, what is known as the chequer-board system is adopted, outside this belt a settler can homestead on every quarter-section. That may be better than our policy, and I do not see how our policy can be improved except as suggested by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) by giving land grants to railways in alternate townships instead of in alternate sections. I agree with him in that entirely, and I may say that the Government in dealing with any application made to them are acting upon that view, and in future when any land grants are given, they will be given in that way. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and several other members have diverged a good deal from what I expected would be the line of the debate. That hon. gentleman came loaded with figures which I was not quite able to follow, and which I am not able at present to controvert. I may say that I was also loaded up with figures, but unfortunately I have left my gun behind me. But I differ from the hon. gentleman in the conclusions he has arrived at, and I hope to take some other opportunity of giving a comparison as to the cost of management of the North-West under the present Government with the cost during the years the hon. gentleman's friends were in power. I can show him that our management has been infinitely more economical than theirs. Now the hon. member for South Norfolk stated that he thought that our policy had been wrong in not putting up to competition coal lands, pasture lands and timber lands. Well, we have a very large coal area, and I am not aware that there is any great demand or rush for those coal lands, and I do not think that if they were put up at auction we would derive more benefit from them than we do now. It requires very large capital to enter into the coal mining enterprise, and for that reason there is not a very great demand in that direction. Our coal area is of immense extent, and the coal is a very

valuable commodity, which should be carefully handled and protected, and in whatever we do our great aim should be to have it worked as economically as possible, and get it into the hands of the settlers at as cheap a rate as possible. I intend to take measures similar to those taken in the United States in order to prevent any monopoly of our coal deposits, and will bring in an amendment to this effect when dealing with our Lands Act. With regard to our rancho lands, I do not think, if they were put up at auction, we should derive any more financial benefit from them than we do. The policy, when leases were first established, was to induce ranchmen to bring capital into the country in order to start the cattle industry there. The price we have obtained for those leases has not been extravagant, but a great many of those who have leases are not paying their rent, and I do not think they intend paying it, as they do not consider the privileges they derive from their leases sufficient to induce them to pay their rent. I do not think if we were to put those ranches up at auction that we would get any greater benefit from them than we do. As regards timber limits, no doubt the hon. gentleman knows that for some years past they have been put up at competition. With regard to the land law generally, in which of late I have taken special interest, I feel very much in the same way as do my colleagues in the North-West. I am as anxious as they are that we should do all we can in the interest of the settlers. In all new countries, whether mining or agricultural, the early pioneer is the one who has to face the greatest difficulties, and the one we ought to protect and assist as much as possible. I was glad to hear from the hon. member from Marquette and others that the interview we had this morning in regard to matters generally in the North-West was satisfactory, and that some conclusions I had arrived at were satisfactory to those hon. gentlemen. I shall be always willing at any time to receive their suggestions and do my share in bringing about any changes which will be in the interests of the settlers. It is hardly the time for me to answer the hon. member from North Wellington. I may say that my impression is that the officials are not overpaid, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that I had this morning an appeal from the members of the west who waited upon me, and who certainly know what they are talking about, to increase the salaries of certain officials in the North-West Territories. I do not think I need detain the House longer except to thank my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) for bringing this matter up, and giving me an opportunity of hearing the different views of hon. gentlemen, which will be of great assistance to the Government in coming to a conclusion on the subject under discussion.

Motion agreed to.

#### TRADE COMBINATIONS.

On the Order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 11) for the prevention and suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government proposes to take next Thursday as Government day, and I would like to have the assurance of the hon. gentleman that opportunity will be given me to bring the Bill before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no hesitation in saying that an opportunity will be given to have the Bill read the second time.

Motion allowed to stand.

## PROTECTION TO LABORERS.

On the Order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 53) for the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. Purcell.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow that Order to stand, as the Bill has only been distributed to-day.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to bring the Bill down again.

Motion allowed to stand.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK presented report of the Select Committee on Bill (No. 2) to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was a member of that committee and failed to get the notice to attend. The hon. member for North Essex was also a member of the committee and was absent, and I regret that the committee has taken action in the matter in the absence of two members most directly interested.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sorry that the hon. members referred to were absent, but I presumed the notices were sent to them as well as to the others. The committee were unanimous in the report they made, and it did not occur to us that we should postpone the proceedings of the committee to find out whether the hon. gentleman intended to attend or to take any further interest in the matter. I can only say that there was a full quorum. There were ten members of the committee present, and they were unanimous in the report made.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be as well, as the Bill is materially changed from the original Bill, to have it reprinted for circulation among the members.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I received notice to attend, and there was a large number present, who were unanimous in their finding.

Mr. CHARLTON. I received notice after the committee had met, and I went to the room at eleven o'clock, but the committee had adjourned.

## P. E. I.—WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. LANDRY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island and Continental Railway and Ferry Company. He said: I would ask leave to call the attention of the Government and of this House to the importance of this Bill. I shall not make any extended remarks at this stage, because on the second reading I shall have an opportunity of speaking at greater length.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

I wish simply to point out now that we hope, if this Bill becomes law and this company is organised, that, in the carrying out of the intentions of this Act, the contract between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the Dominion as to winter communication will be more effectually carried out than it has been in the past. From that point of view, I think it is a Bill of very great importance, and I therefore wish to ask the attention especially of the Government, as well as of other members, to the measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## ESTREATED RECOGNISANCES BILL.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) to amend chapter 179 of the Revised Statutes. He said: Under the Indictable Offences Act, and the Summary Convictions Act, provision is made in a number of sections to enable the magistrate before whom an accused person is brought, or a person who gives evidence, to take recognisances for the appearance of the accused afterwards, or that the person will prosecute, or that the witness will attend, or for his reappearance on an adjournment, or for the appearance of a person who has been seized on a distress warrant, but it is not provided what the magistrate is to do with the recognisance when he takes it. Two or three years ago, an Act was passed in regard to the manner in which recognisances were to be estreated, but there is no provision in the existing law, by which these recognisances should be forwarded to the Superior Courts, in order that they may be enforced. It is to fill up that hiatus in the law that I have introduced this Bill, and I trust the Minister of Justice will examine into it, and, if he finds, as I am sure he will find, that I am right, that there is a very great omission in the existing law, the consequences of which are that prisoners go unwhipped of justice, he will take the Bill under his wing and will give it Government support, so as to allow it to get through this Session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## COMMERCIAL UNION WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to place before the House a matter of information which will be of very great interest, I presume, to every member of the House and to the Government. A telegram has to-day been received from Washington, which reads:

"House of Representatives this morning passed my resolution to promote Commercial Union with Canada. Nearly unanimous vote.

"ROBERT R. HITT."

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very bad hit.

## JESUITS' ESTATES BILL.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to give notice that, on the first convenient occasion I will move a resolution on the subject of the disallowance of the Act respecting the Jesuits' Estates passed in the Province of Quebec. I would have moved in this matter at an earlier period of the Session, were it not that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) had taken up this question, but, after a delay of two weeks, I find he has put a notice on the paper, which, from its position, can hardly be reached during the present Session, or, at any rate, until so late as to prevent a proper discussion of the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. When members desire to bring up matters before the Orders of the Day are called, they should do so before those Orders are called, and should not interrupt other members after the Orders are called.

## SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply."

And the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

"In view of the rejection by the Senate of the United States of the Washington Treaty of 1888, and the unfortunate and regrettable differences existing between Canada and the United States on the fishery and trade questions, this House is of the opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada for the satisfactory adjustment of such differences, and the securing of unrestricted freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that in any negotiations entered upon for such purposes, Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government.

"That in the meantime and to permit of such negotiations being favorably entered on, and to afford evidence of the anxious desire of Canada to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, this House is of opinion that the *modus vivendi* proposed on behalf of the British Government to the Government of the United States with respect to the fisheries should be continued in operation during the ensuing fishing season."

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I rise to continue the debate on the resolutions moved by my hon. and esteemed friend, the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), a few days ago. The resolution which was offered to the House contained three propositions of a very important character to the people of this country, which open up three important living subjects before the people, and which, in my opinion, before many years have passed, will have to be decided on the lines which are proposed by the great Liberal party. The first is the fishery dispute. It is a question which has engaged the attention of both parties for a great many years, but more particularly since the abrogation of the Washington Treaty, and it has created a good deal of annoyance, irritation and misunderstanding between the two countries—a condition of matters which is not pleasing to either of those countries—and it behooves us, not as a party or as a Government, but as the people of this country, to endeavor to settle this question on equitable lines. What is the difference between the contention of Canada and the contention of the United States? I understand that the principal difference has regard to the interpretation of that clause of the treaty which indicates, by its verbal construction, that the Americans have no right to come into our ports, except for four purposes—to secure water, to secure wood, for repairs, and for shelter. Now, Sir, it has been contended by the Government of Canada that this is the construction which we should put upon that clause of the treaty. I do not impute to the Government of this country any fault in vindicating what they suppose to be the rights and dignity of Canada, but I do believe that the construction placed upon the treaty is of too narrow a character, it is too much of a verbal character; and I do not believe that it will be borne out by the British Government, who is responsible for the settlement of this matter. The United States contend that we put too narrow and too illiberal a construction upon that clause; and contend that they have the right to come in as well to buy provisions and other necessaries during the fishing season, and to tranship their fish in bond across Canadian territory. Now, Sir, who has the settlement of this question? It is well known to every person in this House that this question must be settled by the British Government; it is in Great Britain that the treaty-making power is vested and not in Canada. We know, from expressions used by the Colonial Secretary of that Government, in 1871, in reference to this very matter under dispute, that the English Government is not favorable to the contention or to the interpretation put upon it by the Canadian Government. Allow me to read to this House the opinion of the British Government as expressed by Lord Kimberly, who

was then Colonial Secretary, in a letter written by him to the Governor General of Canada, for the information of the Government of Canada, upon the interpretation of that clause. In February, 1871, Lord Kimberly wrote as follows:—

"The exclusion of American fishermen from resorting to Canadian ports, except for the purpose of shelter, and of repairing damages therein, to purchasing wood and of obtaining water, might be warranted by the letter of the Treaty of 1818, and by the terms of the Imperial Act 59 George III, chapter 38, but Her Majesty's Government feel bound to state that it seems to them an extreme measure, inconsistent with the general policy of the Empire, and they are disposed to concede this point to the United States Government under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent smuggling, and to guard against any substantial invasions of the exclusive rights of fishing which may be reserved to British subjects."

Now, Sir, that is the opinion of the British Government upon the very point that is in dispute between Canada and the United States; and as the British Government will have to decide this matter, they certainly will not go back upon the opinion they expressed in 1871 through her Colonial Secretary, and, so far as I have read or have been enabled to gather, the British Government have expressed no other opinion. Now let me further quote from another letter sent by Lord Kimberly to the Governor General of Canada during the same year:

"I think it right, however, to add that the responsibility of determining what is the true construction of a treaty made by Her Majesty with any foreign power, must remain in Her Majesty's Government, and that the degree to which this country would make itself a party to the stricter enforcements of the treaty rights, may depend not only upon the literal construction of the treaty, but on the moderation and reasonableness with which those rights are asserted."

You will see that the opinion expressed by the British Government in 1871 was that they had the power of deciding this question, and that if circumstances arose in which Great Britain was called upon to decide it, she would certainly decide it in the favor of the contention of the United States—that is, she would decide it upon broad principles of equity between two great nations. Therefore, I am of opinion that if this matter is brought before the British Government for solution, they would never hold the contention of the Canadian Government, since they have already placed upon record the opinion that I have cited; and surely the British Government would never think of going to war for the purpose of assisting Canada in upholding a contention in which the British Government did not believe. The British Government also says that the Canadian contention it is not only extreme, but it is contrary to the Imperial policy; therefore if they assisted Canada in carrying out that contention, they would be opposing what in their opinion is contrary to Imperial policy. Therefore, I am of opinion that the Government of this country should meet the United States upon honorable and dignified ground, and propose something that would lead us out of this difficulty before we are compelled to back down, after having involved our country still further in irritations and annoyances so unpleasant and dangerous. But there are other considerations to be borne in mind. Supposing that Canada conceded what is set forth in the Colonial Secretary's letter, who would be the loser? There are two sides to this question. Suppose Canada allowed United States fishermen to come into our ports for the purpose of purchasing provisions, bait, nets, &c., necessary to fishermen, certainly that would be an advantage to the American fishermen as it would bring their basis of operations much nearer their employment. That is one side. Now, look at the other side, and ascertain whether our own people would not be largely benefited also. If these fishermen were allowed to come into Canadian ports for the purpose of purchasing those necessary articles—such as seines, tackling, ropes, nets, bait, provisions and other things—they would become customers to the people of the Eastern Provinces, and would assist our own people by affording them a mar-

ket for those articles in the production of which they are engaged. In this way they would be largely benefited. Then, again, there are a large number of men in Nova Scotia and neighboring Provinces ready to be engaged on fishing vessels; they want money to support their families, and if the American fishermen were allowed to come upon the Canadian shore for the purpose of engaging men to go out to the deep sea fisheries, large numbers of Canadian people would obtain employment and earn money with which to support their families; and so in a hundred ways our people would be largely benefited, much more benefited in this particular respect than any injury that might accrue by the concession of the point in dispute between the two countries. There is another point to which I beg leave to draw the attention of the House. Suppose that the Canadian Government is not willing to concede this point, what is to be the outcome? The consequences might lead to trouble and excite an irritation the results of which might be deplorable. The Americans propose to themselves three alternatives of settling this matter. I would place them before the people of this country and ask which they prefer to accept? I will read from an official document presented to the Congress of the United States by a commission that was appointed to report upon the matter. The commissioners say, speaking for the United States, first:

"We must live under the treaty, and be constantly embroiled with the British Government as to its proper interpretation."

That is what she has been doing for a great many years. She has been embroiled with the British Government a great many times since 1818, and she has been particularly embroiled with the British Government since 1885, leading to irritation and annoyances which are not pleasant to either country. Or, second:

"We must reform that interpretation by a fair and just agreement between this country and the British Government."

Is not that a just and right way to solve the difficulty—to interpret that treaty along the lines of international equity which should exist between great nations in the settlement of disputes. Or, third:

"We must abandon the treaty and adopt a policy of retaliation to protect our rights."

I do not suppose there is any hon. member, on the Conservative or on the Reform side of this House, who would like to see the last alternative adopted by the United States. We were told the other day by the leader of the Government that he did not fear retaliation. But if retaliation should come—and there is no improbability in the matter—it would certainly affect the interests of Canada as well as those of the United States, and if we are a wise people we can settle the difficulty on a better principle than that of allowing one Government to enter upon a policy of retaliation against another. It would at least be wise and honorable to go half way and to say to the United States: Come, let us reason together on this matter and settle it on the lines of equity and honor between nation and nation. This is an important question, and in relation to it the people of this country should not act as partisans. It is a matter particularly affecting Canada. It is one that affects Reformers as well as Conservatives and every true Canadian, and it is to the interest of everyone that politics and partisanship should be laid aside, and like men and Canadians ask ourselves: What is the best way of settling a dispute which has caused so much irritation and annoyance? I am not speaking from a political standpoint to-day, but from a Canadian standpoint, and if we are in the wrong let us yield, but if we are in the right, according to the judgments of the very highest authorities, let us maintain that right with dignity. But surely there are wise men who can find a way by which this question can be settled, and at the same time maintain the friendly

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

relations existing between the two countries. Mr. Speaker, there is another question which is of great importance to this country. It came before us the other day. It is a question which should be thoroughly ventilated and discussed by both parties with a view to arriving at a proper conclusion. It is a question into which our political partisanship should not run, but it should be decided in the interests of our country, not only of our present country, but of our future country, which we expect to be much greater and grander than anything we possess to-day. But if we are continually considering questions from political and sectional standpoints, the future of this country will not be as great as it is expected to be; but if we stand shoulder to shoulder like true Canadians we will arrive at wise conclusions in regard to these national questions that are pressing upon our attention. We, as Canadians, possess a country which contains within itself the greatest possibilities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am very glad to know there are very many hon. gentlemen opposite who entertain bright expectations with regard to the greatness of our country. I also do so. I am a Canadian, born in Canada, and I love Canada far above even Britain herself, and it is our duty as Canadians to work out our own destiny. This country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, containing within itself every element of greatness, has a great destiny in store for it, if Canadians are true to their country and to themselves. We possess vast tracts of the finest agricultural land upon which the sun ever shone; we have vast forests of timber, the finest that stands upon the continent of America; we have the finest mineral resources to be found in any nation, in different parts of this country, and only awaiting capital and labor for their development, and we have fishing interests in the east and the west surpassing any other fishing interests in the world. With these vast storehouses of natural wealth around us, and with a people full of pluck, vigor and skill, we shall work out a great destiny, provided we stand shoulder to shoulder and apply our great natural forces to accomplish that end. We have great responsibilities resting upon us. We have the responsibility of developing these vast resources; and in order to be placed in an equal position with the other countries surrounding us, I hold that we must have a wider and greater constitutional freedom to open up markets for our products. Even at the present time we have the home market glutted, and we are compelled to send a large portion of our product to foreign countries, and if we hope to compete successfully in the markets of foreign countries with rival nations, we must possess equal privileges with them. We must possess the power to make our own commercial treaties with foreign countries. Again, there is great responsibility resting upon us in view of our geographical relations to the great country to the south. We are contiguous with the greatest nation on this continent for three thousand miles, and it behooves us to act so that we may avoid everything of an irritating character between the two countries. It becomes us to watch that there be no overt act committed that may give umbrage to the United States Government, and that nothing shall be done that will interfere with trade and commerce between the two countries. I believe, if we possessed the constitutional powers to make our own treaties, and if we were able to send a representative direct to Washington, we would be better able to avoid contentions than we are under the present system. It is our duty to go to Great Britain and ask Her Majesty's Government to extend to us the constitutional liberty to make our own treaties, so that we may be better able to develop this portion of the Empire, and, by developing this Dominion, add to the dignity and prestige of the British

Empire as a whole, and thus we will take greater pride and delight in calling ourselves Canadians, though citizens of the Empire. There is another responsibility resting upon us, and that is with regard to opening up foreign markets for the people of Canada. It may be asked have we opened up foreign markets to as great an extent as possible? Have we extended our commerce to all those foreign countries that are prepared to receive the products of the Canadian people? I do not think so. It only requires an investigation to ascertain that our foreign markets are very limited, and it behoves the Canadian Government, and the Canadian people to seek to extend their trade and commerce into those countries where the people are prepared to buy from us, and in order to do this we require power to enter into negotiations with those countries and to consummate those negotiations by trade treaties. When we consider we have here 5,000,000 of intelligent people, largely composed of the most intelligent classes from foreign countries—of intelligent Scotchmen, Englishmen, Irishmen, Frenchmen and Germans—many of whom, on arriving here, were already skilled in the art of government, and have become still further skilled in the art of constitutional government in Canada, it is not too much to ask that to this Dominion should be given the power of making her own treaties. I think, Sir, that on looking over the history of this country we will find that we have neither abused nor ill-used the constitutional power granted to us by the British Government. On the contrary, we have used that constitutional power to promote the interests and prosperity of our country, and to increase the dignity and the prestige of the British Empire. We can, therefore, with grace and dignity go to the foot of the Throne of England and ask that further constitutional powers be bestowed upon us. We were told, about fifty years ago—many of the hon. gentlemen I address will not remember, but you know it from your historical readings—when we asked for responsible Government, that it was a step towards the dissolution of that tie which binds us to the British Empire; but the sequel has taught us differently. We are more loyal to-day, our affections towards the British Empire are stronger to-day, and the bonds that bind us to the British Crown are stronger to-day than they were fifty years ago, when a constitutional Government was given us. The more power we obtain, the more loyal we become to the British Empire, and the more dignified we appear in the eyes of the world. We know how to take care of the power placed in our hands. I believe that if the British Government is approached by the Government of this country, and if the matter is laid before them, in a plain and reasonable way, the power of making our own trade treaties will be cordially granted this country. It has been asked in this House: "Has not the diplomacy of England been sufficiently favorable to Canada in all cases in which that diplomacy was used?" Sir, the diplomacy of England has not, on the whole, been conducive to Canadian interests. In 1794, Lord Dorchester said that we should give up to the United States all the territory west of Niagara Falls, because the great ships of England could not pass beyond that, and the territory beyond was of no use to England. Wiser and better counsels prevailed, and that vast and fertile territory west of Niagara Falls, has been secured to the Canadian people. As the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) put it the other day, the "greater Canada" has been reserved to the Canadian people. In 1842, when the boundary settlement was made between the Province of New Brunswick and the State of Maine, the Americans took advantage of the ignorance of the English diplomatists, and they withheld an important map from the consideration of the commission, by the withholding of which, and on account of the ignorance of the diplomatists sent from England, a large portion of New Brunswick was taken from Canada and annexed to the State of Maine. Need I

refer further into the diplomacy of Great Britain in matters pertaining to Canada, to prove that my statement is true? Let me refer to the circumstances attending the commission on the boundaries of Oregon. The American Government went to Maltby & Co., the celebrated geographers, and purchased a terrestrial globe. It marked the divisions of Oregon on it to suit itself, and made the English commissioners believe that these outlines were made by the great geographers. This proved an important factor in the decision of the commission. The ignorance of the English diplomatists was again taken advantage of, and the boundary was fixed in opposition to the interests of Canada. Many of you remember, as I remember, the time the Fenians invaded this country. Those men were allowed, in the United States, to hold meetings in open day for the purpose of discussing and perfecting their plans to invade Canada. They left the United States ports under the very eyes of the United States authorities without any remonstrance whatever, and they entered this country at Ridgeway, destroying public and private property. Not only that, but many of our own gallant young men who turned out from the University of Toronto to defend the institutions of their country, were slain by those bad men who came from the United States. What was the result of British diplomacy in this matter? A few years afterwards the United States Government made a demand upon the English Government for compensation for the destruction of the *Alabama* during the war, and it received \$15,000,000 from the British Commissioners. I believe that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government was one of the High Commissioners at that time. When our claim for compensation against the United States was pressed upon the British plenipotentiaries, they asked our Minister to withdraw his claim, and they did not press it upon the United States Government. The British Government gave us only a guarantee under a loan of twelve and a half million dollars. The interests of Canada were neglected. This was another instance in which the interests of Canada were sacrificed by the British ambassadors. The Canadian Government had the advantage of the Imperial guarantee, but not a single cent was paid to our private citizens who had their property destroyed on that occasion. You will remember, Sir, that in 1878 we had the Halifax Commission. That commission was for the purpose of deciding the value of our fisheries to the American fishermen during the continuance of the Washington Treaty. The English Government proposed to send a man here to arbitrate for us, but to the credit of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who then led the Government, he told the English Government that we could settle this matter very well on this side of the water, and that he would appoint his own arbitrator. That power was at once granted by the British Government, and the hon. gentleman made a wise choice of his commissioner in the person of the present Sir A. T. Galt. The result of that commission was that an award of five and half million dollars was made, and it proved highly satisfactory to the Canadian people. This satisfactory result was obtained because we were represented by a Canadian who understood our interest, who went there in the interests of Canada, and whose whole thought was to benefit the country which appointed him. After all the failures and sacrifices we suffered at the hands of British diplomatists, it will be abundant evidence to prove to every person in this House, that we should have the power to appoint our own agents, to carry on negotiations with other countries. I ask the people of this country, who can discharge their duty best in the interests of Canada? Is it not the party whose interests are to be served, whose markets are to be enlarged, whose country is to be developed and whose trade and commerce are to be extended? Are not these the proper parties to send to a foreign power, to transact business in which Canada is

deeply interested? Let me point out to this House, that our foreign markets have been neglected. I do not know whether an endeavor has been made to improve them or not, but the fact remains, that the Government has failed to establish any market for Canada in foreign countries of any importance whatever. In 1879, when the Government inaugurated the National Policy in this country, it was said by the Reform party that it would destroy our trade with the Americans. The Government's answer was that they were entering into negotiations with foreign countries, for the purpose of opening up new markets for us, and that even if the Americans did not take a single dollar's worth from us, Canada would derive as much profit from these new foreign markets. Now, it will be interesting to this House, and the people of this country, to know whether these promises have been realised or not, and to show whether they have or not, I wish to refer to the increase that has taken place in the last ten years in our trade with foreign countries other than the United States. Sir, when I consider that one-third of our people are of French extraction; when I consider that one-third of our population are people whose language, manners, customs and religion are the same as those of France, I wonder at our limited trade with that country. I would reasonably expect our trade with France to be very large? France requires many articles produced by the skill and enterprise of the Canadian people, and is able to supply us with many of the articles our people require, and it would be natural that a large trade should exist with that country. But a large trade does not exist; and I ask whose fault it is? I do not say it is the Government's fault; it is the fault of the system. We are not able to send our High Commissioner to France to make direct negotiations, but all negotiations with that country have to filter through the British Foreign Office and the British Embassy in France; and these roundabout methods prevented Sir Alexander Galt, in 1878, arranging a treaty with France in favor of Canada. Now, Sir, to show the limited character of our trade with France, let me say that we imported from that country in 1888—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going back to the discussion of the question that was disposed of in the House the other day.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The principle is embraced in the present resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is only incidentally embraced; and the hon. gentleman cannot make a speech on the subject that was the other day discussed and negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. It strikes me that the hon. gentleman is not violating the Rule in the manner in which Your Honor suggests, but is incidentally referring to the failure of the Administration, in relation to the management of public matters, in dealing with the question of trade.

Mr. SPEAKER. As long as the speech of the hon. gentleman could be taken in the sense just noticed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I allowed him to go on, but now I think he is entering into a speech on the subject.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I understood from the wording of the resolution that it embraced the principle of making our own treaties through our own accredited agents, by stating that in any negotiations between Canada and the United States, Canada should be represented directly by her own, accredited agent; and that, in my opinion, involves the principle of dealing in the same way with any other country as well as the United States. I did not refer to any arguments used in the discussion the other day, or to any person who took part in that discussion. I thought I was perfectly at liberty to run along the line indicated by the wording of that resolution. I am only a young mem-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

ber, and, of course, I only throw out these suggestions. I do not assume to give any information to the Speaker at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would just like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution, which says: that steps should be taken at an early day, by the Government of Canada, for the satisfactory adjustment of such fishery differences, and the securing of unrestricted freedom in the trade relations of the two countries, and that, in any negotiations entered upon for such purposes, Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government. The resolution disposed of the other day had relation only to commercial treaties. This has specific relation to the settlement of our fishery differences. Many gentlemen might hold that it was necessary to have our own representative to settle our fishery differences, and not to make ordinary arrangements. Therein the two resolutions are not alike.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not decided that the hon. gentleman could not make his speech, but that that question is only an incident to the present question before the House; only he must not go too far.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was about to say that our trade relations with France are not what we would naturally expect them to be. Our imports from France in 1888 amounted to \$2,245,000, not a very large import, but a very large one when compared with our total export to that country, which only amounted to \$383,000. Now, unless it can be shown that France has no capacity for anything we produce, I think there must be some reasonable explanation for the meagreness of our trade with that great country. I have already said that Sir Alexander Galt was sent to France as High Commissioner to negotiate a treaty a few years ago, and, according to his statement, he found a very great difficulty in negotiating, because he was not permitted to go into the immediate presence of the parties with whom he had business. He stated that one of the greatest difficulties in negotiating treaties of that kind was the fact that those negotiations had to go through so many hands. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the British Minister has to build his reputation, not upon colonial interests, but on British interests; and when we find British interests coming into contact with colonial interests in these negotiations, we cannot reasonably expect that the British Minister will use his influence for Canada in opposition to the interests of Great Britain. Was there any point in the negotiations of 1878 that was in favor of Great Britain? Yes, there was. British ships entering France for sale were only charged a Customs duty of 2 francs per ton, while Canadian-built ships were charged 40 francs per ton. Do you suppose that any man, being human as the British Minister is, and being interested in the prosperity of those whom he represented, could be expected to make a treaty in the interests of Canada when the interests of the ship-building industry of Great Britain were opposed to it? It was of the greatest interest to Canada to arrange a treaty with France so that her ships could go into the French markets on the same terms as British ships. That treaty was very nearly concluded. But the delays in the British Foreign Office, and the necessity of waiting for the action of the British Minister, resulted in the failure of that treaty; and our ships continued for a time to be charged 40 francs, and British ships only 2 francs a ton of duty. It may be said that we did not suffer long in this respect; but when the duty was reduced on Canadian vessels to 2 francs a ton, then the French Government gave a bounty to their own built ships to such an extent as to give a greater protection to their own vessels and a greater restriction to ours. Now, I hold, if we had a plenipotentiary there, appointed directly by the Government of Canada, with power to negotiate directly with the French authori-

ties any treaty based upon these negotiations, being subject to ratification by the Canadian Parliament, our relations with France would be better than they are; and if the treaty was contrary to Imperial policy, Great Britain had the same power that she now possesses, of disallowing the Acts of the Canadian Parliament. In this respect there will be no interference with her rights, and we would have all the advantages of direct negotiations with the countries into whose markets we wish to send our products. Let us next refer to Spain. With Spain we have hardly any trade, although effort after effort has been made by two of the greatest statesmen that ever occupied the Treasury benches of this country, who went to Spain to make a treaty. Sir Alexander Galt was sent to Spain a few years ago, and did all he possibly could to negotiate a treaty, but failed; and the other great statesman, the late Finance Minister, one of the best diplomats probably in the country to-day, went there three or four times, and he, to a certain extent, failed also. Let me give you Sir Alexander Galt's reason for his failure, as quoted by Sir Charles Tupper in his Budget Speech in 1887. Sir Alexander Galt had left a document for the perusal of Sir Charles Tupper in regard to this particular matter, and Sir Charles Tupper said:

"I may say, Sir, in that relation, that in 1884 Sir Alexander Galt, before his appointment as High Commissioner for Canada in London, was charged with the duty of endeavoring to negotiate with Spain a treaty of advanced commercial trade relations with Cuba and Porto Rico. That treaty, hon. gentlemen know, Sir Alexander Galt was not able to carry to completion, and when I had the honor of succeeding him in the office of High Commissioner, he left for my information and perusal a document in which he said that he found himself greatly hampered in discharging the duties imposed upon him by the Government of Canada, because he only stood in the position of a commercial commissioner, and it was necessary that all his negotiations with the Government of Spain should be filtered through Her Majesty's Minister at the Court of Madrid."

Sir Charles Tupper then went to Spain, having received from the Government of Great Britain greater power, greater latitude and greater constitutional freedom, as he says himself. And how did he succeed? He said:

"I will read to this House an extract from a letter sent by the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, dated 26th July, 1884, and forwarded to me for the information of the Canadian Government:

"If the Spanish Government are favorably disposed a fuller power for these negotiations will be given to Sir Robert Morrier."

"—who was then Ambassador of Her Majesty's Government at Madrid—

"and Sir Charles Tupper jointly. The actual negotiation would probably be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper; but the convention, if concluded, must be signed by both plenipotentiaries, and be entered into between Her Majesty and the King of Spain, with the special object of regulating Canadian trade with the Spanish territories specified in the convention."

"I am quite certain that the House will appreciate the great importance of that arrangement, and they will feel that the discussions that have taken place in this House have, no doubt, done good in relation to that question. They will feel that another step has been gained by the concession from Her Majesty's Government in this matter of trade negotiations, and that Canada is to have the freest and fullest scope."

As I said at the beginning, I appeal to both sides of the House to discuss this question not as partisans, but as Canadians.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are no Canadians on the other side.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The question is whether we shall be better served in foreign countries by having plenipotentiaries of our own there or not, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite have as much interest in that question as we have. Sir Charles Tupper was of opinion that the discussion which took place here in 1882 was of very great importance in getting the powers, which he obtained, granted to him; and I believe that the discussion of this question to-day in Parliament, in a sober, honest and reasonable way, will tend largely to the benefit of Canada, even if it does not lead to our being given the full power of sending representatives to foreign courts, fully equipped with all necessary powers, it will have a beneficial

effect on the Government of England in inducing it to clothe Canada with the power of making its own commercial treaties. That was the opinion of Sir Charles Tupper in the debate which took place on this subject in 1887. Sir Charles Tupper then said:

"I am quite certain that the House will appreciate the great importance of that arrangement, and will feel that the discussions which have taken place in this House have, no doubt, done good in relation to that question. They will feel that another point has been gained by the concession from Her Majesty's Government in this matter of trade negotiations, and that Canada is to have the freest and fullest scope."

Now, there is the admission of Sir Charles Tupper himself, that a freer and greater scope than we possessed in the past is absolutely necessary, in order that we may negotiate our treaties to greater advantage; and we have the opinion of Sir Alexander Galt that his failure to bring about a treaty was that all his negotiations with the Government of Spain had to be filtered through Her Majesty's Ministers at the Court of Madrid. Sir Charles Tupper went with full liberty to negotiate with the Government of Spain, and, consequently, he succeeded in obtaining advantageous terms. I want to show you, irrespective of that matter, that our trade relations with other countries are not growing as we expected them to grow. You may attribute the cause to what reason you like, but I attribute the failure to the want of power to negotiate directly with these countries by our own accredited agents. We have been told that efforts were brought to bear to extend our trade with foreign countries. The right hon. the First Minister said in 1882:

"I am not aware that before 1878 any step of any kind was taken by the Government to develop our trade. But the first thing we did was to attempt to develop our trade with foreign countries. We had to provide for an occasional over-production, we supposed there might be sometimes a plethora of manufactures, that our markets would be glutted, and so we commenced at once our negotiations in order to make arrangements with foreign countries which would likely exchange commodities with us."

Now, let us see how successful we have been in our efforts to promote trade with foreign countries. We exported to France in 1878, goods to the value of \$369,000; in 1888, ten years later, we exported to the value of \$397,000, being an increase of but \$28,300 in ten years, not as much goods as would fill a good wholesale store in Ottawa. We exported to Germany in 1878, goods to the value of \$22,300, and in 1882, \$198,500, showing an increase in ten years of but \$76,200, or about sufficient to fill two stores in Ottawa. Take the exports to Spain. In 1874 we sent Spain \$49,000 worth of goods, and in 1883, \$52,300 worth, being an increase in ten years of \$2,100, notwithstanding the fact that we sent our High Commissioner there, at a large expense, to negotiate a treaty for the improvement of that trade. Again, we have been opening up communications with Japan and China, which produce a number of articles which we consume, and which require a number of articles which we produce. Our exports in 1878, notwithstanding the poor policy of my hon. friend who led the Government at that time, as stated by the then Opposition, amounted to \$102,570, and in 1888, they were only \$132,400, or an increase of \$29,880 in those ten years, notwithstanding the increased facilities afforded. Let me point out what the leader of the present Government said in regard with our trade with Brazil. He twitted the Opposition with not opening up a trade with foreign countries, and, in 1882, he used the following words:—

"In the first place, we went to a nation on this side of the Atlantic, and we now got the official—the not ostentations, but to a great extent the expressed assistance of Her Majesty's representative at the Court of Brazil; and now we have a line of steamships running monthly between Quebec and Brazil, and although that trade is in its infancy, I think the indications are clear that one of our best markets in the future will be Brazil. The commodities of the two countries are of such diverse nature that we can profitably send our productions to Brazil and receive hers in exchange."

He says there that we have the expressed assurance of the English Minister in Brazil; that we have his promise that he will assist us to extend our trade there; that we have a monthly



line of steamships between Canada and Brazil, and that the products of the two countries are so different that Brazil becomes a great market for us and Canada is a market for them. Here are three elements of success in opening up a commerce with Brazil. What has been the result of the effort. I ask the Government and the country to point out if there is not something wrong. The Government blamed us for not opening up markets in foreign countries, and we find this: In 1882, the first year in which the exports to Brazil were separately stated, we exported the value of \$193,500 to that country; in 1883, \$370,000; in 1884, \$339,000; in 1885, \$311,000—coming down all that time, and that notwithstanding these increased facilities. In 1886, we exported to Brazil \$352,500 worth; in 1887, \$429,400, and in 1888, \$333,000. And that is the result, notwithstanding all these facilities, and notwithstanding the idle boast that a large trade was to be created with that country, to make up the trade we were losing by the restrictive policy of the Government in shutting us out from the American market. If we Canadians stand shoulder to shoulder, and have less political partisanship, and give our attention to the interests and prosperity of the country, the day will soon come when the young men of Canada will take a greater interest in the affairs of the country than they do now, when they will speak in the language hoped for by the late illustrious and eloquent statesman, D'Arcy McGee, when he said:

"When I can hear our young men say as proudly, 'our federation, our kingdom, our country,' as young men of other countries do when speaking of their own, I shall then have less apprehension for the result of whatever trials the future may have in store for us."

Give the people of this country the liberty and the constitutional freedom to extend our trade relations by direct methods, and we shall build up a country which will be prosperous in every way; and, instead of our young men leaving our country, to become good citizens of the United States, they will remain with us and have a true patriotic sentiment in their bosom, and we will hear young Canadians say when speaking of their country, our Dominion, our country, our federation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought it was probable that some hon. gentleman from the other side of the House would have been disposed to answer the very able address which has just been delivered by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Macdonald, Huron). He has travelled over ground which is interesting to us all. He has produced his case with a moderation and a clearness which I am sure must have commended itself to the judgment of hon. members of this House; and, if nothing else were said to-day on our side of the House, than what has been so well said by that hon. gentleman, I should be disposed to rest our case there. But there is more to be said on that subject, and, in following the line of argument introduced by the hon. mover of this resolution, I think it is interesting to observe that the discussion on the part of hon. members on the other side of the House has been mainly directed to prove that the motion itself, the argument by which it was supported by the hon. gentleman who introduced it, and the object of the Opposition in bringing it forward, were unpatriotic and inopportune. It was said to be unpatriotic, inasmuch, at a moment like the present, we were saying that we were anxious for a renewal of reciprocity, and that without it the interests of this country could not succeed. If such were the case, if there were any apprehensions that anything said in this debate could be taken hold of by the Americans, as showing that we, in this country, could not live and prosper without access to their markets, or without an immediate treaty with them, I should be the last man in this House to raise my voice on such an occasion, because, in this Parliament, and on other occasions when I have been called upon to express an opinion upon our trade relations with the States, I have always guarded myself to the fullest

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

extent, I have been always careful not to lay too strong a stress upon the absolute necessity of an urgent appeal to the United States. Last year I gave to the House the opinions which I had delivered through the press and on the platform in my own Province on that subject. My observations were quoted here at considerable length on that occasion, and they all showed that I was willing to support the Government in every reasonable step they took in order to obtain the renewal of reciprocity with that country. But the cause of complaint which we had, and which we still have, with the Conservative party is that, according to our judgment, they have not taken the opportune time to negotiate with the people of the United States. Perhaps their position as a party may stand in their way. I am disposed to think that has a very considerable effect. When you consider the position of the Conservative party in regard to the United States, I think we can see in it, beneath the lines, a very strong reason why the people of the United States are less friendly disposed to deal with a Conservative Government in this country than they would be with a Liberal Government if it was in power. I recollect in 1878, during the time when we had very important discussions on the National Policy, when we had the eloquent tones of the late Minister of Finance and other hon. gentlemen then sitting on this side of the House, that, day after day and week after week, those hon. gentlemen were directing the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that this was becoming, as they termed it, a slaughter market for the manufacturers of the United States, that the United States had not shown at that time any earnest disposition to negotiate with them, and pending such a condition of affairs they, if placed in power, were going to say to the people of the United States that they would put them in a position either to shut them out of our market or compel them to come to our own terms. That view of the case was represented day after day, and month after month, on every platform throughout the country, and in the press of the party; and that was so well understood by the people and the Government of the United States that it created in their minds a feeling of active hostility against the Government of this country, and it has been one of the main causes, in my judgment, why, during all these long years, the Americans have held their hand, and have been less willing than we would like, to negotiate a treaty of greater freedom between the two countries. That such a treaty may be negotiated we come at this moment to offer to the Government of this country our humble support. We come in no factious mood; we come, according to our resolution, in order to pave the way to remove those difficulties which have been existing, to remove the irritation which exists to-day, caused by the regrettable rejection of the late Treaty of Washington. We say that we, as the Liberal party of this country, are willing to assist the Government of the day in so far as we represent the public sentiment of this country, to negotiate a treaty of freedom of commerce between the two countries. Is there anything blameable in that, Mr. Speaker? Why, Sir, I think that any man who has the interest of his country at heart might freely stand up here and offer his advice to the Government, who are merely the executive of the country. If there is anything wrong in such a view—why, I can point to hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House who, when these speeches were delivered last Session on our trade relations with the United States, spoke in the same terms, and did not receive from the Treasury benches any condemnation for the sentiments they expressed. There is one hon. gentleman in this House who, perhaps, above all others would be the last unduly to defer in any way to the people of the United States, one hon. gentleman who, in all his public utterances—and they are all well worth perusing, and I always listen to him with the greatest possible pleasure—is careful to

uphold the rights of this country. On that occasion that hon. gentleman said:

"For years past the people of the United States have kept up a tariff wall against us. Over and over again we have entreated them to take it down, and they have just as often refused."

That hon. gentleman was the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He says that the people of Canada have "entreated" the people of the United States to take down their tariff wall, but they have refused. We are not "entreating" them in the resolutions before the House; we do not go so far as the hon. member for Bruce did in his address last year; we are not begging or entreating them to take down the tariff wall against the people of this country, but are merely saying to the Government that it is our opinion that, in view of the unfortunate rejection of this treaty, they should again approach the Government of the United States in a friendly spirit and endeavor, if possible, to arrange with them a renewal of the treaty between the two countries. I say, Sir, that is a position which the Liberal party may well take, and may well stand by; it is a policy which the people of this country will sustain, and they will give us all the more credit for it because we are willing to come forward at any time to assist the Government with our support in the event of their making a treaty with the United States. Now, Sir, during last Session we had a discussion of that treaty, and various lines of argument were pursued; but there was a line of argument pursued by many hon. gentlemen against our reciprocity movement, on the ground that the people of this country were well enough situated as they are, and that we do not require access to the American market. Hon. gentlemen, at great length, entered into a comparison of the position of the Canadian farmer and the American farmer, of the Canadian and the American fishermen, of the Canadian and American lumbermen. Taking up the debate of last year at random, I find in almost every speech references made by hon. gentlemen opposite, going to show that either the people of this country are well enough off as they are, or that they would not be advantaged by having the markets of the United States opened to them. The late lamented Minister of the Interior, in a very able address last year, in reply to my hon. friend who introduced that resolution, endeavored to prove, at very considerable length, that the people of this country were not in need of access to the American market. He said that we were making steady, and successful, and substantial progress, and that, taking us altogether, our various industries were in a more healthy and satisfactory condition than were similar industries on the other side of the line. Referring in the first place to the fishermen, the hon. gentleman, on page 166 of the *Hansard*, said:

"Every one who has watched the progress of the fisheries and the fishing trade during the last two years in our Maritime Provinces, knows that there has never been—I think I am within the mark in saying there has never been in the history of the Maritime Provinces more profitable fishing than that which occurred during the last two years."

He was going on to prove that under the present condition of affairs the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces were doing as well without a treaty with the United States as they would with that market open to them. Now, if the hon. gentleman had been familiar with the course of trade in that large branch of our industry, I venture to think he never would have indulged in such an observation. If hon. gentlemen were to visit the Maritime Provinces to day, particularly Nova Scotia, they would find there large quantities of fish of a valuable character, for which there is no market in the West Indies, which can only find a market in the United States, at whatever rate it may bring; because the market in the West Indies will only take a certain quantity, and when we go beyond that quantity it has to go to the United States to be sold for whatever it will bring. Hon. gentlemen should also be aware that this great

industry in the Maritime Provinces can only be further developed by the freest access to the American market. It is useless for us to attempt for one moment to fit out our bankers for their hazardous voyages; it is useless for the merchants of Nova Scotia to invest their money, as they have been disposed to invest it, in building fast vessels and thoroughly equipping them under the command of experienced masters, and with able crews on board, and sending them on their trips, when, on returning well laden after a hard season's service, their catch realises no fair price in their own market, and is excluded from the natural market alongside of us. I say this is a branch of the subject which, to us in Nova Scotia, exceeds for the moment all other considerations, because it is a natural product; it is one not rewarded or fostered by any National Policy; the laws of this country do not and cannot affect the quantity which is taken, but the regulations of this country with other countries form the only means whereby the product of this great industry can be profitably realised in the country lying alongside of us. The hon. gentleman then went on to show that the farmers, as well as the fishermen, were prosperous. He, on that occasion, endeavored to prove that they had no need of a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The hon. gentleman said:

"Now, the hon. gentlemen tell us the farmers would be better off if they went to the States. Happily for us we have the record of the farmers of the States. They will be, I have no doubt, interesting. I think I can say this with perfect truth, that on the face of God's earth there is not to-day a body of men, take them on the average, who are as well to do as the farmers of Ontario at the present time."

And he goes on to contrast the unenviable position in which the farmers of the United States were placed, showing that their products in the American markets were lower at that time than were similar products in the markets of Canada; and he concluded by saying:

"So that I think, Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts and figures, which are official on both sides of the line, from the officers of the Ontario Government so far as Ontario is concerned, and from the officers of the American Government so far as the United States are concerned, we may fairly say that the farmers of Canada find nothing to envy in the position of their neighbors on the other side of the line."

I make these quotations, Mr. Speaker, to show that the arguments of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in the early part of last Session, went to prove, if they went to prove anything, that we did not require any treaty with the United States at all; they went to prove, if they went to prove anything, that we were better off as we were. I could quote a dozen speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite to the same effect, and I could show that opinions expressed by the lamented gentleman to whom I have referred were concurred in by leading members on that side of the House. A speech also was delivered here by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen), who said:

"There is another industry, on which I shall touch but slightly, as it has been dealt with ably by hon. gentlemen who preceded me, and who are better acquainted with it than I am, and as it will be also treated by hon. gentlemen who will follow me. I refer now to our fishing industry, which is one of the most important of this Dominion. It has been said that this industry has been seriously injured, and that it is becoming demoralised, and that our fishermen are unable to obtain remunerative wages, owing to the present depression of trade. If you will allow me, I will quote a few figures from the Fisheries Report, showing the number of men employed, the capital invested, and the value of the products of Nova Scotia for the years 1881 to 1886, inclusive."

The hon. gentleman gave us a return of the figures from 1881 to 1886, and he then went on to say:

"If we take the last two years of free fishing to the United States fishermen within our three-mile limit, namely 1883 to 1884, we find that taking the value of the fishing product and the number of men engaged, it amounted in 1883 to \$261 per man, and in 1884 to \$292 per man. Then take the year 1886, the first of Canada's protecting her shore limits, and when a duty was simultaneously imposed on our fish in the United States. It was found that the fishery product of Nova Scotia is \$306 per man engaged, showing that the protection afforded our fishermen is already being realised. The above figures, which have but re-

cently been brought to my notice, bear out the views of intelligent fishermen with whom I have conversed on the subject in my own county and who are emphatically of the opinion that the protection to our three-mile limit is of more value to them than free American markets ever can be."

This was the same view with respect to the fishermen which the other hon. gentleman expressed with regard to the farmers. In both of these cases a dozen other hon. gentlemen concurred in these sentiments, and, in fact, they were the sentiments embodied in every speech in the early part of that debate. Hon. gentlemen proceeded to prove, first, that we did not require any trade treaty with the United States. They said: We are willing to have a treaty with the United States, but, as a matter of fact, we do not require it, because our farmers and fishermen are better off without it. It is to disprove such a condition of affairs, that we on this side of the House take issue with hon. gentlemen. It is quite true that after those speeches were delivered in the early part of last Session, the Government took a rather different course of action. Those speeches, as hon. gentlemen will remember, were all delivered before the return of the late Finance Minister from his official duties at Washington, and when the late Minister of Finance made his appearance in this House and delivered that celebrated speech which has been quoted over and over again, it was amusing to watch the consternation exhibited by those hon. gentlemen opposite who had spoken on that occasion. When the late Minister of Finance told us he had offered unrestricted reciprocity, hon. gentlemen opposite thought their ears must have failed them. It cannot be possible, they said, that after all we have been led to say by the Government here, that after the Government have quietly sat in their positions day after day and have permitted us to commit ourselves, and as far as we are able, the party to which we belong, to the proposition that we do not require a large measure of reciprocity with the United States, that when we in our speeches have over and over again proved to our own satisfaction, if not to the satisfaction of the House, that we are better off as we are, that our fishermen and farmers are better off as they are than with access to the American market, at the last moment the Minister of Finance steps in and says: Gentlemen, I offered unrestricted reciprocity to the United States, and I meant it to be unrestricted reciprocity. I meant it, he emphasised, it was not accidental, as you might be almost led to suppose; but he said: I offered them unrestricted reciprocity, and I meant it; I desired to see how far they would go. Of course, if the Americans had met him in the same spirit with which he made that proposition, a broad and statesmanlike proposition, is there any hon. gentleman here who would not be prepared to admit, or who would be prepared to deny that we would have unrestricted reciprocity to-day. I say, Sir, that if the Government of the United States had met the proposition of the Minister of Finance when he made it, as he says, in that broad and liberal spirit, and if they had taken up the discussion of that question and recommended such a policy to the United States Government, although it was beyond their functions and it could not be done by Executive act but only by Congress—if they had said that, so far as our desire and influence extend, we are disposed to recommend that policy to Congress, then, instead of the rejection of the Fisheries Treaty, unfortunately for the Americans, we would have been enjoying the blessings of unrestricted reciprocity with 65,000,000 people alongside of us. From that moment, a very considerable change came over the spirit of the dreams of hon. gentlemen opposite. They could not obliterate what they said, they could not go back on the Government of which they were such strong and ardent supporters, and so they thought their best policy was to submit with all possible grace and retain allegiance to their party. But we remember very shortly afterwards there followed the celebrated explanation

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

in this House with respect to fruit trees on which a duty was paid. We remember, when we first brought this to the notice of this Parliament, during the absence of the hon. the Minister of Finance at Washington, we were told frequently by the Government, and by members of that side of the House, that they could not place the fruit trees on the free list, in the same manner as they were placed on the free list in the United States, under the statutory offer made by this House. We remember the eloquent terms in which the hon. the Minister of Justice denounced such an idea as traitorous to the best interests of the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did nothing of the kind. What I said, as I have repeatedly stated in the presence of the hon. gentleman, was, that to admit the interpretation that we were bound to put these articles upon the free list, because the United States had chosen to make us an offer in regard to one of the subjects in the statutory offer—that to admit that interpretation of the statute would be treason to Parliament. I expressed no opinion as to putting those goods on the free list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will have the benefit of hearing his own words before this debate is over.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My words as they are?

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) Yes, as they are. We do not desire to give any other interpretation to the hon. gentleman's words than what the plain language would convey, but I venture to say that every gentleman in this House listening, as they always do, with pleasure to the Minister of Justice—gathered from his utterances that the idea of admitting that class of importations from the United States free of duty, simply because the United States had admitted our goods under statutory offer, would be treason to the interests of the country. At all events, this is what was generally understood from his remarks. Be that as it may, the hon. gentleman and others soon saw their way to take a different position on the return of the Minister of Finance from Washington. That hon. gentleman said to them: "Give up playing statesmanship, give up indulging in those utterances which are unworthy of public men, you have a statutory offer on your statute books made to a friendly nation alongside of you, and when they accept that in good faith it is your duty to accept it on the same terms. Under the castigation I might say (probably a word not so severe as that would imply the fact as well), but, at all events, under the strong language which the Minister of Finance used on that occasion, the Government supporters, although they grumbled a little and looked rueful for a time, gladly accepted the position and said it was a good thing, after all, to admit those articles duty free into this country. Since then we find that there have been other evidences of back downs by this Government. We find that we have before us an evidence of their change of view with regard to our relations to the United States in the wreckage Bill now before this House. Hon. gentlemen may say that this is not very important, but the change about face of the Government towards a measure of that kind is very significant in character. Hon. gentlemen will remember that last year when this Bill was introduced it was quietly snubbed by leading members on the Government side of the House. They said: It will never do to allow the thin end of the wedge of reciprocity even in the wrecking laws between the two countries; it will never do to allow an American vessel to assist a British vessel in British waters, or to allow a British vessel to assist an American or British vessel in American waters, and, as we all remember, that Bill was lost in this House. Precisely the same Bill is brought in this year, and a change seems to have come over the feelings of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. They seem to think that, after all, it is not so bad to have

intercourse with our friends across the line, it is not such a bad thing to allow them to come across here to save the property and lives of our subjects, and it is not such a bad thing, after all, to allow Canadians the benefit of employing their capital in American harbors. They have apparently satisfied themselves upon these grounds, and they think it is just as well to allow the Bill to pass. Beneath all this, and between the lines you will see that these hon. gentlemen are preparing for themselves a way by which they may recede from the position they have taken on this matter. If I am not very much mistaken we will see the Government go still further in this direction before this Session is over. There was another question with regard to sawlogs. The Government proposed—unconstitutionally, I hold, because they had no right under our Constitution—to impose an export duty on sawlogs. Hon. gentlemen know that the clause of the British North America Act which was originally intended to confer that power was expressly eliminated, at Lord Carnarvon's suggestion, when the commissioners met in London. The American Government held it to be unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional in England, and the Imperial Government would not permit, so far as they were concerned, that a clause should be put in the British North America Act under which this Parliament should be empowered to impose any export duty on any of the products of the country. Still the Government imposed this export duty on sawlogs, and with what results? The duty was small at first, but it went on increasing and last year an additional amount was put on by Order in Council. We saw the result reflected immediately in the American Congress. We saw an Act introduced there that if any country chose to put an export duty upon the product of that country the original duty in their country should be increased, plus the export duty of the country from which those articles were exported. This great industry of Canada stood in a position of great peril; and having a vast amount of property jeopardised and having all those valuable timber limits throughout the west made of very little practical value, they found that they would have to recede from their policy in this direction. The Minister of Finance last year accurately described the position of the country with regard to the dealings of our friends across the border, when he said: "It is all very well to have a technical right, but it is a very different thing to carry it out." That is just what these gentlemen find out when they are disposed to put a most extraordinary construction upon our relations with our friends in the United States. If I may judge from the comments of the Press favorable to the Government of the day, I think this House may congratulate the Government on the fact that the export duty on saw logs will also be removed from the burdens of this country. That will be back down number three. I contended at the outset, that the Government of the day had embittered the public feeling in the United States against them, and that they are now, at the last moment, endeavoring to remove that impression. We saw them a very short time ago dealing, in my judgment, very harshly with an old public official, the collector at Halifax. We saw them dismiss from his office an officer who for fourteen years had discharged the duties of that important position with great acceptance to the mercantile community; and I believe I am right in saying that I never knew a case which excited so much sympathy, among Conservatives as well as Liberals, as the dismissal of Mr. Ross. I am not going to deny that Mr. Ross was technically wrong; I am not going to defend him further than to say that he committed an error of judgment, and he made an immediate apology. He went beyond his orders in allowing the fish of an American vessel to be transhipped at Halifax, but the moment that he found that he made a mistake, he notified the Government, and humbly apologised. Now, I think it would have been a graceful act on the part of the Administration to have

said to Mr. Ross: It is true, you have done wrong, you have exceeded your powers, but you are an old public servant, and while, no doubt, like other public servants in this country who have occasionally committed errors of judgment, you have made a mistake, and we disapprove entirely of your action, and shall have to manifest it in some way, either by your temporary suspension or otherwise, yet we are not going to take the extreme step of removing you from office. Is there any man in this House, on either side, who, if he were to review his whole life, public as well as private, could hold up his hand and say that he had never committed an error of judgment from want of consideration? That was the case with Mr. Ross; but his dismissal was intended to intensify the feeling towards the United States. Here was an officer who had shown some kindness to an American fisherman in distress; here was an officer who, on his own responsibility, had done a friendly act, and nothing more, towards a neighboring fisherman; and for that act he was dismissed. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that that did not go home to the people of the United States? Do they not know that Mr. Ross's dismissal was flashed over every telegraph wire from one end of the United States to the other as an act of hostility to the United States? No act of the Government was so calculated to arouse a bitter feeling towards the Government of this country as their sacrifice of a man who had shown kindness to an American fisherman in distress. But what did the Government next do? After the dismissal of the old collector, a new collector was appointed, and not a month had elapsed when another American fisherman comes into the port of Halifax, and asks for what? Not for the privilege of sending forward to his own market 5,000 or 8,000 lbs of fish, which were of no great value; but he asked the privilege of making the port of Halifax a base of operations for carrying on his fishing business. He asked the collector for the liberty of buying in that market all the articles he required for the prosecution of his fishing, his supplies having given out. The new collector was wise in his generation, and I commend him for it; he immediately communicated with the Government at Ottawa. And now we see the changed position of the Government on that matter. A month ago they dismissed their collector for allowing 8,000 lbs. of halibut to be shipped to the United States, and a month has not elapsed when a vessel comes in without provisions, when she could not have gone back to the bank if permission to buy needed supplies had been refused, and when all its captain could have asked was liberty to get enough supplies to take the crew to their own homes; but the Government go back on their record, and they instruct the collector to allow that fisherman to make the port of Halifax his base of operations. If that decision of the Government is indicative of their policy for the rest of the season, we shall have the whole fishing fleet of the United States coming into the port of Halifax for their supplies. Now, this fisherman had not complied with the *modus vivendi* in securing a license; he had not paid anything into the revenues of this country to entitle him to any privilege in the way of securing supplies in our ports; but the Government, in the most important point of the controversy between the two countries to-day, so far as the fishing interests are concerned, made a complete back down. Well, Sir, that act goes much further than the policy called for by the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. What does that resolution say? It merely says that, in the judgment of this House, the *modus vivendi*, whereby all these irritating differences and misunderstandings between the two countries could be avoided, shall be continued pending negotiations. That is the spirit in which the *modus vivendi* was proposed. If hon. gentlemen will turn to it, they will find that it is expressed in almost the same emphatic language.

It was offered to the Americans as a means whereby, pending the ratification or the rejection of the treaty by the two Government of Canada, all cases of irritation between the countries might happily be avoided. That was the origin of the *modus vivendi*, that was its scope and intention, and all we ask for now by the resolution before the House is that the *modus vivendi* shall be continued, if the Government are disposed to negotiate anew with our friends across the line. I say that position is a natural one, it is a consistent one, it is a statesmanlike one, it is the line of policy laid down by the Minister of Finance in his position as negotiator in behalf of Canada; and it is the position which, I heartily believe, will be approved of by the people. If we require an illustration, I may go back to the time when the Treaty of Washington expired. What did the Conservative Government of that day do? Did they immediately exclude the Americans from our harbors? Did they immediately fit out cruisers to protect our shores? Did they annoy the Americans, as they have of late, with all our custom house regulations? No, they still hoped to be able to negotiate a new treaty, and with the object of preventing any irritation during the negotiations, they allowed the Americans the use of our fisheries for six months free. We do not ask them to be free under the present resolution. We merely ask that they shall be permitted to go in, as was originally intended by the Treaty of Washington, and under that treaty they should pay the amount which is provided in it, if they require to take advantage of it. If the Government of the day are disposed, in individual cases and applications, to allow these vessels to come in, as they have already done, without any payment of a fee, and to obtain supplies and reship their cargoes, they are going very much further than we propose to go under the resolution submitted to the House. I am not going to condemn the Government or approve of them beforehand, but I say that, having committed themselves to the policy which they carried out only the week before last, in Halifax, of permitting an American vessel to obtain supplies there, they will have to take a new departure and exclude American vessels altogether or give them the benefit of the *modus vivendi*. It may be they are awaiting the arrival of that distinguished gentleman who is now on his way out, to throw some light on the subject, to tell them how far they are to back down, and how to back down most gracefully. We know how readily they succumbed to the hon. gentleman's eloquent observations last year, and I have no doubt that when he makes his appearance, he will be able to show the Government that the moderate suggestion we have made is in the interest of peace between the two countries, and thus enable the Administration to approach the American Government with the concurrence of both sides of the House. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are in a measure responsible for leading the American Government to suppose that if they refuse to come to terms we will be ready for annexation, for they are constantly telling us indirectly that one-half of the people of the country are in favor of annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say indirectly. The hon. gentleman must not forget that the Government have pointed out to the people of this country that unrestricted reciprocity means annexation and nothing else. They have through their press and public utterances declared that every man who is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity is an annexationist in disguise.

Mr. HAGGART. That is true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I knew the hon. gentleman would admit that the position I take is a sound one. Admitting that such is the case, what is the natural result? We have had several elections in this country lately. We

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

know that unrestricted reciprocity has been accepted as the policy of the Liberal party, who are at least half, if not more than half the people, and much more than half the best elements of the country, and the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite says that the Liberal party, having adopted the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, are all annexationists. Look at the elections that have lately taken place. Look at Halton, Joliette and Haldimand. All these elections were run on the question of unrestricted reciprocity, and the inference from the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is that the majority who returned members to support the Liberal party are in favor of annexation. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite if the inference is not a natural and reasonable one. By the continued reiteration of such statements for party purposes, the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite and the Government have done irreparable injury, because if they could convince the people of the United States that we are only waiting to be admitted into the Union until unrestricted reciprocity is approved by our people, it is natural that the Americans will say: Well, we will wait a little longer, until the unrestricted reciprocity advocates get a little larger majority, and then we will take them in. For such a condition of public sentiment in the United States, the Conservative party of this country is solely responsible. Another view taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to the Treaty of 1872, was this, that it was discontinued on account of the feeling of unfriendliness during the civil war which existed on this side of the border. Possibly that might have had something to do with it at that time, but it was long after that. No doubt, however, this feeling was intensified by the hostile position of the Conservative party, and their public strictures on the policy of the United States. But the hon. the First Minister, the other night, told us what was also one very important factor with regard to this treaty. There was ranking in the minds of the people of the United States the fact that we had got from them \$5,500,000 as a balance between the rights we conferred and the privileges we received. We know that that was a very important factor, in the opinion of the American people, in regard to that treaty. It was a very unreasonable one, we know, but it is useless to reason with a people when they get an idea in their heads, as it is apparently useless to reason with my hon. friends opposite, when they have made up their minds to a certain course, and run their heads against a stone wall in reference to our trade relations with the United States, and then have to back down. However, the people of the United States had that idea in their heads, and they had another idea which was equally dangerous, and that was that they could get no further renewal of that treaty, except for a further monetary consideration. I took occasion at a previous time to refer to that matter. If the Government, before that treaty expired, when they received a notice from the United States that they were about to terminate it, had intimated to the people of the United States that they were willing to renew it without any monetary consideration at all, I believe that cause of irritation would have been very largely removed. I have had intercourse with very many of the leading people of the United States who are largely instrumental in forming public opinion in regard to that branch of our relations with that country, and they have pointed out that, as they had had to pay five millions and a half for the previous twelve years, we would naturally want as much for the next twelve years. That was a fatal mistake, but the Government allowed it to go on from day to day without letting the Americans know that we would not require the money payment as well as other considerations. We have offered this resolution in good faith to the Government, and to hon. gentlemen on the other side, and we mean it in good faith.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend laughs and I am glad he is pleased.

Mr. RYKERT. You are only joking.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hands of the Government will be strengthened, I hope, by the knowledge that they have behind them in any negotiations they may make, a body of men on this side amounting, I think, to eighty-five or ninety. We have not counted them for some time, but they are gaining every day. The Government must admit that their case cannot be weakened, but must be strengthened in dealing with the people across the line, when they know that they have the public sentiment, not only of their own friends, but of the Liberal party, who are willing to assist them in all reasonable and feasible negotiations. This is a matter of great importance. The trade relations between two great countries like these are matters of paramount consideration, and I would not for a moment stand here and throw any obstacle in the way of their negotiations with our friends across the border. I believe it is possible, by a friendly approach, and by making it understood that the people here, while we think they have not dealt justly with us, are still willing to meet them in friendly discussion, from such a discussion to eliminate a policy which will be acceptable to us as well as to them and to England, and we must remember that England is a very important factor in this matter, because she naturally looks with great interest to see such a large and important colony as this, lying alongside of sixty millions of people, preserve its intercourse with that people on such a basis as to prevent any causes of irritation arising between these two great Anglo-Saxon powers. It is in the interest of peace between England and the United States, as well as the commercial interests of our people, and, if the Government do not accept this expression of opinion from this side of the House, and do not at the earliest possible opportunity approach the Americans with a friendly and sincere desire to bring about an early, a large, a full and a comprehensive measure of reciprocity between these two people, I say they will fail in their duty and in the discharge of their responsibility to the people of this country.

Mr. KENNY. As I listened to the address of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) the other evening, —and I always do so with a great deal of pleasure—and to the resolution which he proposed, asking that the *modus vivendi* should be continued, I was very much afraid that we would not have the pleasure of hearing from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), for, remembering what that hon. gentleman had stated and how he had argued in this House when the Fishery Treaty was under consideration last year, I was puzzled to know how he could reconcile his views with the resolution which his leader had proposed. But, with that versatility which characterises his party, he is always equal to such an emergency. We have been taunted from that side of the House with having backed down. In my short parliamentary experience, I never witnessed such a back down as we have heard here to-day. The hon. gentleman tells us that the United States of America is the only market for our fish. Does he not know that, of the productions of our own Province of Nova Scotia, not more than one-third goes to the United States?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he thinks I said that the United States was the only market for our fish.

Mr. KENNY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if we lost the United States market for our fish, our fishermen would be seriously injured.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I said, after the other markets were supplied,

Mr. KENNY. Of course, after all the rest of the world is supplied, there will be no great demand for fish. The hon. gentleman says that in the United States we would have a fish market of 65,000,000 people. That would mean that every American would have one herring, and that would be 65,000,000 herrings. If they were to take two herrings apiece—and they would be likely to take two herrings now that Lent is coming on—they would require 130,000,000 herrings. That reminds me of that well-known character, Colonel Sellers, who has been well known to all the members of this House. He found out that there were 600,000,000 people in Africa, and that every one of those had a sore eye, and would want a bottle of eye-wash. That would require 600,000,000 bottles, and the more they used, the more they would want. They would, therefore, require at least 1,200,000,000 bottles of eye-wash. In the same way, my hon. friend says we should look at these 65,000,000 people who are wanting to consume our fish. My hon. friend is a commercial man of very high standing in the community in which he resides, and he is an authority in regard to the business with which he is connected, and he ought to be infinitely more conversant with this fish business than I am, having studied the question, which I have not looked into lately. He should have told the House that, during the past 21 years, our trade (including Newfoundland) in fish with the United States has not increased \$500,000. Now, Sir, my hon. friend knows that that is not a *per capita* increase, that the Americans do not actually take as much of our fish *per capita* as they were taking 21 years ago. But he desires that, under the *modus vivendi*, the Americans should have the privilege of transshipment. Why, Sir, that is the very thing he contended against last year, and he was so positive on it that he actually went back to his utterances on the Treaty of 1871, and particularly to what he had said on that occasion, which I will now read you from the *Hansard*:

“ Any concessions to the Americans giving them the use of our ports for shelter, bait and transport, without concessions on their side of a satisfactory character in return, would, I feel confident, never prove acceptable to our people, nor be ratified by Parliament.”

An hon. gentleman who is leading an active commercial life like my hon. friend, can hardly carry all the speeches that he has made in his memory. Again, the hon. gentleman, not only through the course of the debate, but when the different clauses of the treaty were under discussion, called the attention of the hon. Finance Minister of the day to the fact that he was very much afraid that under the clause—I think it was clause 12—Canadian vessels would not enjoy in American waters the same privileges which that article accorded to American vessels in our waters. But to-day he is prepared to sacrifice the interests of Canadian fishermen without getting anything in return from the Americans. That is what the *modus vivendi* means, and although I do not pose before this House as an authority on fishing matters, I say that the majority of the fishermen of Nova Scotia would be opposed to such a measure, and I am sure it would not be in their interest to adopt it. The hon. gentleman is an advocate of the transshipment of fish. Why does he not, if he has the interest of the fishermen so much at heart, advise the transshipment of fish by steamers to the West Indies? Why does he not oppose the system which prevails to-day of allowing French fish to come into our ports, fish which receives a bounty of \$1.80 per quintal, and so prevent such great injury to our fishermen; there is a platform on which we could meet in common, because then we would be advocating in common the interests of our fishermen. But what is to be the remedy? The remedy is to be a change of Government. That is invariably the point to which all arguments from that side lead. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has pointed, as an index of the change of public opinion, to two elections which have been held in the western part of this country; he wisely made no refer-

ence to his own Province, because he knows and feels that there never was a party so firmly entrenched in the affections of a people as the party led by the right hon. Premier of this country is to-day in the affection of the people of Nova Scotia. Let me point to instances; let me point, not to Haldimand, with its meagre majority, but let me point, first of all, to Pictou, now represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and we are all glad to see the prominent position which he occupies in this country to-day. What is the result there? Was it a majority of 30, or 40, or 50? No, Sir; he was returned by acclamation. Let me point again to Cumberland, where two elections have taken place, the county so ably represented by my hon. friend Mr. Dickey. Let me point again to Shelburne, to Victoria, to Colchester. I think that is a pretty good answer to my hon. friend as to the change of sentiment that has taken place in the Province from which we both come—

Mr. KIRK. How many million dollars have the Government expended to bring it about?

Mr. RYKERT. A sore pill for you.

Mr. MITCHELL. Shut up, Charley.

Mr. KIRK. What about the ship railway and the short line?

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman contends that it would be in the interest of Nova Scotia and the fishermen of that Province that the *modus vivendi* should be continued. Sir, I take entirely antagonistic ground to that proposition. I say it is not in the interests of the people of Nova Scotia, or to the honor or dignity of this Dominion. What does he want us to do? Does he want us to crouch, to crawl on our knees to the American people, and ask them, for heaven's sake, to take pity upon us, that we are so poor that we cannot even find a market for our products; "take pity upon us, you 65,000,000 of people, you charitable people, you good people, take compassion on us." Sir, we have a great admiration for the American people, but we are not ready to fall into their arms yet. Why, Sir, has not Great Britain, has not Canada, made every effort to secure a treaty and fair business relations with them? We were not only refused the Fishery Treaty, but Great Britain has been refused the Extradition Treaty; and further than that, the representative of Great Britain was sent from that country in a way which must have filled every British subject with a feeling of humiliation; not only that, but the American Government, to whom we are told to crouch, this expiring American Government, actually recalled from London almost the best representative that the United States has ever had there, because, forsooth, it was supposed that gentleman was favorable to Great Britain. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, are we, the Canadian people, to go to Washington and say, "Have compassion on us, or we perish?" No, Sir. The hon. gentleman has used this debate as a means of calling the attention of the House—and in a manner at which I was very much surprised, under all the circumstances—to the dismissal of Mr. Ross, late collector of Customs at Halifax. For Mr. Ross, personally, I entertain the warmest feelings of friendship and regard; and knowing well that Mr. Ross, who, I imagined, had claims for consideration upon hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing well that he had requested that this matter should not be brought up in the House, I say it was an act of injustice, of unkindness, to have mentioned it in this House. Imagine, gentlemen, if any friend of ours had, through any misfortune, lost his situation in the public service, and if it was well known round these benches that he did not wish his case mentioned in Parliament, is there a man on this side of the House who, forgetting old friendship, would so disregard the wishes of an old comrade? I do not believe

Mr. KENNY.

there is. I say it is not fair, it is unkind to Mr. Ross, to bring his name up in this way. I know this is Liberty Hall, and we assert very great liberty in debate here, but when a friend has asked us not to bring his name up here, I say it is a breach of friendship to do so. Let us look at this question of Mr. Ross. Mr. Ross was a long time in the public service. Before he entered the public service he was Minister of Militia in the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and it is not for me to state the circumstances under which he lost that position or retired from his position of Minister of Militia in that Government. There are hon. gentlemen now listening to me who know a great deal more about it than I do, and if they were so disposed they could enlighten the House. I may say, however, that his retirement from the position of Minister of Militia was not voluntary; so this is not the first time that Mr. Ross has had to complain of the Governments of Canada. It is, at all events, a fact that he retired from the position of Minister of Militia and was succeeded by the Hon. Mr. Vail; and there was an interval—I forget the exact dates, but an interval of some three or four weeks when Mr. Ross held no position. Then the position of collector of customs at Halifax was assigned to him. The gravity of Mr. Ross' offence necessitated some emphatic action at the hands of this Government. On all previous occasions Mr. Ross had communicated with his Government, and very properly so. He should have assumed no responsibility, particularly as he knew from the instructions of his department that the relations between the two countries on the Fisheries question were in a very critical condition, and it was all the more necessary for him to be more cautious than under ordinary circumstances. But he transgressed the regulations of his department on a very important occasion, and the danger was that unless this transgression was emphasised not only the Government of the United States, but also the British Government would imagine that a precedent has been established, and therefore it became painfully necessary for the Government of the day to dismiss Mr. Ross or sanction his retirement. The hon. gentleman says that this intensified the unfriendly feeling which, he contends, exists between the people of the United States and Canada. So far as my reading of the American journals goes, and so far as my intercourse with American people, outside of the politicians who are looking for votes, goes, I do not believe there is any intensely hostile feeling to the people of Canada in the United States. But the sweeping assertion has been made that this dismissal has "intensified the feeling." There is no journal in the northern part of the United States which is considered to be a better exponent of republican feeling or a greater authority on fishing matters than the *Boston Advertiser*, and it referred in the following terms to the dismissal of the collector at Halifax:—

"The dismissal of the collector of customs at Halifax is an instructive objection to our Administration of the proper course to pursue towards officials who concede contested points to foreign nations. Collector Ross granted the application of Consul General Phelan for the necessary bonding papers to enable the transshipment of the fresh fish cargo of a Gloucester schooner to this city from Halifax. We need not say that we assert the American right under the mutual covenants of 1830, and ordinary international comity, to make such transshipments, but the right has been denied by the Government at Ottawa, and the collector of customs, in conceding it, in this instance, without instructions from the Dominion Government, made disavowal necessary to maintain the Canada position unimpaired."

This is an American authority, not the *ipse dixit* of any hon. gentleman, and this American journal says this course was absolutely necessary. It continues:

"Disavowal was made signal by the request for the resignation of the offending collector. As a matter of fact the cargo was not shipped overland, and the Canadian Minister of Customs does not regard its transfer as distinctly conceding the American claims, but as the concessions might be interpreted as impairing the Canadian case, it was sharply repudiated. We are sorry for the obliging collector, but our Administration can profit by the example of Canada in the treatment of officials who fail to maintain the asserted rights of the nation."

I think this is the best answer that can be given, not from the Canadian standpoint, but from the American standpoint, of the necessity that existed for such recognition of the transgression of regulations by Mr. Ross as he received. Referring again to what has appeared in an American paper in connection with this matter - because it is not fair that the Government should be blamed for upholding the dignity of our country, and adhering to the proper interpretation of international treaties—I find the following despatch appeared in American papers in connection with the transshipment of the cargo of the *M. A. Batson*:

"Capt Campbell packed 8,000 pounds of halibut in ice boxes and transhipped it by the steamer *Carroll* to Boston. The vessel has no license, and Capt. Campbell says he made the transshipment under the rights given Americans by the bonding arrangements of the Treaty of Washington. This is the first attempt made to tranship."

This despatch was telegraphed to American journals, and thus intensified American feeling, or, at all events, if it did not intensify American feeling, it proclaimed to Americans that Canada had conceded the most important point in the treaty. I may say that while I was in Halifax I had a conversation on this matter with the Consul General of the United States, a most efficient, capable, honorable officer, and that gentleman expressed to me his utter astonishment at Mr. Ross' conduct. He said that to him it was incomprehensible; and Mr. Ross himself has never attempted to explain it; he cannot do so. But what was more important was the impression it produced on the mind of the American Consul General. That gentleman, I believe, when he found the transshipment had taken place to the United States, telegraphed to his Government that Canada had conceded transshipment. Hon. gentlemen can imagine to what difficulties that might have led; so much so that the Consul General expressed to me his utter surprise that Mr. Ross should have taken such a step without consulting his Government, and have acted contrary to his written, positive and clear instructions. But the circumstances of that case were remarkable. That vessel came into Halifax and all the repairs she required involved only an outlay of 50 cents. If I could imagine such a thing, one would almost suppose an attempt was made to make up a case; I do not insinuate that for one moment, but it is extraordinary that all the repairs required involved an expenditure of only 50 cents. That is entirely different to the other case to which the hon. gentleman has referred. The second case to which he has called attention, and it is a comparatively recent occurrence, is that of an American fishing vessel which came into Halifax harbor in distress. She had experienced very stormy weather and had lost a portion of her rigging, and permission was asked to refit in Halifax, not, as the hon. gentleman has said to make Halifax her basis of supplies, but permission to obtain there the necessary outfit to enable her to return home, and whilst this was being done her cargo was allowed to be transhipped. Shall we be ever able to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite? At one moment they say: You are too severely strict with the people of the United States. They ask nothing from the Americans, but contend that we must surrender everything to them. The next moment they blame the Government because it has allowed in one instance a vessel to be refitted. In regard to the question generally of the *modus vivendi*, my hon. friend (Mr. Jones), to whom I always listen with a great deal of attention, has treated us to a dissertation regarding the farmers of Ontario, the log export duty, a reciprocity treaty, and many other questions which, to my mind, are hardly relevant to a fisheries question. But it will be for the people of Canada to adjudicate upon this question at the proper time, and, notwithstanding the jubilation with which hon. gentlemen opposite view certain elections that have taken place in the Province of Ontario, I firmly believe, knowing well the feeling of my own Province at least,

that when the time comes the people of Canada, and the people of Nova Scotia, will recognise that in the matter of this *modus vivendi* as in all other important matters, their interests are quite safe in the hands of the Government led by my friend the right hon. Premier.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Dominion Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Trow)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act incorporating the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn)

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Hawkesbury Lumber Company.—(Mr. Labrosse.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Denison.)

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 50) to amend the Act incorporating the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Marshall.)

Bill (No. 66) to ratify an exchange of land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the wires of telephone, telegraph and electric light companies in the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Small)

Bill (No. 82) to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

#### SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES.

House resumed debate on Mr. Foster's proposed motion and on Mr. Laurier's amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. In rising to take part in this discussion I may say that I am pleased to find that by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, with some few exceptions, it has been approached in a manner comparatively free from that party strife and those party references which have too often distinguished discussions in this House. I think it is a matter of great importance to Canada that, in discussing a question where international interests are involved, and particularly when the issues to be tried have yet to be settled between the countries interested in the matter, that we should endeavor to avoid as far as possible saying anything of an acrimonious nature, or anything that would place the gentlemen who for the time being are in charge of the affairs of this country, in a position of disadvantage in carrying on any negotiations which may hereafter take place. I think that is the true spirit in which we should legislate in this country. So far as I myself am concerned, whatever other parties may



do, I have held myself free in every discussion since I have been in this House, whether in the Government or outside of it, and endeavored to control myself in such a way when addressing this Parliament that anything I might say, no matter whether against the Government of the day, or whether in favor of my party interests, when I had party interests, I endeavored in every such case to avoid saying anything that would be detrimental to Canada in any negotiations that might be carried on. That is the line I propose to take to-night, and I will ask this House to bear with me for a very short time in deed. On this subject, last Session, I delivered a speech of some two and a half hours duration, when the Fishery Treaty was before the House. Sir Charles Tupper then ably laid the views entertained by him and the Government he represented before Parliament, and I feel it would be taxing the time of this House too much if I were to occupy more than a very brief space in stating my views on this question. It is well that we should know what is ahead of us, and I may be permitted to claim a little prophetic vision on this subject. I can see that the advent of Sir Charles Tupper (who so ably conducted the negotiations at Washington, and although he conducted them, not to my satisfaction, I am quite satisfied he did the best he could).—I am glad to find that he is again on the ocean coming to Canada, and that he will arrive within the next forty-eight hours in New York.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is there now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad that he is there. I have no doubt as to the object of his mission to this country. I have no doubt in my mind that Sir Charles Tupper is coming out here charged by the British Government to lay before the Cabinet of the Dominion of Canada, the views, personally intimated to him, which the English Cabinet entertains in relation to this question. We all know that the British Government are extremely desirous to avoid any difficulty with our neighbors to the south of the boundary line. We know it is neither their interests nor inclination that those difficulties should exist, and we know from past experience that they have been only too ready to sacrifice the interests of Canada for the sake of peace. While I make this statement, I am not one who regrets that peace has been maintained. I believe that any sacrifice, short of the loss of national honor, is not too dearly made in order to obtain that great object with a people who are so nearly allied to us in race, in religion, in language and in everything that tends to advance civilisation and christianity at the present day. I am pleased to believe that the sentiments of both sides of this House will be as far as they can, to promote the object which the British Government have in view in maintaining that peace. I want to warn the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, from experience of the last twenty-five years, of the manner in which British views have been expressed, and I want also to warn the people of Canada, I desire to warn them that there is a limit, an extent to which they may not go, and satisfy the public mind of Canada. It may not be out of place at present for me to place briefly before the House the actual position of the Fishery question. I will not go back beyond the Convention of 1818, when the rights of the people of Canada were recognised and admitted by the people of the United States, and when were defined the privileges the people of Canada should possess and the rights the Americans should have. It was then defined that the line of three miles—and I make the statement now in order to meet the statement made by the right hon. the First Minister and by the Minister of Finance the other day, that they had always guarded the true interests and preserved intact all the rights granted to Canada by the Convention of 1818, and that to-day we were enforcing the rights of the Treaty of 1818

Mr. MITCHELL,

just as they had been enforced in years past. By that Treaty of 1818, we all know that the Americans agreed they should have no rights within a line of three miles drawn from the headlands, bays, and coasts and shores of Canada. My hon. friend will bear me out in saying that for forty years after that treaty was made the construction put upon it was that the Americans had no right within any one of these bays or within three miles line from headland to headland along our shores and coasts. For forty years the British Government protected that construction, and the Americans acknowledged it, and I refer to my speech of last Session for all the authorities and quotations to sustain that assertion. Does the right hon. gentleman mean to say that to-day we are assuming the position which we maintained for forty years in relation to the rights Canada possesses, and which, with the protection of the parent Government, we enjoyed up to the Elgin Treaty of 1854? I may say here that I agree with hon. gentlemen who hold that the Elgin Treaty was eminently in the interests of this Canada of ours. Under that treaty, for the twelve years of its existence, the trade of this country increased to an enormous extent with the American States, just as that of the American States increased with us. I hold that the treaty was mutually beneficial, and that if it had been continued Canada would be in a very different position to-day. At the time the treaty was made one of its conditions was that the Americans should enjoy free intercourse in common with the citizens of Canada in the fisheries along our coasts. The expiration of that treaty brought about the suspension of that particular privilege. But although the rights of the Americans to participate in our fisheries ceased at the termination of the treaty, we found ourselves in this position, that while the British Government, up to the time of the Elgin Treaty, had sustained the claim of Canada to the headlands, bays, harbors and ports of Canada, and for three miles outside of them, while the British Government had up to that time sustained that construction of the treaty and the Americans, had admitted it, yet, when the treaty expired in 1866, we know that while the Government of Canada claimed our full rights—and I will do my right hon. friend the credit of saying that at that time the despatches written under his instructions claiming that construction and the enforcement of our rights on the part of the mother country, were a credit to him and to the Government of which he was one of the heads at the time—the British Government endeavored, in order to avoid difficulties with the United States, to get some arrangement made by which we should allow the Americans to come in and fish for one year. Well, that privilege was conceded. The right hon. gentleman sent down to the Maritime Provinces, for that was before Confederation, to induce us to aid him in coming to some arrangement, and the Maritimes Provinces consented to an arrangement by which for one year American fishermen should enjoy with ours the same privileges they had enjoyed during the twelve years existence of the Elgin Treaty. After 1867, when Confederation was established and the Department of Marine and Fisheries created and organized, we had to take up the question; and before the next fishing season we represented to the British Government that it was inadvisable to continue that system; that our rights having revived and those of the Americans having dropped after the expiration of the Elgin Treaty, it was not advisable to continue granting them that privilege. We represented that if we continued, year after year, to allow them to come in and participate in those fisheries, without any reciprocal advantages being given by them, they would in lapse of time consider our title had been prescribed and claim the privilege as an absolute right. We were induced, however, by the British Government, for three years to permit that kind of thing to go on, and we saw at last it would only end in our losing our rights altogether unless some

action was taken. We did take some action I was, under the direction of the right hon. the First Minister, empowered to put on a force for the protection of our fisheries, and did so; and while that continued our rights were tolerably well protected, but only to a limited extent. The British Government would not allow us to enforce our rights beyond three miles of the shore. The old question of the headlands they desired should remain in abeyance, and under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies of that day, we had to rescind the instructions which I had issued. Canada had no power to protect her rights beyond the three-mile shore limit, that being the municipal extent of her jurisdiction, and the force she put on was merely a police force. Her Majesty's vessels were the only source we had to look to for protection of our rights under the Convention of 1818. At that time, however, there were indications on the part of the British Government that in all probability they would abandon the claim which they for forty years had sustained in regard to the headlands. My hon. friend says now, speaking of his Government, that they have abandoned no portion of the rights which Canada acquired under the Treaty of 1818; but I would like to say this to him, that when he makes that remark, he has failed to observe the fact that we have never attempted to enforce, because the British Government would not do it, and we for want of municipal jurisdiction outside of the three-mile limit could not do it, that special right which we formerly enjoyed and which has remained in abeyance. I mention that fact, not to bring a charge against the Government of the day, for I believe they have endeavored to press upon the British administration in the strongest way they could the necessity which exists of enforcing our complete rights; but the Americans, from the laxity of the rule which had crept in and from the fact that for twelve years during the existence of the Elgin Treaty they had enjoyed almost complete immunity, the British Government felt reluctant to enforce the question of our rights to the headlands and bays. I mention this for two reasons. First, to point out to the hon. gentleman that he is wrong in his statement, that the Government of Canada to-day are enforcing and carrying out every right which Canada enjoyed under the Convention of 1818. I make it for another reason, and I may say here, in referring to Sir Charles Tupper's advent to the shores of America again, that he has come for a purpose. I venture to prophesy that his chief object is, under personal instructions from the Ministry of England, to confer with the Cabinet of Canada, and that he will again be an ambassador to Washington, or, at all events, a confidential missionary for the purpose of viewing out the land. My belief is that we will find ourselves in the same position now as we found ourselves in in former years where the British Government have had a finger in the pie in regard to our negotiations. If there were one thing more than another which would make me view with satisfaction the position of hon. gentlemen in bringing forward a resolution declaring that we should have our own commercial treaties arranged by our own men, it is this case of the last Washington Treaty. I have no doubt that Sir Charles Tupper will go down to Washington again, and I may say that there are few men, if any, in Canada who are better qualified to carry on such negotiations than that hon. gentleman, and, though I do not agree with the provisions of the treaty which was made last year or believe that it was in the interest of Canada, I said then and I say now that I believed he used every means in his power, and that, if he failed to get what Canada was entitled to, it was because he was restrained by the other representatives of the English Government and by that Government under whom he acted. I mention this now, because I do not know what steps the Government may take in regard to the renewal of negotiations, and I have no doubt that negotiations will be renewed.

If we can believe what we hear, if we can believe that the statements we see in the press are true, and if we can believe what the right hon. gentleman said the other day in this House, negotiations have already been renewed in an informal way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not at all intend to convey the idea that any negotiations, formal or informal, were commenced. I simply said that I had unofficial information as to the feelings of the incoming Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I certainly understood that some negotiations had taken place, or some representations had been made to the right hon. gentleman in regard to the feelings of the new administration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not intend to convey that at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course I accept the right hon. gentleman's statement, and I take that back. However, we find in some of the papers published in the United States positive statements as to what is going on in Washington. We know there are gentlemen there now who are interesting themselves in that matter, and those gentlemen, I think, I may safely say, are in communication with the right hon. gentleman on the subject. Whether he has authorized those negotiations or not, I cannot say, and, therefore, I will not assume that he has, but I think we may fairly assume that, gentlemen who are negotiating in that way—and the right hon. gentleman admits that he has knowledge of something of the kind going on—do not, as a rule, do that without some encouragement from those who are in authority here. Further, if the right hon. gentleman has people there who are feeling the way to bring these difficulties to a friendly termination, he is only doing what is in the interests of the country and in the interest of his Government, and for my part I entirely approve of it. We all know that there are certain informal steps to be taken before we can approach a matter of such great importance as this, and I am only glad to hear that something of that kind is being done by someone in concert with the Government of the day, and that I hope it will have a satisfactory result. I would like to ask my right hon. friend a question in regard to the treaty of last year which this House unanimously adopted, not because they believed it was in the interests of Canada, or that Canada had received fair play in that treaty, but because they desired to see peace prevail. We, on this side of the House, knew that, when the ambassador of the right hon. gentleman and the English Government came here with a treaty completed between the English ambassadors on the one hand and the American Government on the other hand, it would be adopted by this House, whether we liked it or not. We, on this side of the House, stated clearly that we did not believe it was a fair treaty for Canada, and I repeat now what I think it is my duty to repeat, especially when negotiations may be further renewed, that that treaty was almost a complete give-away of what Canada had contended for for the last twenty years, and had enjoyed for over fifty years. I urge upon the Government that, in the renewal of negotiations, we should not be simply content to claim what was in the treaty of last year, because that was rejected by the United States Senate, but that we should claim what we are entitled to, the privileges which have been recognised and enforced by the British Government on our behalf and which have been acknowledged by every Government from 1818 down, and that we should let the Americans know that, though for the sake of peace that Treaty was accepted last year, it was not because it was what we thought Canada was entitled to, but that it was simply in the interests of peace that we accepted what was

proposed. Let any man take a map and draw a line three miles outside of the headlands on our three thousand miles of coast, let him take the fishing privileges and the water territory, which that includes, and then let him look at the delimitations which Sir Charles Tupper laid before this House, and he will see what a fragmentary portion of our rights is reserved under that treaty. But our hands were tied on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to follow the right hon. gentleman no matter what arrangement he might take, and all we could do was to assent to that arrangement. After the treaty was assented to here, a very unkind remark was made by an hon. Minister, who asked why we did not challenge the treaty, take a vote upon it, and test the feeling of the House. We had no power to test the public feeling. All we could do, when the Government submitted it to us, was to protest against it and accept it. We had one consolation. We thought, if we accepted it unanimously, it would be accepted by the Senate of the United States, and it would be a great boon to Canada, though we gave all those privileges away. It would have been a boon to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces if the United States Senate had accepted that treaty, as it would have given them peace, though at the sacrifice of their interests. I do not wish to make any reflections on our neighbors, but there cannot be much doubt that the Senate rejected that treaty because the Republican majority in that House felt bound to defeat their Democratic opponents, and, on grounds of party policy mainly they were bound to reject that treaty. I am not going to take up much of the time of the House in regard to what I stated at such great length last year and supported by such clear proof, as to the treatment which we have received from the British Government; but I am afraid that the British Government will again send some half-hearted and weak-hearted man to Washington, who will influence the commissioner whom Canada may send, if she does send one, and that we will be over-ridden again, not in the interests of this country, but in the interests of Britain, and because of their desire to maintain peace at the risk of all the interests of Canada. Sir, I hope this will not be the case, but when I look at what has taken place in the last twenty-five years—and I am pretty well conversant with the correspondence which has taken place during that time—I must say that I look with dread upon any renewal of negotiations where the British Government has anything to do with them. Why, Sir, the High Commissioner told us last year that there was a great power behind us. If that power is only behind us, and is only a sham, only a dummy, what is the use of it? We would have been far better alone. I believe one of the causes which defeated that treaty in the Senate was a dislike and hatred to England. We know there is in that great country an element of eight millions of Irishmen, and we know the feelings that have been excited in the Irishmen in the United States toward Great Britain, and we know that has always had a controlling influence whenever England's name has been mentioned, or England's interests are involved in the States. What I fear now is that that feeling is still in existence, and when we come to have our interests dealt with, we will find that we shall have that feeling to fight, as well as the political one. Now I think I have said enough of that portion of the question which is under consideration. It has been stated that negotiations had been going on with the view to renewed trade relations between the Americans and Canada. Sir, I believe that there has been for some time, notwithstanding the statements made from the other side of the House, a growing feeling on the part of the people of the United States towards closer commercial and business relations with the people of this country. We all know that a strong party feeling exists in the United States in favor of a reduction of their high tariff, that their accumulated revenues have come to be an

Mr. MITCHELL.

embarrassment to the trade of the country, and that each party is shifting around to find the best way to reduce the revenue which they find to be detrimental to the prosperity of their country. Sir, we have had announced to-day the action of the Congress of the United States, who have almost unanimously adopted a resolution submitted by Mr. Hitt, a very prominent and able man, in favor of Commercial Union. Now, Sir, I am no Commercial Unionist, I have never been, and the paper I control has endeavored to show the difficulties which would surround any arrangement for Commercial Union. But, Sir, I will tell you what I am. I am in favor of more extended trade with the United States in another shape very closely allied to Commercial Union. I have often been asked: "What is the difference between Commercial Union and the Unrestricted Reciprocity which your paper, the *Herald*, advocates, and which you have always advocated in Parliament?" The difference is this, and it is just as well that it should be stated: In the case of Commercial Union it would be an assimilation of the tariffs, they would be the same in both countries, and the arrangement of that tariff could only be attained by a conference, and the result would be that sixty millions could not give way to five millions, and unless they let the tail wag the dog Canada would have very little to say about it. For that reason I have not been in favor of Commercial Union. But let us get Unrestricted Reciprocity. Let each country make its own tariff, and let both agree to assimilate them to one another as far as they can, and it is no odds whether they would be exactly the same or not. There is very little difference between the two now; the difference is only that probably the United States would control the regulation of the tariff. Under Unrestricted Reciprocity that could not be, because we in Canada would make our own tariff. Why should we not? Are we not doing it now? Are we not rapidly approaching to the high standard of taxation that exists in the United States? There the tendency is to lower the tariff, here the tendency is to raise it. This very week, this very day I believe, at all events yesterday—a delegation of millers were down to ask for an increase of a dollar a barrel on the food of the poor man, upon the flour that he eats. Sir, look at the iron men. The Government have been pestered with them ever since this Parliament opened—delegation after delegation of them coming on. I asked one of them the other day: "What is the average condition of the tariff in regard to its effect on iron products now?" He told me, 50 per cent. He said the blast furnaces which Sir Charles Tupper portrayed, that would be scattered all over the country, built here and there, and everywhere, when this high tariff was adopted some years ago—why, he said, not one of them has ever been constructed, not a new one started yet. But they are actually asking for higher duties to be put on iron; these representatives of the one blast furnace in Canada, the Londonderry Works, come here and ask for an increased duty of 10 per cent. to be put upon iron imported into the country. We find the ten rolling mills sending delegations here to oppose that, and asking the Government not to increase the duty. The fact is, the chickens are coming home to roost amongst these iron men, and they are finding out the difficulty, the evil effects of the policy adopted by this protective Government, this so called National Policy, which my right hon. friend led the country into adopting years ago, led it with misrepresentation—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With your assistance.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes with my assistance, because I was deluded; but thank God the scales have fallen from my eyes. When, in order to drive the Mackenzie Government out of power—and I was as anxious to do it as my right hon. friend was—yes, I am honest about the thing, I do not carry two faces under one hat, I say what I think and what I know to be true—when the right hon. gentle-

man talked of this National Policy, about which he had no more conviction, but only accepted it as an opportunist, he accepted it because he was told that it would carry him into power, and it did. But when I accepted it as first propounded, there was no talk of a duty of 50 cents per barrel upon flour, no talk of 50 per cent. duty upon iron used by every farmer, every lumberman and every fisherman in the country. It was by misrepresentation that my hon. friend succeeded in sailing into power on his National Policy, with a promise of only a 25 per cent. maximum rate.

Mr. JONES. "Telegraph to Boyd."

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course he telegraphed to Boyd, and Boyd telegraphed back. He told Boyd that there was to be no increase over 25 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. Merely a readjustment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know my right hon. friend pretty well; we have foregathered before now. I may say that is the reason the hon. gentleman taunts me with assisting him in getting the National Policy imposed upon this country. I did help him, but it was under false pretences. I never dreamed of a duty of 50 cents a barrel on flour, 40 cents upon corn meal, \$2 upon pork, 35 per cent. upon cottons, worn by the people, 35 per cent. upon woollens, 150 per cent. upon some other articles that I named the other night. Sir, this tariff has grown like the horse leech; it is "give, give" all the time. They want more and more, and they are coming here and asking for it now. I saw some millers here to-day, I believe some of them are in the gallery listening to me now; they want an increased duty upon flour, \$1 a barrel is all they want. I should like to know what the poor fishermen, and lumbermen, and farmers in my county—they are all half farmers, half lumbermen and half fishermen, for that is the class we have on our shores—would say if I quietly sat here and consented to such proposition without resenting it and protesting against it as I am doing to-night, and as I shall continue to do if such a proposition is attempted to be carried. That is the kind of National Policy my right hon. friend has reached. He has advanced from a National Policy to adopt a protective policy, and a mighty hard one at that. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about not being able to make an arrangement with the United States. Why, is it because there is any great difference between the tariffs of the two countries? No. The Americans have had a high protective tariff for many years until they have found it to be an incubus, that it has produced and fostered the growth of institutions which are cursing the country in the form of "combines" and that it is taxing the many for special purposes to enrich the few. That is about what the protective policy has done there. The right hon. gentleman having once got the wedge entered by means of the National Policy, plausible as his theory was at the time, because it had then none of the objectionable features in regard to taxing the poor man's bread, has continued and is still continuing to drive it home, and while I fear he is doing it in a way that will injure the people, I hope it will drive him from power. I do not propose to continue my remarks; I feel that after occupying over two hours last Session in placing my views on the fisheries question before the House, I should not tax the patience of the House too much to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. The leader of the Government, when replying to the leader of the Opposition the other day, made some observations on which I will say a few words, and I hope my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will excuse me if I say a word in his defence. I have no right to speak for him, but with his permission I will just say

this: The right hon. gentleman charged my hon. friend with being a friend to every country but his own. That expression came with very bad grace from the hon. gentleman. He also said that he did not want to go on his bended knees to the United States, and beg them to give us reciprocity. Is there no method of approaching an independent and splendid people other than by actions either of of servility or of defiance? The right hon. gentleman on the one hand, assumes an attitude of opposition and defiance to them, and, on the other hand, he says: Do you want Canada to go on bended knees to ask the United States to give us reciprocity. There is a medium course which should be adopted by a statesman,—it is that of conciliation, one whereby he might approach a great country such as the United States, and while he commanded their respect, at the same time he would lead them to consider any proposition which might be made to them in a fair and honorable spirit. That is the course I should like to see adopted, not the course which the right hon. gentleman and his Government have pursued for several years past towards that country. Is he likely to accomplish anything with that people by the course which he has pursued with regard to the fisheries? When the treaty expired in 1886, what course did he pursue? The most stringent one possible. I do not know what the instructions were that were given to the commanders of the cruisers, because, up to this day, although they have been several times asked for, they have never been produced, or we have never ascertained what they were, but we do know what the effect has been. The hon. gentleman's officers—I hold him responsible for their actions—have pursued a course towards the fishermen of the United States that was not warranted by the circumstances. When the *D. J. Adams* and the *Doughty* were seized within three days in the Bay of Fundy, they were seized on the most frivolous pretext. They were held in the port of Halifax for months and months, and I believe they were only released—I have been told so by an hon. friend on this side of the House—when the treaty which Sir Charles Tupper assisted to negotiate was agreed upon. I have never seen evidence of that release or despatches relating to it, but I am informed by some of my hon. friends that they saw something of the kind and that those vessels were released after the treaty was made. I told the right hon. gentleman when he seized the *D. C. Adams* that he had acted wrongly and that the Government's action could not be sustained, and moreover that the course pursued was not only very frivolous but very vexatious and annoying to a proud spirited people like the Americans. The right hon. the First Minister the other day, when dealing with the statements made by the leader of the Opposition, said the Government had not done a single act which they were not justified in doing. I say there have been innumerable such acts and the seizures of those two vessels were acts not justified by the facts. Is it the way to conciliate a great people like the people of the United States, to have their flag pulled down by one of our cruisers? Is there anything that a proud people would resent more quickly than such an act? Yet this was done by the master of one of the cruisers. I am in favor of protecting the fisheries of this country, I am in favor of protecting our rights, and of doing it in a manly and independent way, but I am in favor of doing it with that moderation and that conciliation as well for the prejudices, as the feelings and rights of others, as we would like to have shown to ourselves. That course has not been pursued by the right hon. gentleman and his Government, and I desire now to state, that the course which the Government pursued in 1886, was not pursued in 1887, I am glad to say, because of the warning they received, and the effect was, that even the High Commissioner himself, resented the course taken, and the policy was changed. I believe it is our duty, while

we uphold our rights, to uphold them in a manner so as to give as little offence as possible to those with whom we are brought in contact, and if we expect to accomplish anything by entering into negotiations with the people of the United States, we must act fairly and squarely, and not act so as to provoke trouble, and seek to become aggressive. It is to the interest of this country that we should endeavor to secure renewed trade relations with the people of the United States. I believe they have now opened the door by the resolution which has been passed by Congress, and hon. gentlemen opposite can no longer say we have to go cringing to the United States. They have invited us to approach them; they have passed unanimously a resolution in Congress declaring themselves in favor of Commercial Union, and the Commercial Union may not be what we desire nor perhaps what we would consider. Yet it is such a long step on the way to what we desire, namely Unrestricted Reciprocity, that if negotiations were properly handled we could no doubt accomplish our object. But I fear for the result. The leader of the Government, after building up the sugar refineries, who are making enormous profits year after year, the cotton factories which are making large dividends, and some of them are already coming to grief because the unnatural bounties offered have caused so many to be established—after building up iron foundries and rolling mills, nail factories and factories of various kinds, the right hon. gentleman will find himself embarrassed in placing such a proposition before the United States as they can accept. The right hon. gentleman will find that he will not be assisted by those men who had in the past made contributions for election purposes. They will be very apt to split upon him, and the public will obtain a good deal of information about these matters which they do not now possess, and in place of handing the right hon. gentlemen contributions at the next general election they will very coolly tell him: No, we have done enough for you, you must now hold your own, you have gone back on us. Of course, that is assuming the right hon. gentleman goes to the United States with a desire to make a fair reciprocal arrangement, and if he does not, I do not suppose he will succeed in getting one. I have now stated briefly my views upon this matter. I would have gone at greater length into it were it not that I did so last year and I do not feel like inflicting upon the the House a repetition of the arguments which I used at length last Session. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude.

Mr. CASEY. I regard the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down as being of special weight to this House and to the country. The views of a gentleman who was once an honest supporter of what he conceived to be the National Policy as explained by the author of it, and his views on the National Policy as it exists to-day are particularly valuable. If the promises made to the country in regard to the National Policy have been so falsified subsequently, that one of its original supporters has been compelled contrary to his old associations, and contrary to his convictions on the subject, to condemn that policy that he once supported, it says a great deal against the policy in question. Coming back to the subject more immediately before us,—the resolution proposed by the hon. the leader of this side of the House and the answer of the right hon. the Premier to my hon. friend's speech, I am reluctantly compelled to say that the policy of the Government as hitherto practised in regard to the fisheries, and as outlined by the hon. gentleman's speech on the question is the genuine old fashioned, true blue, Tory policy of bluster and back down. When the Washington Treaty came to a conclusion by notice from the United States there was a short interval of the policy of bluster indulged in. Then it was found that negotiations must be

Mr. MITCHELL.

entered into and the Government most flagrantly backed down from the position they had taken in the early stages of the discussion. They had told Canadians, and told the Government of the United States, that to surrender certain rights in regard to these fisheries would be to surrender territorial rights—a part of the heritage of this country and which could not be surrendered without treason to the best interests of the people. The Commissioner of this Government, in conjunction with the British Commissioner, went to Washington and surrendered these rights. Not only did they do this, but they arranged a *modus vivendi*, of which so much as been said, giving a certain qualified admission to our fisheries on certain terms which were to subsist until the negotiations were finally closed, and it was found to be utterly impossible to conclude the treaty. In that the Government practised the policy of bluster and back down. In the new negotiations which had been initiated as would appear through the instrumentality of the same gentleman who inaugurated the last negotiations—the instrumentality of the annexationist and traitor Erastus Wiman, the policy of bluster has been practised, so far at least as the public utterances of the Government in Canada are concerned. I do not know what has been said to the United States Government by their special ambassador, but I know that their policy in Canada has been one of bluster. I beg to prophesy that perhaps before the end of this Session, and certainly before a very long time thereafter a policy of back down will have succeeded to this policy of bluster and we shall find the Government taking in many respects, if not in all, the suggestions and the position which we urge they ought to take now. With whatever rivals or opponents the Government of the day is engaged; whether it be with a few hundred half-breeds in the North-West or sixty millions of people to the south of us, we always find that they pursue a policy of bluster, in the first place, and of back down in the second place, when they find that bluster won't do. It is that which galls them in discussing this motion of my right hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Laurier.) It galls them to know, as they do in their heart and conscience, that in a short time they will have to adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and perhaps to go further than he has urged them to do. It is evident that they are not comfortable in their minds on this subject, and not only are they uncomfortable, but, I might say in a metaphorical sense, that they are feeling ill. The proof of this is that when a man feels sick he generally sends for the doctor. The Government undoubtedly feel sick on the present occasion for they have sent for the doctor: they have sent for the great medicine man of the party, the gentleman who is the great healer of all breaches in the party, their great deliverer, without whom nothing is done that is done on that side of the House; and upon whom the chief of the party seems to rely as upon a superior and overpowering intellect. Without Sir Charles Tupper nothing of importance has been done for years past, and when we see him appear suddenly in Ottawa, a couple of months before he was expected, we know that the patient has been very ill, and that the doctor has been sent for to try, if possible, to cure his malady. Whether the doctor will be successful or not it is impossible to say, but I am quite certain that that distinguished physician, diplomatist and politician, will, in all probability, inaugurate a new course of treatment. The drugs to be administered to the Government, and the nostrums to their supporters and the pabulum to be given to the United States Government will all be changed. We shall have a total change of tone in the treatment of this great question now that the great doctor, the great medicine man and the great general mediator of the Conservative party and of its chieftain, has arrived on the scene. Before I go further into these general remarks I want to allude to some statements made by the right hon. the Premier when

we last discussed this question. He told us that when he was negotiating the Washington Treaty in 1871 he was heavily handicapped and he was prevented from securing what he wished by the fact of a certain resolution regarding the duty on American products having been passed here in his absence. In relating briefly the course of discussion between him and the American commissioners and the offer they made, he said :

"But when this subject was being discussed the Canadian Parliament was sitting here, I being at that time in Washington, and Parliament *suendo diabolo*, Mr. Holton passed a Bill taking the duty off coal and salt, and I was confronted by that vote of the Canadian Parliament. We were completely sold by our own people, and Mr. Hamilton Fish, chairman of the American Commission, with a quiet chuckle, said : We withdraw our offer."

Now, Sir, this statement was not new on the part of the hon. gentleman, for so long ago as 1872 when he was making a speech in Peterborough during the election campaign, he gave us a somewhat similar account of these transactions. He said :

"From day to day I was fighting that battle. In that struggle I had every chance of success—that at least a fair chance of success—when judge of my surprise, my honor, when I found that in my absence Parliament then sitting at Ottawa took the Opposition, not regarding the peculiar position of the representatives of this country on the Commission, regardless, I say it boldly, of the interests of this country with an utter want of patriotism in this case at least, and in defiance of the remonstrances, even of the earnest entreaties of my colleagues, proposed and forced upon Parliament a repeal of the National Policy Act by which we had put a duty on certain American productions such as flour, coal and salt."

Now, Sir, that proves that even as early as 1872 the hon. gentleman's recollection of that matter was considerably muddled; for, although the proceedings had only taken place a year and a half before, he had managed to give as complete a misstatement as possible of the facts of the case. Instead of his colleagues having earnestly protested and entreated against the passage of the Act in question, repealing the so-called National Policy, I find in the Votes and Proceedings of the 22nd of March, on which day the vote was taken, that every colleague of the hon. gentleman who was then in the House voted for that Act against which he says they earnestly entreated. I find the names of Hincks, Howe, Langevin, Robitaille, Tilley, Tupper, and two gentlemen who are still in the House, Cameron of Inverness and Costigan, recorded as voting for that resolution which the hon. gentleman said killed the negotiations at Washington. It might be possible to excuse a slip of memory on the part of the right hon. gentleman at this late date, but it was not excusable then. After hearing the right hon. gentleman state that Hamilton Fish, with a quiet chuckle, "We withdraw the offer," I consulted a friend now in the House, who recalled to my memory the fact that Hamilton Fish had written a letter on this subject shortly after the negotiations. It is published in the *Globe* of the 27th of August, 1872, and is as follows :

"DAVID MILLS, Esq., Clearville, Canada.

"SIR,—Your letter dated 5th July was not received until within the last three days. You ask whether the action of the Canadian Parliament in March, 1871, in repealing the Act of the previous year, imposing duties on coal, salt, flour, &c., influenced the action of the Government of the United States in declining to admit salt, lumber and coal, the products of Canada, free from duty. Your reference is undoubtedly to the proceedings of the Joint High Commission in session in Washington in the spring of 1871. I have no hesitation in saying that the position and determination of the American Commissioners with regard to the question of duties on articles the products of Canada, were not in the slightest degree influenced by the action of the Canadian Parliament, repealing the Act imposing duties on American products.

"I am,

"Very respectfully yours,

"HAMILTON FISH,

"Secretary of State, U. S."

That is Mr. Fish's account of the interview. The right hon. gentleman says that Mr. Fish, with a quiet chuckle, said : "We withdraw the offer," and said it in consequence of the action of the Canadian Government. Mr. Fish, immediately

after the event in question, said that action had not the slightest influence upon their decision. But we scarcely need Mr. Fish's testimony on the subject, for we find from the Journals of the House that this action of the Canadian Parliament took place on the 22nd of March, and we find from the protocols of the Commission itself that it was on the 25th of March, three days after, that the American Commissioners made the offer, and that they did not withdraw it until the 17th of April. Therefore, the action of the Canadian Parliament could have had nothing to do with the position of the American Commissioners in the matter, even if we had not Mr. Fish's positive statement to the contrary. But, Sir, if it were possible that it had any effect on the result, the right hon. gentleman is as responsible as his colleagues for that action. Whether it was the devil or Mr. Holton who persuaded his colleagues to vote in that way, he is responsible for their action, and must bear that responsibility. Now, Sir, this is not the only peculiar statement made by the right hon. gentleman in his speech the other day; and since we have found him so clearly wrong in this, I think we may judge his other statements by the same standard. It is quite clear, in regard to that matter, that either his memory is totally untrustworthy, or that he was misinformed as to the fact of the case. The latter supposition is out of the question since he was one of the parties concerned in the negotiations. Therefore his memory, to put it mildly, is utterly untrustworthy in stating past facts concerning negotiations in which he was engaged. But when he comes to speak of later matters, we find him equally untrustworthy. He says :

"We adopted, *ex necessitate*, after the termination of the Treaty of 1871, the course of defending our own waters, of keeping our own property to ourselves, of keeping poachers and smugglers out of our preserves."

Well, Sir, did the hon. gentleman and his colleagues do that? I think it is in the memory of every member of this House that in the first fishing season after the termination of that treaty, the Government gave up everything, which he says incorrectly my hon. friend and leader proposes to do on this basis of the *modus vivendi*. They did worse than that. They gave the Americans the free use of our fisheries in that fishing season without any *modus vivendi* or license at all; they let them go on and fish just as if the treaty was not in existence; and it was not until a year after that they began the policy of bluster which finally, as I have said, ended in the policy of breakdown. Then, he goes on :

"Mr. Bayard went further, and we could not induce him, Sir Charles could not induce him, nor could the British Government induce him, to consent specifically and explicitly to a statement that the Commissioners should have full power to enter into the subject of a commercial treaty. But it is mentioned incidentally."

What is the fact, Sir? The fact is that after Mr. Erastus Wiman, the annexationist traitor as they called him, had put Sir Charles Tupper into communication with Mr. Bayard, Mr. Bayard was the first to suggest, as the only basis of a satisfactory arrangement between the two countries, a treaty securing enlarged commercial relations between us, not as an incidental, but as the main basis of any possible solution of the difficulty. And when the Commission met and was asked to consider commercial questions, the right hon. gentleman says :

"The American commissioners withdrew even from the expressions that had been used in the previous correspondence; they refused to take up the question of trade relations, they confined themselves to the fisheries."

One would naturally suppose from this that there had been some change of attitude on the part of the American Government; but the protocols show an entirely different state of things. They do not show that there was any change of intention on the part of Mr. Bayard or his colleagues. They only show that after the Commission met, the American Commissioners stated that they had no power from Con-

gress to negotiate a commercial treaty at all, but only power to negotiate as to the meaning of the Treaty of 1818, and they said: We cannot go beyond our powers. Nobody on the part of the United States Government has said that they were unwilling to consider the question of a commercial treaty, it was merely to state, as a simple legal fact, that they had not power to consider such a question, and it is utterly unfair and beyond the question to take that statement as a proof that the American Government are unwilling to consider any such question. The hon. the Minister of Finance took the same line that the United States Government were not willing to consider any such question, he challenged everybody on this side to show a single leading opinion in the strong dominant public opinion of the United States in favor of increased trade relations on the lines we laid down. Further on, he said:

"I do not speak here of the Butterworths and the Hitts, and the other men strong in position in the United States; I do not speak of the papers of New York, Boston and Chicago, which show the dominant public sentiment of the country; in not one of these can you find a defendant of unrestricted reciprocity; in every one you may find a reference to "manifest destiny."

The best answer to that is given by the resolution passed almost unanimously by the Congress of the United States in favor of commercial union with Canada, or reciprocity on a basis which appears to amount to about the same thing. If the people of the United States are willing to consider commercial union, they are willing to consider extended trade relations with Canada. The challenge of the hon. gentleman has been met, and he will have to confess that when he threw out that challenge in the heat of discussion he exposed himself to a crushing reply which has been given by the Congress of the United States. It is proven now by the only body who can speak authoritatively for the American people that they are not only ready but anxious to consider trade relations with Canada, and if our Government refuses, as they will refuse by negating this resolution, to take steps towards negotiating with the United States Government for improved trade relations, they will be throwing away an offer which may not be repeated. All my hon. friend's motion asks for is that we should deal in a neighborly manner with our neighbors; all he asks for is that we should enter into negotiations for the purpose of settling the trade question and the question of the fisheries on a friendly basis, which Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard agreed, two years ago, was the only basis on which these questions could be settled. Hon. gentlemen opposite find a great deal of fault because we ask to be represented by Canadians in the making of our treaties. Well, we were represented by a Canadian when the last treaty was made, and the only trouble was that his hands were tied. He was under the direction of a man, not a Canadian, who did not care for Canadian interests, and whose principal ambition was to return to England with a treaty of some kind, no matter what might be the fate of the treaty afterwards. The presence of Mr. Chamberlain was no doubt the cause of the treaty being so little favorable to Canada, and of its rejection afterwards, such as it was, by the Senate of the United States. I have no hesitation in saying that if Sir Charles Tupper had been alone, he would have made a much better treaty, and it would have been accepted by the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, when we speak of making treaties as Canadians and by the authority of the Queen in Canada instead of the Queen in England, that we are becoming disloyal; they say that in that case we would have to negotiate without the prestige of England at our back, and without the assistance of British diplomacy, and without any guarantee that the treaties would be enforced by British power. This is pure nonsense. The Queen is Queen of Canada as well as of Great Britain. What she does by the advice of her

Mr. CASEY.

Ministers in Canada, through the medium of the Governor General, is done by her and on the advice of her Ministers as much as if it were done on the advice of her Ministers in Downing street and by her direct authority. The treaty-making power is a prerogative of the Queen which she can delegate to her representative here, the Governor General, and if this treaty were made altogether between Canadian Ambassadors and American Commissioners, and ratified only by this Parliament, it would be just as much a treaty between Great Britain and the States as if it had been made through the medium of her Ministers in Downing street. The Queen's prerogative is the same no matter whether the medium of exercising it comes from Downing street or otherwise, and we should have the prestige of England at our back and the guarantee of British authorities in a treaty made by Canadian Ambassadors just as we would in a treaty made by those sent from England. The treaty would be just as binding on the British Government and the British Government would be just as much bound to enforce it, as if it were made by Ambassadors sent directly from home. The only question is, how can such treaties be most conveniently made? It stands to reason and common sense that they can be better made by ambassadors from here, conversant with the wants and circumstances of the country, than by those from from England who know nothing about them and care less. Where has the friction arisen with regard to the Treaty of 1818 or the Washington Treaty? It has arisen in the carrying out of the treaties, in the way American fishermen have been treated under their provisions. The most critical part, the carrying out of the treaty has been left to the right hon. the First Minister. Will he then dare to assert if he has ever to administer or to conduct matters which are more diplomatic than political in their nature, if he has ever to decide how a treaty shall be administered and what measure of treatment shall be meted out to American fishermen, that he is incapable of properly deciding what the treaty should be in the first place? If the Canadian Government is fit to be entrusted with the execution of treaties, is it not fit to be entrusted with the making of treaties? A treaty made by Canadians with Americans would be much less likely to give rise to friction than one made by Englishmen who have less knowledge of our circumstances and affairs. For all these reasons I shall be happy to vote for the motion of my hon. friend, if I should happen to be here when the division is taken. Unfortunately I have to leave to-night for home, and may not be here when the vote is taken, but I wish to declare my unhesitating adherence to the principle of the motion and my strong desire to support it if I can possibly do so by my vote in the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is a matter of deep regret that in a question of so great importance as this the Government side of the House should have been prevented giving expression to their views, as they have been. We have had not a word from them for the last two days of the debate since the right hon. the First Minister spoke. My attention is called to the fact that a few remarks were made this afternoon by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), but as they had no reference to the subject matter under discussion but solely to some small municipal dispute in Halifax, they may be passed by as not being really part of the debate at all. It has been admitted by the leader of the Government that the leader of the Opposition did not overrate the importance of this resolution, and when one comes to think it is a matter affecting our international relations with the great country lying to the south with whom we do the larger part of our business and with whom we are more intimately connected than with any other country, it is not necessary to say the importance of the resolution cannot be over-estimated. It may be considered, as a

matter of party tactics, a mistake that we should have propounded a policy for the Government. In domestic matters I know it is generally thought best not to prescribe until you are called in; but in a matter, we as we conceive it, of overwhelming national importance, in which the greatest interests possible are at stake, we feel we would not be discharging our duty to the country if at a political crisis in the affairs of the country we remained silent. We put the question the other day in order to obviate any discussion on the matter as to the policy of the Government. When the treaty in Washington was ratified a year ago, we heard the Government taking great pains to provide that the *modus vivendi* should not terminate when the treaty was rejected by the Senate of the United States. They contemplated distinctly the rejection of that treaty and inserted a provision in their Bill that it should be in the power of the Government to prolong for another year the *modus vivendi*, even if the treaty was rejected. Under those circumstances and knowing that we were approaching another fishing season within a few days of the time when the Government were proposing to come to some conclusion on the question, we submitted quietly to the Government a question whether or no they had made up their minds to maintain the *modus vivendi* in force for another year; and we were told, with the usual official reply that the matter was under the consideration of the Government. We have noticed for many years back that there has been a total lack of policy in regard to this fishery question on the part of the Government. We have noticed that their policy has changed with the changing seasons; that one year they were bellicose and another year submissive; that one year they were defiant with their cruisers on the water, and that another year they withdrew their cruisers and submitted to anything. There has been a lack of policy, a want of statesmanship and a display of ignorance on the part of the Government that brought us almost to the verge of war with our neighbors to the south, as the Commissioner of the Government himself stated last year, and that should not be repeated. I almost fear, however, from the speech delivered by the leader of the Government the other day, that we are again to be relegated to the dangerous condition of affairs which existed in 1886. The hon. gentleman was as mysterious then as he was in 1885, he was just as full of bounce and defiance, and, so far as he came to any conclusion at all, we had a right to suppose he was going to commit Parliament to a repetition of that policy. The words which he had put into the mouth of the Governor General indicated that the policy of the Government was to carry out the Treaty of 1818, whatever that may mean, and we had a right to presume that the Government intended to carry it out in the manner in which they attempted to carry it out in 1886. We made up our minds that, if that was the case, it should not be done without the most solemn protest which we on this side could place on the records of the House. We prepared that protest, and, feeling the magnitude of the question, we decided to take the Government into our confidence, we did not desire to make any party capital, but we made up our minds that we would tell them what was the policy we thought they ought to pursue. That might be bad tactics from a party standpoint, but the leader of the Opposition was prepared, as he has been on other occasions, to sacrifice party for the good of his country; and to-night we stand before the House with this additional fact which has been communicated by telegraph, that our neighbors to the south are not disposed to carry on an international warfare with us, but are disposed to treat us kindly and cordially. We have before us the great fact that a proposal for absolute free trade between the two countries has been carried almost unanimously by one branch of the United States Congress. That

may be surrounded by conditions which may not commend themselves to every one of us, but the fact remains that Congress is willing to deal with this country in some way so as to have an absolute system of free trade between the United States and Canada. That being the case, it behoves us seriously to consider whether we should adopt any policy which should irritate or annoy the Congress of that great country, or turn away those kindly feelings which they have exhibited. It is perfectly plain that the policies of the two parties in this country are different in reference to this matter. The policy of the Government, as I have said, was announced in the Speech from the Throne and it is a reversion to the condition of affairs which existed before the Washington Treaty was agreed to. We are referred back to the Treaty of 1818, and, if that treaty is carried out in the manner in which the Government carried it out before the Washington Treaty was agreed to, we will find ourselves in the same deplorable condition in which we were during the last two or three years. The policy of the Liberal party has been formulated in this resolution, and that policy is one of conciliation. We wish the Government to hold out the right hand of fellowship to our neighbors. We desire that these matters of dispute should be settled not by the arbitrament of the sword, but by kindly and friendly arbitration. We wish that ambassadors should be sent from this country to place before the people of the United States the demands we make and the grounds upon which we will agree to a new treaty, and we think it is well that, while these negotiations are proceeding, matters should remain in such a shape that neither the officials of the Government in the Maritime Provinces nor the captains of fishing vessels should have the power to bring about such a state of things as that which Sir Charles Tupper deprecated in 1886. But the same statement which we have heard so many times before is made, that this is inopportune, that this, of all times, is the most inopportune for our propounding a policy. Why is it inopportune? Is not the fishing season close upon you? Must you not shortly come to a conclusion? What evil can possibly happen by the Opposition putting on record their view that the policy of the Government should be one of conciliation and negotiation? The hon. gentleman will tell us, as he told us in 1883, in 1884, and in 1885, that upon this question we should not exercise an opinion, or, if we had an opinion, we should keep it to ourselves. When I asked a question the other day, in reference to this subject of the international relations between the two countries, the hon. gentleman said that nothing could be more inopportune, but he failed to show why it was inopportune. Does he imagine that the electorate of this country should remain in ignorance of the policy of the Government on this great question, a policy which means weal or woe to them? I say that the Opposition would be recreant to their duty, if they had not, by resolution and by debate, demanded of the Government an expression of opinion, and tried to find out what they are going to do. I believe, that our fishery troubles have been largely due to the hon. gentleman's policy of procrastination. He will not make up his mind to anything. A few years ago, when the American Government gave notice of their determination to abrogate that treaty, the hon. gentleman was at the head of the Government. What did he do? He did nothing. He was reminded by Lord Derby, the Colonial Secretary at that time, who forwarded the notice from the United States terminating the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, in the month of March I think it was, that he should make up his mind what course he should take. Again in the month of May, he was reminded by Lord Derby that he should make up his mind on the subject and formulate some policy. But the hon. gentleman said nothing, and, according to the papers brought down, it does not appear



that he ever acknowledged the receipt of the dispatch in any way. In the month of January, 1884, he was—I was going to say, admonished—but certainly he had his memory jogged by Lord Derby upon this great question, and finally, in December, 1884, he was pressed by the English Government hard upon the point, who told him that the time had come when these fishery articles were about to expire, and he must make up his mind to some action, conciliatory or otherwise, with regard to the fisheries of this great Dominion. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman did nothing, and the then Opposition came forward with a resolution to this House, and laid down what they considered to be the true policy. In a resolution which I had the honor to move in March, 1884, the Liberal party of this Dominion propounded a policy which they thought should be adopted; and I have no hesitation in saying, from knowledge which I have since acquired, that if the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had accepted the offer made by the Liberal party, and had sent a man to Washington to negotiate a treaty, I have the very best means of knowing that if he had sent the right man, a man in earnest, he could have succeeded in negotiating a proper treaty. The public mind of the United States at that time had not been irritated and annoyed; the politicians were not in the state of mind that they were in 1887, when they passed the Non-Intercourse Bill; the leading men of the United States were more than anxious that the fishery trouble should be settled upon an amicable, a peaceful, and a friendly basis. Sir, I charge upon the hon. gentleman to-night that by his supineness, by his procrastination, by his want of statesmanship upon these occasions, he let the golden moment go by, and he is chargeable before this country with all the evils which flowed from it, and with the vast loss, financial, pecuniary and otherwise, which accrued to it from the condition in which the country found itself in 1885-86-87. Well, Sir, what was his reply on that occasion? It was almost in the stereotyped form in which he gave it to the leader of the Opposition a day or two ago: "We are not going down upon our knees to the Yankees. It is not consistent with the dignity of this great country to go down upon our knees to the United States." Sir, who asked him to go down upon his knees to the United States? I suppose there is such a thing, as was stated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as friendly negotiation upon an even footing. I suppose that it would be no humiliation to Canada to send a duly accredited agent to Washington, sanctioned by the Imperial Government, with power to negotiate a friendly treaty, and to settle the fishery disputes. Where would be the humiliation? Is it a humiliation for 5,000,000 of people to treat with 60,000,000, their great neighbors to the south? The thing is ridiculous and childish. The hon. gentleman answered us then that he would not do it. But what did he do? He put off the evil day till the last moment, and when the last moment came and he could not put it off an hour longer, he voluntarily offered to surrender the whole of the territorial and fishing rights of this Dominion, during 1885, for nothing. He found himself in a corner, put there by his own want of statesmanship, his own want of judgment, and he offered to give them free fishing if they would give us free fish. The hon. gentleman did not get his offer accepted. Why? Because he had left it too late. The hon. gentleman gave the free fishing but he did not get the free fish. The people of this country saw what was national humiliation, if anything was; they saw their territorial and their fishing rights, which has been secured to them by treaty, given up absolutely to the people of the United States for a whole season, and not a single concession asked in return. The hon. gentleman, two or three years afterwards, tried to take credit in this House and before this country, that that was on his part a conciliatory and friendly act. It was nothing of the sort. He acted only when it was forced from him,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

when he could do no better. He let the golden moment go by, he refused to listen to advice from this side of the House, and he refused to listen to the advice of Lord Derby who tendered it to him on four separate occasions; the result was that he found himself in a fix, he had to surrender, and he surrendered ignominiously. Sir, when the season went by what did the hon. gentleman do? What did he do at the end of 1885? He found a very strong feeling had grown up in the Maritime Provinces among the fishermen that their rights were not being looked after, that the hon. gentleman, as the common feeling down in the Maritime Provinces expressed it, did not care a snap for the fishermen or for the fisheries as long as he could remain in power. What did he do then? Prompted by fear and the result of his previous policy, he turned around and adopted a bellicose policy. He told us that he was going to teach the Americans that they would not only not have access to our fisheries, not only would they not have the right to come in to fish in our waters at all, but they were not to have even those common rights which one nation extends to another in the matter of its mercantile marine. Why, Sir, we had in 1886 the spectacle of the Customs laws of this country being dragged in, nominally to carry out the article of the Convention of 1818, but practically to drive the American people to desperation. Sir, they did not try to carry out the Treaty of 1818 in an honest, square and manly way; they resorted to every conceivable regulation of the Customs, with the result of driving the American people to desperation. The hon. gentleman adopted a policy the result of which was that in 1886 he had seized over 68 vessels of the Americans, he had refused them access to our harbors, he had seized them every time they had come into a harbor unless they reported themselves, he had refused them the right to purchase such supplies as belong to an ordinary merchant ship, he had put upon record his deliberate policy that if he allowed an American vessel to enter our harbor for any purpose whatever, that would be a surrender of the rights and privileges we had under the Treaty of 1818. Sir, he tried that policy for one year, he seized these vessels, and at the end of the year what did he find? He found himself brought into collision with the American Government, he found that the American Government, representing the American people, were in an irritated state, and were determined to defend themselves from the suicidal policy he had adopted; he found they had passed their Non-Intercourse Bill and a spectacle was seen in the American Congress seldom seen there, of an entire Congress rising with unanimity and passing a Non-Intercourse Bill with Canada, because they believed that their people had been treated unkindly, unfriendly and in a harsh and bellicose spirit. The hon. gentleman thought he was bringing the Americans, as he said, to their knees, but he did not do it, he simply brought them to their senses, and they told him then and there: If this policy is to be pursued by you we will adopt a retaliatory policy on our part. What was the consequence? The hon. gentleman who would not even negotiate with the Americans in 1885, who thought it was an indignity on the part of Canada to send an ambassador there, or a plenipotentiary even, to negotiate unofficially, was obliged to send down his Minister of Finance to see if the troubled waters could not be quieted. We had Sir Charles Tupper going down to Washington in the year 1887, and, Sir, before he went, the American Government had laid before the British Government their complaints. Their complaint was not so much that we had put a wrong construction upon the Treaty of 1818; it is true, they did not agree with our construction, but their main complaint was not that our construction was incorrect. Sir, the construction put upon the Treaty of 1818 by our Government, technically, was correct, there is no doubt about that. I think that construction was endorsed and approved of by every lawyer on both sides of the House. But the construc-

tion of the treaty was one thing, and the policy of carrying out the construction we put upon it, was another; and the American Government contended, not so much against the construction of the Treaty of 1818, which we put upon it, as against the policy that we had adopted in our attempts to carry it out. Sir, we have Mr. Phelps, Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James, telling the Imperial Government in a despatch what the complaint was. In that despatch he says:

"And quite aside from any question arising upon construction of the treaty, the provisions of the Custom House Acts and Regulations have been systematically enforced against American ships for alleged petty and technical violations of legal requirements in a manner so unreasonable, unfriendly, and so unjust as to render the privileges accorded by the treaty practically nugatory.

"It is not for a moment contended by the United States Government that American vessels should be exempt from those reasonable port and Custom House regulations which are in force in countries where such vessels have occasion to visit. If they choose to violate such requirements, the Government will not attempt to screen them from the just and legal consequence.

"But what the United States Government complain of in these cases is that the existing regulations have been construed with a technical strictness, and enforced with a severity, in cases of inadvertent and accidental violation where no harm was done, which is both unusual and unnecessary, whereby the voyages of vessels had been broken up and heavy penalties incurred. That the liberal and reasonable construction of these laws that had prevailed for many years, and to which the fishermen have been accustomed, was changed without any notice given. On every opportunity of unnecessary interference with the American fishing vessels to the prejudice and destruction of their business has been availed of."

That was the complaint formulated by the American Government. It was not, as I have said, so much against the construction which we put upon the Treaty of 1818 as against the policy we adopted in enforcing our Customs laws. I call attention for a moment to the policy of the Government which was laid down at that time by the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Customs and endorsed by the entire Government in minutes of Council. I do this to show that that policy resulted in the most injurious consequences to this country, and I do it to show that if hon. gentlemen opposite intend to repeat that policy they will find the results to be as bad and injurious as they were in 1886. It was contended by those Ministers that the Americans had the right by the Treaty of 1818 to enter our ports for four specific purposes, and they said: We will not allow you to enter for any other purposes, no matter whether humane purposes or charitable purposes, or such purposes as common humanity would dictate. What did they say? The Minister of Marine [and Fisheries in his report said:

"It is not however the case that the Convention of 1818 affected only the inshore fisheries of the British Provinces; it was framed with the object of affording a complete and exclusive definition of the rights and liberties which the fishermen of the United States were thenceforth to enjoy in following their vocation as far as these rights would be affected by facilities for access to the shores or waters of the British Provinces or for intercourse with their people. It is therefore no undue expansion of the scope of that convention to interpret strictly those of its provisions by which such access is denied, except to the vessels requiring it for the purposes specifically described.

"Such an undue expansion would, upon the other hand, certainly take place, if under cover of its provisions, or of any agreements relating to general commercial intercourse which may have since been made, permission were accorded to the United States' fishermen to resort habitually to the harbors of the Dominion, not for sake of seeking safety for their vessels or for avoiding risk of human life, but in order to use those harbors as a general base of operations from which to prosecute and organise with greater advantage to themselves the industry in which they are engaged."

In following that up, the Minister of Justice goes on to say further:

"For this purpose it was necessary to keep out foreign fishing vessels, excepting in cases of dire necessity, no matter under what pretext they might desire to come in. The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coast could claim the right to enter our harbors, to post a letter or send a telegram or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood or pestilence, or to buy medicines or to purchase a new rope."

That was the policy laid down by the hon. gentlemen and approved in minutes of Council. The hon. gentleman at that time represented to the British Government that it was absolutely essential for the protection of our fisheries that we should carry out the strict letter of the treaty, and under no pretext, not even to obtain a surgeon in case of accident or a physician in case of illness, should we allow American fishermen to enter our ports. They sent home a Minute of Council prepared by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in December of that year, in which they laid down the lines of their policy still more clearly, in which they said they could not be expected to deviate in the slightest degree from the policy they had carried out that year. That despatch said:

"It is not to be expected that after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights, and upon the respect due by foreign vessels, while in Canadian waters, the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are governed, in the absence moreover of any decision of a legal tribunal to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, that the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments, withdraw from a position taken up deliberately and by doing so in effect plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity and bad faith which, in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States.

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trusts committed to their charge."

That was the policy the Government laid down in 1886, that was the policy they submitted to the Imperial Government at the close of that year, that was the policy in regard to which they said they would be committing a breach of trust if they surrendered one iota, and it was the policy which they told the British Government they were prepared to stand by. What took place? When they saw the storm which that policy had brought about their ears and saw that the American Government had taken up the question seriously, when they were brought face to face with a Non-Intercourse Bill which would prove one of the most serious evils which could possibly be inflicted on the Canadian people, some of the longer headed members of the Government saw that this game of brag, blow and bluster would not succeed and would not be tolerated. So they did then what should have been done the previous year, they did at the last moment what should have been done earlier, and they endeavored to act so as to appease the American people. The entire policy was changed, and notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Finance the other day, I say that in 1887 an entirely new policy was brought in force as compared with that of 1886. In 1886 the Government had seized, chiefly for infractions of the Customs laws, over sixty-eight American ships; and in 1887, when they were face to face with a Non-Intercourse Bill, they did not seize one vessel. They had cruisers in our waters, the flags were flying, they made a great parade and expended large sums of public money, but it was only a sham battle. They never seized an American vessel or hauled down an American flag; and when President Cleveland was called upon to report to the United States Senate as to whether there had been a repetition of the insults, as they termed them, which occurred in 1886, he replied that nothing of the kind had taken place. I call attention to the report which the President made to Congress at that time. He says in that report:

"Soon after the passage of the Act of 3rd March, 1887, the negotiation which had been proceeding for several months previously progressed actively, and the proposed conference and the presence at this capital of the plenipotentiaries of the two Governments, out of which the since rejected treaty of 7th February, 1888, eventuated, had their natural influence in repressing causes of complaint in relation to the fisheries. Therefore, since 3rd March, 1887, no case has been reported to the Department of State wherein complaint was made of unfriendly

or unlawful treatment of American fishing vessels on the part of the Canadian authorities in which reparation was not promptly and satisfactorily obtained by the United States Consul General at Halifax."

This proves that the policy of the Government changed entirely, and that the bluster, and the brag, and the blow, and the cannons, and all that kind of thing which they indulged in in 1886 had ceased, and that in the year 1887 they became as quiet as lambs. There is no doubt in the mind of any man who has studied the question that Sir Charles Tupper when he went to Washington in 1887 agreed that there should be no more of those seizures and cruel harshness of which the Americans complained. President Cleveland says so in so many words in the extract which I have just read to the House. In 1887 with the Non-Inter-course Bill so staring us in the face the present Government did what they should have done in the previous year. We had a treaty agreed to in 1888 and we had attached to that treaty a *modus vivendi*. The Government did not wait until that treaty became the law of the land. They did not wait until the treaty was ratified by the Executive of the United States, but they came to this Parliament and asked us to ratify the treaty before it had been submitted to the Executive of the United States. I thought that was a great blunder at the time for they were binding not only the plenipotentiary of Her Majesty to agree to the treaty, but they were binding the Canadian people through their Parliament to that treaty. What did we find then when the treaty was brought down? We found that it conceded to the Americans 90 per cent. of the claims they had made. It was a treaty of concession from beginning to end, and this Government abandoned their policy which they declared to be absolutely essential for the protection of our fisheries and they conceded to the Americans the rights which they had been clamoring for and which the Canadian Government withheld from them in 1886. A more complete back down never was seen in the history of this country. That treaty was rejected by the United States Senate and so far as those clauses are concerned which relate to the delimitation in our waters, or so far as those clauses are concerned which make an offer on our part in return for some concession to be made on theirs, those clauses are not in force to-day. I submit to this House that, in so far as the Government agreed to put a new interpretation on the Treaty of 1818, and in so far as that new interpretation is embodied in the Treaty of 1888, that treaty having been ratified by this Parliament, we are bound by the interpretation put on the Treaty of 1818 in the Washington Treaty of last year. It binds us now; it will bind us for all time to come and if that is the case the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches to-day have agreed to an interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 which admits the American vessels to our waters and gives them rights which the Canadian Government declared in 1886 to the Imperial Government would be an entire surrender of our fishery interests. The policy of the Government is an arbitrary, capricious and unstatesmanlike policy from the beginning. In 1885 they gave up the fisheries for nothing. In 1886 they enforced Customs laws against the American fishermen with an unnecessary harshness and severity which drove the people to desperation. They told the Imperial Government that it was absolutely necessary that they should pursue this course because if they did not, it would be the giving up of all our rights. Yet in 1888, they agreed to a treaty and made this Parliament consent to it which surrendered every right which they said was necessary for the maintenance of those fisheries for ourselves. What is the state of affairs now. Formerly the Government exacted a formal entry and clearance from fishermen of the States temporarily seeking shelter in our ports, by an article of the Treaty of 1888 they abandoned that, and American fishermen by their own interpretation of that treaty can enter our harbors without making for-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

mal entries and clearances. They can enter our harbors now for the purpose of obtaining provisions, for the purpose of obtaining whatever supplies they need for homeward voyages, and having obtained a license they can get permits at all times. There has been an abolition of the pilotage charges, and the right of transhipment and sale has been conceded to them as incidental to repairs. We were told in 1886 that if these concessions were surrendered it would be the abandonment of all our rights under the Treaty of 1818. The point I want to make is this: that whether they agreed to the *modus vivendi* or not our Government cannot go behind or beyond the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 which they laid down in the Treaty of Washington of 1888. If that is so, let us see where exactly we are. This last treaty conceded almost everything to the United States, and in this connection we must remember the Message which President Cleveland sent to his Congress. In respect to that treaty he said:

"The history of events in the last two years shows that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors.

"Such inconvenience is provided against in the proposed treaty, and this most frequent and just cause of complaint is removed.

"The articles permitting our fishermen to obtain provisions and the ordinary supplies of trading vessels on their homeward voyages and under which they are accorded the further and even more important privilege on all occasions of purchasing such casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels are of great importance and value.

"The licenses which are to be granted without charge and on application, in order to enable our fishermen to enjoy these privileges, are reasonable and proper checks in the hands of the local authorities to identify the recipients and prevent abuse, and can form no impediment to those who intend to use them fairly.

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes is full and liberal. These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for which contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State, and our Minister at London, and by the American negotiators of the present treaty.

President Cleveland therefore contended—and I think he contended with great force—that the contentions made on behalf of the United States Government had been nearly all conceded in this treaty. I cannot see for the life of me how this Government in interpreting the Treaty of 1818 as they did can hereafter go behind or beyond the interpretation which they conceded in the Washington Treaty of 1888, and which they asked this Parliament to assent to and which this Parliament formally did assent to. The right hon. gentleman the Premier in the speech which he made the other day undertook to make several statements which I think were made without much reflection. And they certainly were inconsistent with the facts. The hon. gentleman in the opening part of his speech somewhat enthusiastically made some boasts which I think on reflection he will regret having made. He stated, to the surprise of this House, and I am sure it will be to the surprise of the country, that every contention the Government had ever made had been conceded by the Americans. I never heard a more audacious statement by any gentleman in the House or out of it. I could hardly believe my ears, and I waited until the official report of the hon. gentleman's remarks came out to see whether my ears had deceived me at the time. But I find they did not, and the hon. gentleman's organs are publishing that speech and declaring it to be a great, logical and statesmanlike speech.

Mr. HESSON. A good speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may be a good judge, but I do not think it was. It was delivered, I was glad to see, with more than the usual physical vigor of the right hon. gentleman, and that we are all glad of; but I do not think it was marked by that statesmanlike prudence and caution which in a great matter, affecting the

relations of the two countries, should have marked the speech of the leader of the Government. What does he say here? He says:—

"Well, we cannot accept the advice of the hon. gentleman; we cannot admit that we are wrong, because we have not been in the wrong; and what is still more remarkable, all he has to do, while advising us to admit that we are wrong, is to look at the treaty made last year with the United States, and he will find in it that the President of the United States, and the commissioners appointed by that president, and the gentlemen who signed that treaty, admit that every one of the pretensions of Canada, every one of the arguments used by Canada, every one of the positions taken by Canada, were just and right. Without one single exception, that treaty admits that all our pretensions, and all the course we have taken under the Convention of 1888, were justified by their acceptance of the *modus vivendi*."

Sir, a more audacious statement or one more inconsistent with the facts never was made in Parliament or out of it. The hon. gentleman knows that so far from the contentions of the Government having been acceded to, they surrendered every contention they made. I read to the House to-night the contentions the Minister of Justice made and Minister of Finance made, the contentions endorsed by the minute of Council which the Government sent home to the Imperial Government; I told you what they did in 1886 with regard to the practical working out of those contentions; and in the treaty everyone of those contentions was surrendered. The hon. gentlemen did not pretend to say when they came down and asked us to agree to the treaty, that the construction they had put on the Treaty of 1818 was to be carried out in the new treaty. No, Sir, but the right hon. gentleman when he spoke the other evening went on to make still more clear what he meant:

"Canada has never set up a pretension under the Convention of 1818, that the Americans have not now finally admitted; Canada has never exceeded her rights and her claims under that convention, and I defy hon. gentlemen to point out one instance in which Canada can be obnoxious to that charge."

Well, Sir, I was astonished. I remember a year ago, when the Finance Minister, speaking as the mouthpiece of the Government on the floor of the House, and recommending that that treaty of his should be accepted by the House and the country, declared that he was bound to say that in negotiating that treaty he could not hold by the contentions which the junior Ministers of the Government had put forward. He said he would have been criminal if he had resisted the application of the United States Government for a modification of those contentions. He told us that the Treaty of 1818 was marked all through by concessions on our part from what he had contended for before, but that it was proper and right, and the only way of arriving at a satisfactory solution. I do not want to exaggerate one word of the language that the hon. gentleman used. I will read what he said and then hon. gentlemen can see how much ground there was for the proud boast the leader of the Government made the other day that every practical contention his Government had made with respect to the Treaty of 1818 had been yielded by the United States Government. Sir Charles Tupper, said:

"Our concessions did not stop there. I am quite ready to admit, and I think it might as well be stated in the outset, that the Canadian Government would find it, I would find it, quite as difficult as our friends the plenipotentiaries of the United States would find it, to justify this treaty if it was to be examined in the light of the extreme contentions maintained on both sides previously. I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right for the representatives of a Government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can sustain in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

And yet in the face of the language of his own plenipotentiary, the right hon. the leader of the Government states that we made no concessions, but that the Americans yielded every contention that we had made. Sir Charles Tupper went on:

52

"Looking at the question in that broad and national spirit, looking at it with a desire to remove the possibility of what I consider would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the civilised world, a collision between the two great English-speaking nations, looking at it from that broad standpoint, it would have been criminal on my part and on the part of those who represented Her Majesty's Government and the interests of the people of Canada if they had by making fair and reasonable concessions, not endeavored, to find a common ground that would present a solution of those important and serious questions."

We find, therefore, that so far from the hon. gentleman's boastful statement being agreeable to the fact, it is at direct variance with the fact as stated by his own Finance Minister, the man who framed the treaty, and who ought to know something about it. Their contentions were blown to the winds by the treaty the hon. gentleman agreed to and asked this House to agree to. They yielded up to the Americans at the point of the bayonet concession after concession, right after right, which they had declared to be necessary to the maintenance of our fishery interests. I told them then, as I tell them now, that I did not condemn those concessions so much in themselves, but I condemned the men who made them. The right hon. gentleman the other day pointed across the House to me, saying that I had condemned the concessions made by the Government in that treaty. His words were:

"How justly was his appreciation of the situation we can now see, because even limited as it was, reasonable as that treaty was, so reasonable that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), denounced it as an unworthy concession made by Sir Charles Tupper, on behalf of Canada—

"An hon. MEMBER. No.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read the hon. gentleman's own speech and you will see. He denounced the unworthy concessions that were made then."

I did not denounce as unworthy the concessions in themselves, but I denounced the men who made them as unworthy. It is not pleasant to quote one's own speech, but when my statement has been challenged in this way, I shall be pardoned if I refer for a moment to what I did say. I pointed out that the concessions made were concessions on points which the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Justice had declared to be vital points, and necessary for the maintenance of Canadian interest, that any surrender of them would be an ignoble surrender, and that the people of Canada would call seriously to account the men who made any of those concessions; and I said it did not become the men who made any of those concessions, after having used the language they had used in the previous year, to come down and recommend the House to accept them. If the concessions had been made voluntary, Canada would have reaped great advantage, but made as they were they might in themselves be right, but they throw discredit upon the men who made them. The language I made use of then was this:

"I am not, just for the moment, contending that these concessions are unjust in themselves, but I am contending that the men who declared a year ago that they were unjust, and that they could not possibly concede them, and that the concession of them would prove ruinous to Canada, stand to-day in a position the most unenviable that any statesmen can possibly occupy, when they ask us now to accept this treaty, which concedes everything which they said before could not possibly be conceded because it would be ruinous. They should step down and let other men make the concessions."

Further on I remarked:

"If we had voluntarily ceded to them these concessions which have been wrung from us under this treaty we would to-day be standing in a proud position."

So the hon. gentleman will see he was entirely wrong in stating that I had condemned the concessions in this House. I did not. I condemned the men who made them, and the manner in which they were made. What was the object of the *modus vivendi*? Does that object still exist? After the treaty had been concluded between the plenipotentiaries of both countries, they agreed upon a *modus vivendi*. The offer was made by the Imperial plenipotentiaries to the United States plenipotentiaries for the purpose of finding

some solution of the difficulties until a treaty could be submitted to both Parliaments and to the Congress of the United States. And that *modus vivendi*, in its preamble, recites the reasons why the English plenipotentiaries submitted it to the Americans:

"The treaty having been signed the British Plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland.

"In the absence of such ratification, the old conditions which have given rise to much friction and irritation might be revived and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned.

"Under these circumstances, and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years, in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

Their anxious desire was to promote good feeling and to remove all possible causes of controversy. That is the object we have in proposing that the *modus vivendi* should be continued the coming season. The hon. gentleman knows a new party is coming into power in the United States, he knows that it will become his bounden duty to approach that new party and to negotiate with them for the settlement of difficulties, and he knows that it is impossible such negotiation can be successfully carried on unless the public minds of both countries are in a better condition than they were in when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington in 1887. He knows that it will be impossible to carry on any negotiations unless a kinder feeling exists between the two countries than existed then. When I heard the hon. gentleman denounce the *modus vivendi* the other night, one would suppose it was something dreadful. His object was to make those who had not studied the question, believe that the Opposition were prepared to give up all Canada's rights in her fisheries, and that our proposition involved national humiliation, and he called on his friends to resist any such humiliating effort. He said:

"Now the hon. gentleman says that we ought to eat humble pie, that we ought to go down on our knees to the Americans whether they will give us a treaty or not, whether they will pass a non-intercourse act or not, whether they will allow us to enter their country or not, and whether or not they pass a law keeping out Canadians from the United States as they have kept out Chinamen. Notwithstanding all this we must, forsooth, say to the people of the United States: 'You may come into our waters, you may do just as you please, you can have the right to fish in our waters.'"

Why the hon. gentleman ought to have known that the *modus vivendi* does not surrender to the United States any territorial right of Canada at all. It does not propose to surrender to them the right to fish in our waters at all, and all this wonderful surrender which the hon. gentleman's vivid imagination pictured is a mere creature of fiction and does not exist in reality at all. What does the *modus vivendi* provide? It provides for the recognition by the United States of our right to prevent transhipping fish and purchasing supplies or bait and shipping men. It provides that if they pay a certain sum per ton, American fishermen may enjoy these rights. It provides that on payment of \$1.50 a ton, the American fishermen have the right to go into our waters to tranship fish, to purchase fishing supplies, and to ship their men. That is all; and the hon. gentleman denounces this as something approaching national humiliation. He says:

"This resolution will, I believe, meet with the condemnation of this House, as it will meet with the condemnation of this country. I believe and I know that the people of Canada will resent anything like humiliation to their status or national honor."

Why, who prepared this *modus vivendi* and who is responsible for it? It is a proposition emanating from his own plenipotentiary, his own appointee; and if it involves national dishonor, then the national honor of Canada was humiliated during the year 1888 when it was in operation. If

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

the repetition of it in 1889 means national humiliation, then we were subjected to national humiliation last year. The hon. gentleman went on to make use of an argument which I was surprised at, an *ad captandum* argument, and I dare say it may have captured some gentleman not acquainted with the fishery question. What did he say? He said: Look what would happen if you proclaimed the *modus vivendi*? We will issue our licenses, and then the United States will, possibly, bring their Non-intercourse Bill into force. They will have the right to come into our waters, to tranship their fish, and purchase supplies, and we will not be able to sell them a herring. But, Sir, the main object of the *modus vivendi* was to prevent the Non-intercourse Bill coming into force at all. The hon. gentleman knows that at any moment the Non-intercourse Bill may be brought into force, and that the most serious consequences which can be inflicted upon Canada will follow. I will not picture those consequences. They were pictured in terrifying language by the hon. gentleman's Minister last year. If the *modus vivendi* does not come into force, you will, probably, he said, have a state of facts brought about which may bring the Non-intercourse Bill into force. It is to prevent that we propose the *modus vivendi* should continue for another year. Our object is to do what we can, consistent with national honor, to maintain friendly feeling between the two countries. We do not want to see the Non-intercourse Bill put into force, we want to extend the boundaries of our trade, and make it as free as we can, consistent with our political autonomy. We believe in our hearts, honestly and fairly, that the best mode of preventing the Non-intercourse Bill being brought into operation would be to maintain the *modus vivendi*. If it is maintained, the Non-intercourse Bill cannot be put into force. If any hon. gentleman will look at the preamble, he will find that the President of the United States is only vested with power to bring the Bill into force when we improperly and harshly enforce against American fishing vessels the rights we believe they have in our waters. The Non-intercourse Bill declares:

"Whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews, so arriving at or being in such British waters, or ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied any of the privileges therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews, of the most favored nation, or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either of all such cases it shall be lawful, and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion, by proclamation to that effect, to deny vessels, their masters and crews, of the British dominions of North America, any entrance into the waters, ports, or places of, or within the United States (with such exceptions in regard to vessels in distress, stress of weather, or needing supplies as to the President shall seem proper), whether such vessels shall come directly from said dominions on such destined voyage or by way of some port or place in such destined voyage elsewhere; and, also, to deny entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish, or any other product of said dominions, or other goods coming from said dominions to the United States."

Now we are face to face with that Act. That Act may be brought into force any day. It may be brought into force as, and when we act towards United States fishing vessels as we did in 1886, and I warn the hon. gentleman that, if that Non-intercourse Bill is brought into force through his action, he will be held responsible by the people of this country. He is entering upon a course which is fraught with danger. If he does not continue that *modus vivendi*, if he does not continue to deal with the people of the United States, and to endeavor to solve on an amicable basis the fishery difficulties which exist between the two countries, he will incur a responsibility greater than any he has ever incurred in the course of his long political career. There could be no evil which could arise to the people of the Maritime Provinces so great as to be cut off from intercourse with the people of the south. What? That none of our vessels should be allowed to trade with them, or to enter

their harbors? Does the hon. gentleman know what that means? It means paralysis of our trade; it means ruin to our people. The hon. gentleman will be called to account for it, if it should happen. The hon. gentleman knows well that this *modus vivendi* was proposed by his own plenipotentiary with the avowed object of preventing, by any possibility, that state of facts arising which might bring the Nonintercourse Bill into force; and we urge this upon him now because we feel the gravity of the crisis. We do not want to be brought into a commercial war with the people of the United States. I do not believe nor does anyone on this side of the House believe that we could not live in this country if we were cut off from intercourse with the United States. No doubt, we might live in a sort of way, but I hope that the stoppage of intercourse will never come in our time or in the time of our children. We, on our part, desire to bring closer and closer the commercial relations which have existed in the past, which exist to-day, and which I hope will exist in the future, between us and our friends to the south. We desire to make those relations as free as they possibly can be made; and we desire that any advance which is made by the people or the Congress of the United States should be met by us on this side of the line. We desire to welcome it, and to meet it by kindly feeling and by kindly measures so that a treaty may be arranged between the two countries, consistent with the rights of both and calculated to develop the natural trade which should exist between two great English-speaking peoples. We are in favor of the broadest and freest commercial relations, consistent with our political autonomy. We believe that, if a Government were in power that desired to make those relations with the United States, a better time for doing so never existed than exists to-day. Though an irritated feeling may have existed a year or two ago, as Sir Charles Tupper stated in this House, I believe that, if we reciprocated the kindly feelings which are expressed in that country, we would find an answer there. In any case, it is well that the policies of the two parties should be laid before the country. We are for conciliation. We are in favor of negotiating with that people in order to remove all difficulties, and we are not for going back to the state of affairs which existed in 1855 or in 1886. We do not desire commercial war or other any kind of war, but we desire that our trade and our intercourse with them should grow, and that everything in the way of that should be removed as far as fiscal regulations or treaty arrangements can do so, and that should be known to be the policy of the Liberal party. We have proposed that to our friends opposite, though we may lose a tactical advantage by doing so, but we believe that it is in the true interests of the country, and we hoped that it would be accepted by those hon. gentlemen.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We must all sympathise very deeply indeed with our friends on the Opposition benches in the disposition to self sacrifice which has moved them to ignore all the "tactical advantages" which they see they are losing by the motion now before the House. I venture to say that, if there is any "tactical benefit" which they will lose, it will not be from any intention on their part to sacrifice any political advantage in regard to this matter, but from the unfortunate misjudgment which is characteristic of their whole policy. Having addressed the House at some length on this subject on a former occasion, I had intended to allow the vote to be taken without saying anything now, but, considering the wide range which the debate has taken, the charges which have been heaped up against the Administration, and the violence of the language we have just listened to against the First Minister, I may perhaps be allowed to take up a little of the time of the House in replying to charges which have been refuted a hundred

times before, but which are repeated each time with greater violence and persistency. If I may be permitted to refer so far back as to the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution which is before the House, I would do so in order to call the attention of the House to the great range which this debate has taken, in order, I suppose, that hon. gentlemen opposite might not derive any "tactical advantage" from it. The leader of the Opposition ransacked the history of the country, and blamed the Government not simply for the policy which the Premier has laid before the House and before the country since the year 1867, for he took a wider range and blamed the policy which has been pursued in this country for the last twenty-five years. The hon. gentleman went back and endeavored to trace the history of the conditions which led so many English-speaking people to sympathise with the Southern States in the war of secession, and he concluded his observations on that subject, after drawing the attention of the House to the fact that, if this was a fault at all, it was a fault shared by almost the whole civilised world as well as by nearly the whole of Canada, by saying:

"I can understand that being the feeling in European society, but I am at a loss to understand how it was that Canada, which in that day, as now, was a purely democratic country, did not throw its whole sympathy into the cause for which the North was then fighting. Not that we could do anything to help it. The North could fight its own battles. But if we had shown anything like sympathy with the supporters of the American Union in their struggles with the rebels, they would have given us their friendship in return, as they have always been ready to do to those who sympathised with them. But finding a hostile people on their border, the first thing they did, when they had the opportunity, was to cut us off from the reciprocal trade relations which we had with them. This is the first fault which, I think, has been committed by the Government of Canada."

It is gratifying to know that when the hon. gentleman went back to a period in the history of this country prior even to Confederation, to find matter for an attack on the First Minister, he could only base that attack upon the existence, in all quarters of the civilised world, of a measure of sympathy with the Southern people; and that though he declared that that was the first charge which he had to make against the Government of this country, he was unable to mention a circumstance or an act in respect to which he could impute fault to the Government of this country. I mention that for the purpose of showing how disdainful these gentlemen are of deriving any "tactical advantage" in this debate, and how eager they are, at any rate, not to be limited in their field of discussion and of criticism, because the facts are not at hand to justify the criticism. Now, Sir, following down the history of this subject for more than twenty years, we were treated in the admirable address made by the leader of the Opposition, and we were treated in the less admirable address—if I am compelled to say so—to which we have listened this evening, to one long and persistent attack upon the Administration with regard to the fisheries question traced down to this hour. We were told that, at every point of the controversy, at every turn of history, we had been false to our duty to the country, and that we had failed to take any step either to solve this question or to protect the rights of the country in regard to it. The leader of the Opposition said that the repeal of the fishery articles of the Washington Treaty came, and that nothing was done; and we were told to-night that that was another illustration of the dilatory policy of the First Minister, who folded his hands and let events take their course, and attempted to redeem them when it was too late. It is old history, it is threadbare history, but it is true, nevertheless, that the efforts and sacrifices which the First Minister and his Government made to renew the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, and to keep them in force, and the sacrifices which he proposed to make, from first to last, and not his inaction, met with the condemnation of the Opposition

in this House, and of their press in the country. We know, Sir, that in order to obtain a prolongation of the fishery articles of the Treaty of 1871, coupled with a trade arrangement which would be to the advantage of the two countries, he proposed that the benefits conferred upon American citizens by the fishery articles of the Treaty of 1871, should be extended until the close of the fishing season which had then begun, and that the cry went up in this House, and it went through the press of this country: "But the Americans will never accept that, because it is suspected by them that you are going to demand a money equivalent, such as you obtained before." But in order to be explicit and clear the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues communicated with the home authorities, and the home authorities communicated with Washington and declared: "You are to have, for the remainder of the fishing season, the advantages which the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington conferred upon you, and that without stint and without price." Then the cry in the House and country changed, and it was: that we had made a dishonorable sacrifice to the United States; we were told that we should have manned our fleet, that we should have run up the flag and run out the guns, and taken a vote of \$50,000 in the Estimates for fisheries protection. But for that purpose the last two or three years the cry is that we folded our hands and did nothing—that we let the fishery articles expire without attempting to renew them. The hon. gentleman who addressed the House this evening says that at the expiration of the fishery articles of 1871 the Opposition proposed a policy to this House which would have been successful. By some extraordinary inspiration he is able to tell the House that if we had adopted his resolution in favor of reciprocity in 1885, that policy would have been accepted by the United States. He has other sources of information than those which are open to all the rest of the people of North America, for every journal which has spoken upon the subject, every public man in the United States whose utterances are worth reading, have with one voice declared in regard to this fishery question, that the one thing that they would not submit to is to have fishery negotiations and reciprocity negotiations mixed up. The one supreme difficulty which the negotiators had to meet with in Washington last year, as everybody knows now, was the conviction which has gained ground in the United States, and which has gained ground more than anything else by reason of the persistence with which this question of reciprocity has been projected into the discussion by the Opposition in this House—the one supreme difficulty they had to meet was the conviction that we did not care so much about our fishing rights, but that we were perishing for reciprocity, and that we were raising the fishery question in order to compel reciprocity. Sir, if the Government in 1885 had linked the two questions together they would have both met a common fate that would have disposed of the question for a good many years to come. But the proposal made to the American Government was to consider the whole question of the fisheries, and in order to get a broad and liberal settlement of the question, as I have said, we threw open the fishing grounds as well as commercial privileges to the American fishermen for the remainder of the season of 1885, on the assurance of the President of the United States that he would recommend to Congress that a commission should be appointed to consider the whole question of the fishery relations of the two countries. That, I suppose, was a policy that should have been acceptable to gentlemen opposite as well as to the Government; and yet, in relation to this matter we are told that the whole fault was on the Government of Canada. What was the result? After the United States had enjoyed our fishing grounds for nearly six long months, together with the right of obtaining supplies, transshipment, and all that, when the President sent down his Message recom-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

mending the commission to Congress, how was it received by the Senate? That body would not take action affirmatively or otherwise on the President's Message, but a resolution was passed declaring that such a commission was unworthy of receiving a vote from Congress for its expensess. Was the Message of the President sustained in Congress even by his own supporters? No, Sir; and there were only seventeen members of the Senate of the United States voting against a proposal that such a commission was not worthy of receiving a dollar from the public Treasury. Yet we are told that we have made no concessions to these people, and that every fault in the whole negotiations of the last twenty years has been with us. Then we were told by the leader of the Opposition, and by the gentleman who addressed the House to-night, that we had put an unwarrantable interpretation on the Treaty of 1818, as soon as we found in 1886 that we could not obtain the settlement of the question. The leader of the Opposition was very distinct and specific as to what this unwarrantable interpretation was—a refusal to tranship was too narrow a construction of that treaty. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) dignified it with a more caustic name than that the other evening—he declared that our interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 was pedantic. The leader of the Opposition said it was narrow and inhuman, and that vessels were sent to sea without provisions under our interpretation of that treaty. Now let me be plain and specific with the House in stating, at least, what I humbly believe the interpretation to have been, historically and as a matter of fact. The hon. member from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) to-night quoted from the despatch of Mr. Phelps, in which Mr. Phelps said that he did not so much complain of the treaty itself as of the harshness with which it was executed, and the suddenness with which it was put in force. It was put in force by themselves, because they revoked the fishery articles of 1871, which had suspended its operation. Sir, that interpretation—I state it with the utmost emphasis—the interpretation which we put on the Treaty of 1818 in 1886, was precisely the interpretation which it had received from the Provincial Governments, backed up by the guns and fleets of Great Britain for 70 years. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) gave hon. gentlemen opposite a lesson upon that subject when he assured the House that for the first forty years of the treaty, not only was it put in force and carried out by the fleets of England, but that it was carried out far beyond the limits at sea where we ever attempted to enforce it, away beyond the headlands where, he said, the fleets of England alone could keep the peace, and it was by the fleets of England that the treaty was enforced during the first forty years of its existence. Yet we are told by an hon. member, whose words will have weight as a leader of a party—whose words I am sure will be received with great weight in the United States, that it was a new, an illiberal construction that we sought to enforce, and the despatch of Mr. Phelps was read to this House to-night stating that it was a sudden and new interpretation that was put upon the Treaty of 1818. I ventured in as strong language as could courteously be used, in a report to His Excellency upon that despatch of Mr. Phelps, not only to assert, but to prove that our interpretation had been concurred in by Great Britain herself for seventy years, and I venture to think I so far succeeded in this, that, in the first place, Mr. Phelps made no attempt to controvert my argument, and, in the second place, Mr. Phelps was informed by Lord Roseberry that there were no two opinions in England upon the question. Let me state that, instead of adopting a new interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, we were enforcing just in its plain terms an Imperial statute passed in 1819, and the statutes of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia passed before Confederation and the statute of Canada passed twenty years

ago. Yet we were told to-night that it was an entirely new interpretation we were putting on the treaty, and an entirely new and objectionable mode of enforcing it. We have been told that our policy is shifting and changing, and that we are unable to hold for two Sessions consecutively the same policy. I wish to show how hon. gentlemen opposite have changed and chopped in their criticisms. Why, let the House remember this: that, in 1886, all these 68 seizures to which the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has referred had been made, that the *D. J. Adams* and the *Doughty* had been seized, that every reason for making seizures had been adopted and enforced during that long and troublesome period in our fisheries dispute. Let me remind the House, moreover, that the reports made by the present Minister of Finance, then Minister of Fisheries, and myself, and which had been approved by Council, and which were denounced by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to-night, as "brag, and blow, and bluster," were put upon the records of this House early in 1887. Nay, more, they had been put before the Parliament of Great Britain early in the autumn of 1886, and had been then published by our own newspapers here. Accordingly, every man who took any interest in this question knew their contents, and when this House assembled in 1887, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and all his associates had read my report on the *D. J. Adams* seizure, and Mr. Foster's report on that whole question. They had read and digested all those reports which they now declare were "brag, blow and bluster"—and did they ask the House to condemn them then? Did the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rise in his place and condemn them? Did the leader of the Opposition rise and say: "this is brag, blow and bluster?" Did they say: "this is a narrow, cruel and harsh interpretation of the Treaty of 1818?" Did they say those 68 vessels should not have been seized, that we treated the Americans harshly, that we had seized too many American vessels? The records will show. But I find on looking over the records that, on the 17th June, 1887, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did bring this subject before the House. He brought it to the notice of the House on a report which he says to-night is "brag, blow and bluster."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, no.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not be able to accept the hon. gentleman's denial of a statement which I heard him make a few moments ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, do me the justice to allow me to explain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has intimated two or three times that I spoke of his report as being a report of brag, blow and bluster. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me entirely. I never did make use of such language to-night or on any occasion, but to-night and on previous occasions I have said that as far as the law is concerned, I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the point. The hon. gentleman has stated to-night that he was unable, and that any lawyer would be unable to differ from me so far as the interpretation of the document was concerned, but he said that these reports and Orders in Council and the policy of the Government based on them was mere "brag, blow and bluster." But I do not care if the hon. gentleman did not say so, it was in 1887 that he should have condemned us if he thought we should be condemned. I want to contrast now the attitude which he has taken to-night with his attitude when the whole policy was fresh before the country, when he had the reports in his hands, when he knew the whole history of the 68 seizures, but when he was not quite

so certain whether it would be to their advantage or disadvantage to attack us. In disclaiming any desire to embarrass the Government with respect to this question, the hon. gentleman said, on 17th June, 1887:

"My intention is simply to discuss this question in the light of the facts as they exist at present. The Government having, as I said, neglected their duties, and being now through that neglect brought face to face with the present condition of affairs, namely, the expiration of the Washington Treaty, I think I expressed the opinion of both sides that in taking steps to protect our fisheries, the Government carried out the wishes of the very large majority of the people."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Hear, hear. I say so now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The policy which we had carried out was well understood. The hon. gentleman had the reports in his hands, the Order in Council and the records of the 68 cruel seizures which he has detailed to-night—all the data on which was based the policy which he now described as "brag, blow and bluster." The hon. gentleman continued:

"I am quite sure that under the then circumstances that was the only proper course to be taken; and so far as they have taken that course they have my cordial support."

We had it, but only for one Session. —

"I am not going to open up those grave questions which have been discussed" —

With "brag, blow and bluster?" No. —

"— with very great ability by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have given a good deal of time to the reading of the papers on those questions" —

The hon. gentleman had not been misled or taken by surprise. —

"— and I think that so far as the controversy is concerned between Mr. Bayard and Mr. Phelps, the American Minister to England, on the one side," —

And to-night the hon. gentleman took the report of Mr. Phelps and backed it up. —

"— and the gentleman who acted for Canada on our side, our case has been very well presented."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I do not deny that to-night.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one other point on which I wish to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, even though it be as to very recent history. We heard to-night about the dreadful category of 68 seizures,—we heard it over and over again. The fact was that what the hon. gentleman complained of on 17th June, 1887, with that list before him, was that the seizures were all made in the harbors and that the cruisers had not gone out and searched the seas for those vessels. Why, he said, the fishery protection has been a farce because our cruisers have searched for American vessels only in the harbors of Canada while they should have taken them on the seas:

"It would strike those who know something about the habits of the American fishermen as very singular, that, if the poachers were watched, only one was seized for fishing within the 3-mile limit. The charge which I make—and I do that without making any charge of improper conduct against those who are carrying on the service—is that their time was devoted too much to the boarding and taking control of American vessels in harbors, while they did not give the proper protection they should have given to the sea-coast fisheries outside."

I shall give the hon. gentleman the full benefit of his statement, and of course anything that is in his favor I will read to him:

"It was a matter of public notoriety, it was talked of at every fireside, it was talked of at every dinner table, it was talked of in every exchange in the Maritime Provinces, that the cruisers were almost all the time in harbor. It may be that it was necessary for them to be in harbor. It may be that it was necessary for them to watch these vessels but my experience, and the information I have derived from those who have the best knowledge of the subject, leads me to believe that it was altogether improper for them to remain in harbor for the time they did. I find, taking up the copies of the different boarding books of these different vessels, that the information I had, and the facts which were generally known in the Maritime Provinces, are endorsed by the official statement which is obtainable here. I find, in the first place, that the schooner *L. Houlett*, under command of Captain Lorway, boarded 264 vessels; and one would



suppose, in looking at this book, that this gentleman and his vessel had been exceedingly active in looking after these poachers and protecting our fisheries, but a critical examination of the paper will show that there was nothing of the kind. Why? Because, of the 264 vessels that he boarded, 259 were vessels lying at anchor in the different harbors of the Provinces, and he only boarded 5 vessels outside of the harbor. One of these five vessels was that which was seized for an actual fishing within the limits, the *Highland Light*, and she has been condemned and sold; and the other four vessels he boarded outside of the harbor while they were supposed to be trespassing within the bounds. Hon. gentlemen will see at once that this was a very small proportion. Then, we have the *Critic*, commanded by Captain McLaren, which boarded 125 vessels in all, but 132 of these were at anchor in the harbor, and only three outside. The *F. E. Conrod*, Captain Smeltzer in command, boarded 48 vessels, and of these seven were outside a harbor, at the mouth of the Baie des Chaleurs, and he reports that he boarded them and warned them not to enter the bay; but, outside of these seven, he does not seem to have boarded a single American fishing craft when it was engaged in prosecuting the fishing business in the Maritime Provinces. The *Terror*, Captain Quigley, boarded 73 vessels in all, and all of these were in the harbor except one, which he boarded at the mouth of the harbor of Shelburne. Then we have the *General Middleton*; that vessel was more or less concerned in the Bay of Fundy, with the fishing of which I am not very well acquainted, but they appear to be all small boats of two tons, three and six tons, and so on, so I will not refer to that. They are not what we call fishing vessels at all. The *Lizzie Lindsay*, Captain Pouliot in command, boarded 27 vessels in all; two of these were outside and the other 25 were in the harbor. The *Lansdowne*, commanded by Captain Dakins, boarded 93 vessels in all. Nine of these were at sea, and 82 were in harbor. Hon. gentlemen would imagine, on a first glance, that a man who boards 72 vessels has evidently done a good deal of work, but, if you examine the return, you will find that as many as forty of those were lying in the same harbor at the same time, and were all boarded on one day.

“ Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What of that ?

“ Mr. DAVIES. I say that these vessels were in the same harbor, and the work done consisted of boarding them in the harbor. I think he should have devoted more time to sailing along the coasts and boarding them there.”

Now, Sir, all those seizures which were made, were for vessels improperly entering the harbors without proper justification, or for violating customs laws while they were there, and the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) contention was that in regard to that very business of boarding vessels—and he need not attempt to confuse the ear of the House by pretending that it was with a view of preventing fishing outside—with regard to that very boarding of vessels he said it should have been extended to our coasts outside. Suppose the American vessels had been boarded outside. What a cry would have gone up, if instead of a record of 68 seizures made in our own harbors and waters, the hon. member was able to point to a number of seizures which were made outside our harbors. How he would tell the House that the American fishermen were persecuted while pursuing their lawful calling along our coasts. I want to call the attention of this House for a few moments to a statement which has been repeated, I am very sorry to say, very many times outside of this House. This statement has very seldom been heard here, because it is only in the American brief on the fishery question—that we have been guilty of the inhumanity of driving vessels to sea without sufficient provisions for the maintenance of their crews. The House was told a night or two ago, and it has been referred to once or twice since; and the Senate of the United States has been informed in indignant terms and with strong language that we have been guilty of inhumanity which no maritime people had ever been guilty of before. The case of the *Molly Adams* has been cited as an illustration of that. Now, Sir, as that statement has been repeated in this House—and now it will be repeated for all time to come in the American brief on this question as having been said in this House—I must ask leave even to persecute the ear of the House by repeating an oft told tale, and to assert that that offence was never committed by the Government of Canada or by any one of its officers. The statement which has been made on the part of the United States is this: that the *Molly Adams* was a vessel which had rescued a shipwrecked Canadian crew, that it had given to the shipwrecked Canadian crew a portion of its provisions, and that when that vessel brought that crew into our waters and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

landed them on our coasts, they were driven to sea without the right to replenish their provisions. How is it, that the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, as well as those who have referred to the matter since, will take the American statement of the case and fling it in the face of those who have to negotiate arrangements for this country, when the statement has been refuted as plainly as a lying statement ever was, and when everybody knows that the refutation which we have made of it has never provoked a single word of reply? Our answer with regard to this case has gone before the United States Senate, it has gone to the State Department of the United States, it has been transferred to the man who made the charge, and more than a year has rolled by, and it is only in political discussions that we hear revived the dead story which we killed long ago. Let me read for a moment to the House what the statement is upon our side, and the statement as I have said has never been challenged even by the man who made the contrary statement :

“ Capt. Jacobs declares that on or about the 26th September last, during very heavy weather, he fell in with the bark *Neskilita* which had run on a bar at Malpeque harbor and became a total wreck. That he took off the crew, 17 in number, at 12 o'clock at night, carried them to his own vessel, fed them for three days, and then gave them \$60 with which to pay their fare home, and provisions to last them on their way. He states that the captain of the Canadian cruiser *Critic* came on board, was told the circumstances, but offered no assistance, and that no one on shore would take the wrecked men unless he became responsible for the payment of their board. The collector at Malpeque, in his report, says that early on the morning after the wreck, soon after the news reached him, he repaired to the harbor to see what assistance could be given; that he then met the captain of the *Neskilita* in company with Capt. Jacobs, and was told by the latter that the crew of the wrecked vessel was comfortably cared for on his vessel and that nothing more could be done. Capt. McLaren of the *Critic* says that he had once visited the *Molly Adams* and was told by Capt. Jacobs that ‘he had made all arrangements for the crew.’ The collector and Capt. McLaren agree in stating, from information gathered by them, that the crew of the wrecked vessel came to shore in their own boat unassisted, and after boarding a United States vessel were invited by Capt. Jacobs, with whom the captain of the *Neskilita* had beforetimes sailed out of Gloucester, to go on board the *Molly Adams*.”

So that this crew had not been rescued at all by the *Mollie Adams*.—

“ The collector was asked by the captain of the *Neskilita* if he would assist himself and crew to their homes, and answered that he could not unless assured that they themselves were without means for that purpose, in which case he would have to telegraph to Ottawa for instructions. The captain of the *Neskilita* made no further application. The Minister observes that it is the practice of the Dominion Government to assist shipwrecked and destitute sailors, in certain cases of great hardship, to their destination or homes, but in all cases it must be clear that they must be destitute, and the application for assistance must be made to Ottawa through the Collector of Customs. Had such an application been made by the captain of the *Neskilita*, it would have received due consideration. In answer to the charge that board could not be obtained for the wrecked crew, it is stated by Capt. McLaren that the crew of a United States vessel, wrecked about the same time, found no difficulty in getting board and that the captain of the *Neskilita* had himself arranged to board with the collector, who expressed surprise at his failing to come. Capt. Jacobs complains that he was not allowed to land from his vessel the material saved from the wreck. To this charge the collector replies that he received no intimation of any wreck material, except the crew's luggage, being on board the *Mollie Adams*, and Capt. Jacobs made no request to him regarding the landing of wrecked material, and that he (the collector) gave all assistance in his power to the captain of the *Neskilita* in saving material from the wreck. It was subsequently discovered that Capt. Jacobs had on board the *Mollie Adams* a seine from the wrecked vessel belonging to the underwriters, for taking care of which, when obliged to give it up, Capt. Jacobs claimed that he was paid the sum of \$10. Capt. Jacobs states that he was put to a loss of ten days' fishing by his detention with the *Neskilita*. The reports of both the collector and Capt. McLaren agree in giving a very different and sufficient reason, viz, very bad weather, consequent inability to fish, a disability experienced by the whole fishing fleet at that time anchored in Malpeque. The second complaint of Mr. Bayard is that when Capt. Jacobs, experiencing a dearth of provisions as a consequence of his charitable action, shortly after put into Port Medway, and asked to purchase half a barrel of flour and enough provisions to take him home, the collector, ‘with full knowledge of all the circumstances,’ refused the request and threatened him with seizure if he bought anything whatever. The collector's report hereto annexed, shows that Capt. Jacobs entered his port on the 25th October, fully one month after the occurrence at Malpeque; that in entering he made affirmation that he called for shelter and repairs, and for no other purpose whatever; that just before leaving he asked permission to pur-

chase half a barrel of flour, and when asked by the collector if he was without provisions, he replied that he was not, adding that he had 'a good supply of all kinds of provisions except flour, and enough of that to last him home unless he met some unusual delay.'

These are the facts on which we are told that we drove American fishermen to sea without provisions, after they had rendered charitable aid to our own people. There is also the case which was referred to by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the case of the *Laura Sayeward*, in which there was a persistent attempt made to fasten on the officers of this Government the charge of harshness to an American who desired to obtain provisions in the port of Shelburne.

MR. EDGAR. Does the hon. gentleman refer to my remarks in this debate? Because I never mentioned that case at all, nor the case of the *Mollie Adams* either.

SIR JOHN THOMPSON. I do not require to cite what the hon. member said in this debate. I am referring to his discussion of the case last winter. Upon his representation of the case to the House a more general reference was made this Session to it in the argument on the other side of the House, as to our inhumanity, and I want to put our case with regard to that vessel on the footing on which I think it ought to be placed. There was an affidavit made by Medeo Rose, the captain of an American fishing vessel, that he came into the port of Shelburne, and was denied the right to purchase provisions there. Upon that an enquiry was made, the result of which was that we not only got the affidavit of the Collector of Customs that the statement was entirely untrue, that he had treated the man courteously, and that the captain had never asked the privilege of buying provisions, but we also got the affidavit of the man himself that his former statement was untrue. These statements went to Washington and were brought to the attention of that roving commission appointed by the Senate to discover what claims could be made against Canada; and fearing prosecution for perjury and that his claim would be thrown out, this man made a statement that he had made his second affidavit in consequence of intimidation. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has brought down and laid on the Table of the House a clear and explicit reply to that statement by the collector himself, who distinctly negatives every statement made as to coercion or intimidation to get this man to retract his affidavit; next, we have the affidavit of the magistrate who took the affidavit of Medeo Rose, and who says that it was made with the greatest willingness, and without the slightest fear or compulsion; and, lastly, we have the written statement of the United States Consular Agent at Shelburne that the statements of our officers are true, and that when Medeo Rose applied to him he never mentioned any such complaint. But that case will not disappear from the brief, either in the United States or on the other side of the House. But, Sir, when we are charged with cruelty, and narrow, inhuman treatment of American fishing vessels, what has the House to say of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) who spoke for an hour this afternoon in an attempt to persuade the House that we should carry out the *modus vivendi* for another year, although we are aware that, last Session, that hon. gentleman denounced the *modus vivendi*, and declared that the people of the Maritime Provinces never would submit to have these American fishermen come in even for shelter. He said that the people of the Maritime Provinces would look upon a concession to allow them to come in for shelter and transhipment and the purchase of bait as a complete sacrifice of all their rights. This hon. gentleman, who sits in council with the Opposition and rises to debate this question every time it is discussed, first on this side and then on the other, but always against the Government, declared last winter that American fishermen should not be permitted to come in for shelter; to-day demands that far greater

privileges should be continued for another year by means of the *modus vivendi*. Now, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred in strong terms to the contention set up in my report. I will not again characterize his remarks, as he does not like the terms I applied to them, when he called that contention one of brag and bluster. But he said that my contention was that we must exclude American fishermen from buying a rope, sending a telegram, mailing a letter or going for a physician. If he reads my report—as he endorsed it in 1887 he will endorse it again—he will find that it makes no such statement. Yet that same assertion has been put forward in the press against the negotiators of the treaty last year. It has been said that I argued successfully that we must deprive the Americans of these privileges, or give up our fishing rights altogether. The contention I put forward in that report was not so, but it may be stated in a few words. Mr. Phelps' contention had been this: that the Convention of 1818, which renounced all other privileges except the privilege of coming into Canadian waters for wood, water, shelter and repairs, surely did not renounce the right to come in to buy a rope, to mail a letter, to send a telegram, or to apply for a doctor; and what I said was not that it was necessary to exclude American fishermen from these trifling privileges, but that we could not admit such an interpretation of the treaty as would give them the right to come in for such purposes. I said that admitting that the Treaty of 1818 was intended to prevent Americans fishing in our waters, if they had the right to haunt our waters on the mere pretext of mailing a letter, or sending a telegram, or landing a man, or shipping men, or buying a rope, the provisions of the treaty would be frittered away. I said, and I think every sensible man who understands the question will agree with me, that that would be the natural result; but I did not say that to extend in mercy the right to call for provisions in cases of necessity, or to call for a physician, would deprive us of a right to enforce the treaty altogether, as was insinuated in the observations made to-night. When I come to call the attention of the House to the provision we made in 1888, and which we were told was a complete negation of all our record, I will show that those rights were not ceded to the United States. I will show that the Americans were confined simply to the privileges they had under the Treaty of 1818 until they should choose to buy other privileges—those which we said were ours to sell and not theirs to take. But if the House will look at the report made in 1870 by the then Minister of Fisheries, the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), they will find that the thing which is declared to-night to be so offensive was the thing which he stood for 18 or 19 years ago. He said:

"But notwithstanding this definite restriction, the majority of United States citizens engaged in the fisheries, finding it to their own advantage to supply them selves in our limits with requisites for the fishing voyages, and with materials needed to carry on their business, endeavor to deal with traders and inhabitants of various places along the coast, and even without reference to our Customs regulations. The revenue officers and other authorities have persistently denied this privilege. Its practical effect would be to extend indefinitely the precise rights secured to them by treaty."

So he goes on at length and I will not follow him out, but it is declared there, in 1870, that to allow the Americans to claim exemption from Customs regulations would be to extend indefinitely the privileges given by the treaty. Now, we have been told several times, in most emphatic language, that the object of enforcing the Customs laws against American fishermen was not to protect our fisheries but to drive the Americans to exasperation. Well, the enforcement of the Customs laws has been simply this: We stated in 1886 that the American fishermen had the right, under the Treaty of 1818, to come into our waters for wood and water, and shelter and repairs, but that in so doing they were obliged to observe the municipal law, which com-

pelled every vessel no matter from what country, entering one of our ports to report herself and declare what her business was. So that if an American fisherman chooses to visit our coast for any of the purposes, which give him the right to enter, the Collector of Customs must know his business, must know whether it is lawful, must know what he has and what he gets, and see that he does not violate any of the provisions of the Customs law. But if fishing vessels were allowed to come and go and stay as long as they pleased, there would be no chance for preserving either our rights to our fisheries, or our Customs laws. Let those who complain in regard to the Customs laws—let those who say that they are unnecessarily severe—turn to the Revised Statutes of the United States, section 2,774, and they will find there what the requirements of the United States are with regard to vessels entering American waters. They will find that every vessel, once she goes into American waters, must enter at the Customs before she dares to depart. It is true she has twenty-four hours to enter, but she has not the privilege to leave in the twenty-four hours, under a heavy penalty; and if they will turn to the reports of the cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, which are noted in the margin of that section of the Revised Statutes of the United States, they will find that by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court those provisions are held to extend to every vessel, even when driven by tempest into American harbors. So that for the last eighty or ninety years, and to-day, the statutory provisions of the United States have been as strict as has been our law, which we enforced in 1886. I suppose it will be said, as it has been said on the part of the United States, and as has been said here to-night: "Is it not cruel and unneighborly to the sixty millions of people who are our neighbors, that we should compel American vessels coming to our ports to enter at the Customs house when we know they come in for shelter or repairs?" As I told the House, it is necessary that we should have some supervision over these fishing vessels in our waters, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was so sensible of the necessity of such supervision, that he wanted them boarded before they came in. This is no new provision. In the United States, as late as 22nd June, 1887, after the Committee of the Senate had made a report of these 63 so-called outrages which were spoken of to-night—after our conduct had been stigmatised all over the United States as harsh and brutal because we enforced the Customs laws, and when we were enforcing the Customs laws, as stated by the hon. member for Queen's, to exasperate the people of the United States, it will be found that Mr. Fairchild, Secretary of the Treasury, gave an important decision on 22nd June, 1887. In that case, which was the case of some Spanish fishing smacks which had run in under stress of weather to buy provisions, and, having bought provisions, because they dared to depart without reporting at the Customs, they were seized and fined by the collector \$500; but Mr. Fairchild had the magnanimity to reduce the fines to \$40 for each smack. It was a pretty severe warning to them not to venture to enter an American harbor for necessary supplies to sustain life without making entry at the Customs house in accordance with the Revised Statutes of the United States, the nature of which he pointed out to them, and made them remember in a way they and their neighbors are not likely to forget. Now, we were told that it was a happy thing for Canada that there existed in the borders of the United States a Canadian citizen, who, finding that the United States and Canada were almost approaching the verge of war on account of Canada having maintained the simple, plain and undoubted rights which she had exercised and enjoyed for upwards of 70 years, volunteered to act as mediator. We were told it was a happy thing there existed a mediator who could bring the two nations together. This matter was called to the attention of the House by what I think was a misconstruction of the language the hon.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Minister of Finance used last Session. It was brought to the attention of the House as if the whole credit of these negotiations, and of any negotiations having taken place at all, was due to a private citizen of Canada now living in the United States. Now, the fact is, that before Mr. Wiman made a single proposal in the direction of negotiations between the Governments of Canada and the United States, despatches had passed between the Washington and the British Governments, and between the British Government and Canada, putting these negotiations on foot, and declaring that there were to be negotiations in which all the relations between the two countries relating to trade, as well as to fisheries, were to be taken up; and it was only after negotiations were thoroughly on foot that Mr. Wiman interjected himself and proposed, before these negotiations should be formally opened, that it would be expedient for some member of the Canadian Government to proceed to the capital of the United States. Yet the House was told the other night, and to-night, that had it not been for that mediation the two countries would have been at each other's throats, and mediation would have been impossible. I do not intend to question the motives which Mr. Wiman had in his interference, nor do I doubt his desire to promote peace between the two countries. But I say that the small part which he played in the transaction has been magnified to ridiculous proportions in this debate. It was said, also, by the leader of the Opposition that Mr. Bayard had written a letter to Sir Charles Tupper proposing trade negotiations, and that, when the proposals had been made by the British plenipotentiaries in the terms of that letter, they were refused because of the irritation which the United States Government felt at the action of Canada on the fishery question. The fact is, and, if the hon. member who made the statement will examine the record, he will be so convinced of it that I believe he will withdraw his assertion, that between those two periods there was nothing whatever in the conduct of Canada to cause any irritation on the part of the United States Government or people. There had been no opportunity for such irritation, because the winter had intervened and spring had not commenced. There had been no frequenting of our waters by American fishing vessels, there had been no action taken, there had been no irritation, no threat, or anything on our part which could give any reason for the withdrawal of the proposal. The statement to that effect which has been made in this debate, with a view to injure the Government, the assertion that we embarrassed those negotiations by pursuing a course of irritation in the meantime, is absolutely contrary to the fact and without a particle of foundation. When the offer was made, it was rejected for reasons which are patent to everybody in the two countries, namely: that, while no doubt Mr. Bayard was sincere in the proposal he made originally that the discussions should include matters of trade and commerce, he found in the interval, not that we had treated his people harshly, and that he was, therefore, justified in withdrawing his proposal, but that the temper and feeling of the two parties in the United States, of one of which he was a member, was such that they would not agree to anything of the sort, and that if any attempt was made on the part of the United States to discuss trade concessions there was an end to the slightest hope of a treaty being concluded in regard to the fisheries. That which was due to the strong feeling of the republican party against free trade and to the sensitiveness of the democratic party to the charge of favoring free trade, has been, for the first time, put down to the blustering course pursued by the Government of Canada. We have been told that we backed down in 1887—that so volatile, so fluctuating was our policy that, while in 1886 we persisted in these seizures, in 1887 we had not a single seizure to record. The reason for that is as plain and as obvious to the hon. gentleman who made the state-

ment as it is to us on this side of the House, namely, that the policy pursued by the Canadian Government in 1886 made its determination to enforce the fishery rights of Canada known to every American fisherman. They knew, by the seizure of the *David J. Adams* in 1886, that we did not intend to permit American vessels to purchase bait in our ports. They knew, by the seizure of the *Doughty* in 1886, that we did not intend to permit the shipping of men on American fishing vessels in our ports. They knew by all these other seizures—as they have been called, though they were really mere arrests—that they must report at our Customs when they entered our harbors. In 1887 they did report at our Customs, they did not ship their men in our harbors, and they did not attempt to buy bait in our ports; and that was simply because the police surveillance in 1886 had been effectual, and not because any instruction was withdrawn, or a line or a dot of our policy was changed in 1887. We were told also that part of the hidden history of these negotiations was that, when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington in 1887, he made the promise that there should be no more seizures in 1887. I know something of his mind in regard to that matter; and I say, unhesitatingly, that that is without the slightest foundation. Even if he had so far forgotten himself as to say so, he had no authority whatever from the Government of Canada to that effect. In any case he could not have been so foolish as to make any such promise at the very outset of the negotiations. Then we were told that we backed down on account of the Retaliation Act being introduced, and that it was that which made us take back all the policy of "brag and bluster." While everyone would have regretted the enforcement of the Retaliation Act, so far from that having been a reason for our backing down, we went to Washington after a statement in writing by Grover Cleveland that it would be injurious to the great commercial interests of the United States to put that Act in force, and that he would not do so, had been published. We were told again that every contention was given up on the part of Canada and that the statement made by the First Minister as to the contentions of Canada having been maintained was so extraordinary that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) could not believe his ears and waited until he could read it. I venture to say that that statement will be borne out by everyone who reads the controversy and who reads the treaty. Everyone knows what were the leading points of discussion between the two countries. Let him look at the treaty, and he will see how they were adjusted. They were settled in a way which was not dishonorable to the United States, but in a manner which adopted the contentions of Canada in regard to every one of them. The United States had asserted that their fishermen had the right to come into our ports for every one of the four objects mentioned in the original treaty, without entering at the Customs. They contended that they had the right to tranship their cargoes, to buy bait and supplies, and to enter our ports for all purposes that were not immediately connected with fishing. By the Treaty of 1888, did we admit that their contention was correct, and that they should have these privileges for all time to come? No; but, as was well expressed by a leading Senator in the United States, when you read the controversy which took place before the Treaty of 1888, you find all these matters referred to as matters of right, and when you read the treaty you find they are matters of purchase. It is one thing to say: "This is our property, and no one shall deprive us of it;" and it is another thing to say that, for the sake of good neighborhood, and to settle the question on terms not injurious to our fishermen, and in order to give us a fair market for our fish: "These rights which we have said belong to us we will sell for a reasonable price to you." And because it was provided that the United States would not any more contend that these things were theirs, but

would buy them, the hon. gentleman says we gave away everything which we had contended for; and it is because of this that the statement of the Premier was well made, that while these privileges are not, within reasonable limits, denied any longer to the fishermen of the United States, they are no longer held by them as a matter of right, as they claimed them to be before the Treaty of 1888. As regards the question of enforcement of the Customs laws, as regards the question of how far it is safe to allow them to use our ports without complying with the Customs laws, you will see that we do not give them the unlimited right of coming into our harbors without complying with the Customs laws; and even if my report bears the strong construction which the hon. member for Queen's said to-night it does, you will find they limit themselves in the use of our ports, even for the purposes of the Treaty of 1818, and that even when they come in for any of the four purposes for which they have a right under the Treaty of 1818, they must report at the Customs if they stay longer than a certain time, and under all circumstances if they have any communication with the shore. If the American fishermen or the American Government had conceded that in 1886 there would have been no necessity for making the seizures which we made, but when the negotiators came together and found that these terms could be made by them and accepted by us, there was an end of the controversy. The rights of American fishermen received a fair limitation—and a limitation which is not inconsistent with the full enjoyment that was necessary to them—of the privileges which were secured by the Treaty of 1818. Another extraordinary statement was made by the hon. member for Queen's—and I have his words this time exactly before me—that Sir Charles Tupper stated that he could not hold by any of the contentions which had been made by the junior ministers; and he further said, in the course of the debate last Session, in introducing the treaty to the House, that he would have been criminal if he had tried to maintain their contentions. I need not tell the House that not one word of this statement was ever uttered by Sir Charles Tupper on the floor of this House or elsewhere. What Sir Charles Tupper did say on that occasion was: that it was impossible for him to sustain the full contentions which had been made by his colleagues; and, indeed, that was a matter which went without saying. He went to Washington, not for the purpose of settling our right as a regular tribunal would settle it, but for the purpose of making a bargain; and whoever heard of two parties being able to make a bargain when both of them stuck to the strongest contention as to the rights which he possessed? Sir Charles Tupper did say:

"I need not inform the House that, in diplomatic intercourse, it is customary, it is right, for the representative of a government to state the strongest and most advanced grounds that they possibly can sustain in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House—"

The hon. member for Queen's interpreted it as "tried before the House on our reports as to what the law was." No; he was speaking of having his treaty tried before the House, as maintaining the strictest right we had contended for.—

"—to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friends the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

Then the hon. member, finding that that was as far as he could safely go in his quotation, said: "Then the contentions made in other parts of the report went to the winds." Did they? If the hon. gentleman had had the courage to read on he would have found that Sir Chas. Tupper said:

"The ground they took was quite right; they were authorised by the strict terms of the treaty in taking the strong ground they did; they would have failed in their duty to this House and to this country, if, called upon to deal with this question as a matter of diplomatic intercourse and discussion between the Governments of the United States and

of Canada, they had not taken the extreme contention that the literal terms of the Treaty of 1818 would warrant."

—And everybody knows, since I have brought it to the attention of the House, that even if Sir Charles Tupper called it an "extreme contention" the hon. member for Queen's differed from him, as I stated before, so far as to call it a very fair statement of our case and a very able report. Now the hon. member for Queen's further erred in the criticism which he made of this *modus vivendi*. He declares that the Premier, in reply to the mover of the resolution, discussed it as if it were an act of humiliation, and the hon. member for Queen's endeavored to assure the House that there was no humiliation about it—that it was a perfectly fair arrangement. He said—and I ask the members of the House to remember it—that this *modus vivendi* gives up no territorial right of Canada. Nor does it? But the House will remember that the *modus vivendi* is but the shadow of the treaty itself. It is precisely of the same shape and nature as the treaty is, it is just what the treaty is, only an agreement that the treaty shall be accepted in all its terms before it can be ratified; and, therefore, when the hon. gentleman commends the *modus vivendi* to the House as giving up none of the territorial rights of Canada, I think it does not lie in his mouth to declare that the treaty itself, which is but the substance of this *modus vivendi* made perpetual, may properly be called a complete give away of the rights of Canada. But I am sorry to say that the hon. gentleman stands in strict and sharp contrast with himself again with regard to that question. I think he was right to-night, in commending the *modus vivendi*, but I think he entirely misunderstood the First Minister when he supposed that the First Minister was denouncing the *modus vivendi* when he spoke of the humiliation of begging reciprocity or any other concessions from the United States. When the Premier made the observations commented on, he was not referring to the terms of the *modus vivendi* at all, which, so far as I understand the statements of the Premier, has not been condemned in any particular. As I understand the question the decision of himself and his colleagues as to continuing the *modus vivendi* in force, is entirely in suspense, not for purposes of delay and procrastination, but for the purposes of seeing whether we are to get anything like an equivalent for the rights which we are conceding, and for the purpose of seeing that we do not open all the privileges of our coasts to the people of the United States, while they may refuse all privileges of their coasts to us. But this is what the hon. gentleman said about it last year:

"I would say nothing about the *modus vivendi*. If the treaty was good in itself, if it was an honorable and fair treaty, I would not object to a *modus vivendi* being agreed upon for two years, such as was offered by the commissioners from Great Britain and attached to the treaty here. But there are not only the concessions in the treaty, it appears as if the Government were not able to give the Americans enough, and as soon as they had given all they asked, the Government then said that in good fellowship and with a wish to promote good feeling we propose for the next two years, for a nominal sum, to give them everything they can possibly ask and all that our fishermen enjoy on our shores."

Now, I think the hon. member was mistaken last year, and I think he was right to-night in declaring that the *modus vivendi* gives up none of the territorial rights of our people, and does not give up either everything that the Americans ask, or everything our own fishermen enjoy on our own shores. But he was mistaken also in this particular; he misinterpreted, I think, the object of the *modus vivendi* itself. He took exception to the remark of the First Minister that to concede now the *modus vivendi* would be to enable the American fishermen, at a small price, to enjoy commercial privileges on our coast, when there is a new administration coming into office within a week which might close all the ports of the United States to our people. That was the point the First Minister made, and I think it was well made. And for the purpose of testing that, let us see the reply of the hon. gentleman. He says:

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

"Does not the House know that the *modus vivendi* was adopted for the purpose of preventing that Retaliation Act coming into force?"

I say not at all. The object of the *modus vivendi*, and it is declared on its face, is this: The treaty was negotiated in February, it could not, in all probability, be ratified by the Senate for some months then to come; in the meantime our coast would be frequented by American fishermen wanting to trade, and it was thought that, either through rashness or precipitation on the part of the American fishermen, who might suppose that the treaty had already come into force, or the desire of some of them who might want to make political trouble, as some of them had avowed was their intention, with a view afterwards of resorting to a Republican Government to redress their wrongs, it was feared this might so precipitate matters on the coast, as to cause a danger that a rupture might take place, which would induce the Senate to say: "Now hostilities have commenced again, let there be an end to the Fishery Treaty." And it was in order to preserve peace, until the decision of the Senate should be pronounced on the treaty itself, that the *modus vivendi* was adopted, and it had no possible relation to the Retaliation Act. But the hon. gentleman says that the Premier's point was wrong; for this reason, that so long as the *modus vivendi* is kept in force there could be no complaint of wrong done to American fishermen, and therefore no pretence for the Retaliation Act being enforced. He is entirely mistaken. Let us adopt this resolution to-night, let us put the *modus vivendi* in force to-morrow, and although it is in force an American fisherman could come down on our coast and say: "I will not take any license under the *modus vivendi*, but I stand on my rights as an American citizen, as contended for by Mr. Bayard and all our people, and I claim the right to go in and buy bait and tranship my cargo without taking out any license whatever." In that case the old contentions would be revived. We must maintain the rights of Canada, and then the President of the United States has it within his power for any cause of that kind to declare that the Retaliation Act shall come into force. Hon. members will find on reading its provisions, that it is most sweeping in its statement of the reasons for which it may be put into operation. It declares that if the rights of American fishermen are infringed in Canadian waters, that if their ships are not allowed the same privileges in our waters as Canadian ships are allowed in American waters—forgetting that they were paid and bountifully paid for the discrimination—it declares that if the privilege of coming into Canadian ports under a touch and trade license is refused—not a *modus vivendi* license—if, under these circumstances, or any of these circumstances a collision should occur between the authorities and the American fishermen, there would be the pretext for putting the Retaliation Act in force, after this House has declared in its bounty and its generosity that the *modus vivendi* at all hazards must be extended to American fishermen, and we would have the humiliation of knowing that the Retaliation Act was enforced at the very time when we had bound ourselves for the whole year to open our coasts and give full privileges to every American fisherman who might choose to pay for a license. So the House will, I think, be of the opinion that on this question a discussion is premature at this juncture of public affairs. I desire to call attention, before concluding, to one point which I forgot in my haste a few moments ago, and that was the position taken by the United States authorities themselves as to our right to enforce our own laws upon our coasts. I will cite from a letter of Mr. Bayard himself, addressed to American fishermen who complained to him of the treatment which they received on our Atlantic coasts. Mr. Bayard said:

"You are well aware that questions are now pending between this Government and that of Great Britain in relation to the jurisdiction and to the rights of American fishing vessels in the territorial waters of

British North America, and we will relax no effort to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the difficulties. In the meantime it is the duty and the manifest interest of all American fishermen entering Canadian jurisdiction to ascertain and obey the laws and regulations therein in force."

That is all the Government of Canada ever did. All they said was this: that to the whole world our ports are free, except for the restriction on American fishermen by the Treaty of 1818, and that when they came into our waters they are bound, as Mr. Bayard subsequently told them they were bound, to enquire what the law of the country was and to obey it. I have shown the House that the law of our country in its terms, enforcement and execution is precisely that which it has been ever since the Treaty of 1818 was made, and is substantially the same as the law and enforcement of the law is in the United States itself. I have only one other observation to make and that is in regard to the challenge or taunt with which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) closed, the extraordinary statement which he hurled at the head of the First Minister in his loudest tones, and with gesticulations as strong and vehement as if he really credited his own assertions, that if the Retaliation Act were put in force the people of this country would hold him responsible and hold him criminally responsible. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say about that matter is, that while no one would regret the enforcement of any act of retaliation by either of the two countries more strongly than I would, or apprehend more seriously the consequences than I would, if any such danger and difficulty should come, the Canadian Government would be able to leave its record to the judgment of any man of fairness, honesty and probity. We have had to deal with the United States through the medium of the Imperial Government which, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) pointed out to the House, has always been most watchful and most critical of the action of an ambitious colony in its treatment of a neighboring foreign power. Under the guidance and with the advice and co-operation of that Government, from time to time, we have made the concession which was made in 1825—made in vain in 1835—we have made the concessions which were offered in 1838, which those hon. gentlemen say were concessions of all we had ever contended for, but which we think were not dishonorable concessions at all. We have made all those concessions; we have done nothing more than uphold the municipal law of our own country, which Mr. Bayard told the American fishermen it was their duty and their manifest interest to enquire into and obey—we have done nothing more than that, and we have done it with the approval of the Imperial Government in a manner which induced Lord Roseberry to use the words which I quoted a few moments ago when on Mr. Phelps asking him to submit the question of the correctness of the reports of my colleague and myself again to the law officers of the Crown, the noble lord said:

"If you want that course adopted you must raise some new question, because on the old case there are no two opinions in England."

We have done all that, and done it in spite of a mode of attack adopted by the Opposition, which was oftentimes unfair. If the United States Government should unwisely and in an unneighborly way enforce any Retaliation Act against Canada, I venture to say that when the bitterness of present political disputes has passed away, and this subject is reviewed by men of intelligence and reason, they will say that the fault did not rest upon Canada; and I shall be glad for the sake of my own country if we are able to say as well that it was not in any way induced by the attacks made from the other side of the House, which have been put forward at this moment with the purpose, or at least with the effect of convincing statesmen in the United States that we are completely at the mercy of that country, and are bound to change our policy and surrender our rights at their dictation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) may be congratulated on having accomplished a very difficult task. My hon. friend has at last succeeded in removing the padlock which the wise precautions of the First Minister have up to this moment placed on the lips of the gentlemen behind him. It was a very difficult task and no wonder when we consider the sort of case that those hon. gentlemen, and particularly the Minister of Justice, have to present and defend in this House. I will say for the Minister of Justice that from his own narrow and technical point—narrow and technical point, I repeat—he has done as he did in his despatches, he has made a very fair *exposé* of the strict legal aspect of the case, but, unhappily, he has failed utterly to comprehend or to state to this country or to this House any of the broad statesmanlike views upon which this great question alone can be properly discussed. Knowing what we all know, knowing what no man knows better than the hon. gentleman, knowing that the right hon. gentleman and hon. gentlemen will have to recede on this point, just as they have receded on every other point, that they are preparing for a new somerset, that they will have to undo their Orders in Council, that they will have to repeal the declarations they have made, and that in all human probability before another month has rolled over our heads, or, perhaps, another week has passed, they will have to contradict themselves and their followers further, and once more cease to use all these petty pedantries as to whether the constructions of a treaty made 71 years ago are exactly and literally to be carried out in the year of grace 1889, we may well wonder why they should thus insist on dragging themselves and their followers through the dirt to no purpose. Now, Sir, as regards the statements made by the Minister of Justice. This House heard him in the very opening paragraph almost of his speech, declare that no American of note had ever proposed to mix up the fishery question with our trade relations. We heard the hon. gentleman declare that. I ask is the Secretary of State of Mr. Cleveland's administration, Mr. Bayard, an American of note? Is Mr. Bayard a man whose voice ought to be heard on this question? What did Mr. Bayard say on this subject? The hon. gentleman in a later part of his speech absolutely gave us the most direct and flat contradiction possible of his own statement made about half an hour before in regard to this matter. Mr. Bayard says:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *quæstio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

With that letter in the hon. gentleman's hand; he has had—I will not say the audacity—but he has had the want of consideration to assure this House that no American of note ever proposed to mix up the fishery question with the trade questions which we now propose to discuss. That is a sample of the correctness of statement, of the accuracy and of the breadth of view which the Minister of Justice has brought to the discussion of this important question. In connection with that the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Bayard subsequently withdrew his proposition, and that Mr. Bayard withdrew it because he found that the American Senate would not allow any interference with treaty privileges on their part. The Minister of Justice would have done well to look a little closer into what Sir Charles Tupper said on that question. What Sir Charles Tupper said was, that the commissioners and Mr. Bayard who was along with them:

"Withdrew that proposition because such was the hostility of public men with regard to Canada and the treatment of Canada by their fishermen that if to-morrow any relaxation of the tariff of the United States was made by an Act of Congress, it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operation so as to deny us the advantage."

That was Sir Charles Tupper's statement, as explicit and as express as words could be, that he found it impossible and that Mr. Bayard found it impossible to carry out Mr. Bayard's proposition to induce them to negotiate on trade questions, because such was the hostility created in the minds of American public men by our treatment of United States fishermen that he could not hope for a hearing. I leave to the House to consider, when a gentleman so well versed in the details of this case as the Minister of Justice must naturally be, can make two such assertions in the course of an hour's speech, so totally at variance with the facts actually before him and some of which he actually quoted, I ask how can he expect us to believe that he is perfectly correct in all the minute details which he proceeded to inflict upon the House as to the *Molie Adams*, the *D. J. Adams*, or any other of the numerous family of Adams which were brought in contact with our cruisers. I will take occasion to call the attention of the House to a very unfair allegation made by the Minister of Justice with respect to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). He alleges that my hon. friend was to blame and that he showed he had no proper conception of the case, because he made the complaint that in these 63 seizures which were made by us in 1886, almost all the seizures were made, not for a violation of our fishery regulations, not because the American boats had been caught poaching in our waters, but on account of a breach of some petty Customs regulations committed in harbor. The Minister of Justice attempts to say that there is a contradiction in the argument of my hon. friend for Queen's. The argument of my hon. friend from first to last, was that the gentlemen opposite continued—at any rate except in very few and very rare instances—to seize these American fishing boats not because they were poaching in Canadian waters, not because they were improperly taking fish, but that they pursued them in an inhospitable and foolish manner considering the relations of the two countries, for certain petty breaches of Customs laws which fishermen could hardly be expected to be familiar with; and that in so doing they undoubtedly did to a very great extent—as not my friend from Queen's, but as Sir Charles Tupper pointed out—exasperate the people of the States, exasperate the fishermen, exasperate Congress, exasperate the whole press of the United States and by their conduct bring us into a very perilous position as regards the United States. I further call the attention of the House to this: that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice, wisely perhaps did not attempt in the slightest degree to explain away the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, quoted by me on a recent occasion, and quoted again by my hon. friend, to show that, be it right or be it wrong—for the moment we will not discuss that question—the policy of the Government had brought us to the verge of commercial war—as Sir Charles Tupper declared, within an ace of actual war—with the United States; had brought the people of the United States into a state of extreme, it may be unreasonable, exasperation. That the hon. gentleman did not attempt to deny or explain. What he did attempt to do was, forsooth, cram into the minds of the members of this House—men who must be supposed to have some acquaintance with affairs—that preposterous, ridiculous statement, that whereas we seized 68 vessels for various breaches of the fishery regulations or the Customs laws in 1886, while in the succeeding year we did not arrest one, yet there was no change of policy. Sir, is there a man within the sound of my voice who could believe such a statement to be possible? Sir Charles Tupper declared more than once that fishermen were—I suppose those of Canada as well as of the United States—a most lawless set of men, who could not easily be

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

controlled; and yet the hon. the Minister of Justice says that the reason there were no seizures or arrests made in 1887, was that the American fishermen were converted all at once into most peaceable and law-abiding persons. We have heard of certain very miraculous conversions, there is no doubt of it; but the conversion of the American fishermen, who were described by Sir Charles Tupper as a most lawless crew, into peaceable and law-abiding citizens, so that not one of them, though there were 800 or more vessels in our waters, ever committed the smallest breach of the fishery regulations or the Customs laws from the beginning of the season of 1887 to the close, is certainly a most remarkable occurrence. Well, I leave to the Minister of Justice or his colleagues to reconcile the repeated statements made by Sir Charles Tupper when he was advocating the passage of the Fishery Treaty in this House, that he was obliged to make numerous concessions for the sake of peace, with the declaration of the First Minister that no concessions at all were made. These two statements cannot both be true, and I leave it to the hon. gentlemen—it is no particular concern of mine—to say which is the truth. I humbly submit that the two positions are utterly irreconcilable, to say the least. But my intention in rising was not so much to deal with what I must, in humble imitation again of Sir Charles Tupper, describe as the narrow view taken of the Convention of 1818 by the First Minister and the then Minister of Marine. My position to-night is this: that by the conduct of the Government we are brought face to face with the situation described by Sir Charles Tupper in words which I do not require to repeat; and, under these circumstances, although I admit most freely that my hon. friend took a grave responsibility on himself when he offered his advice to the Government on this critical question, I say that if ever the leader of an Opposition was justified from the past conduct of the Government, in taking the sense of the House as to the future policy of the Government, my hon. friend has been justified on this present occasion. Now, Sir, I have said before, and I repeat, that until these discussions commenced, very few people in Canada—I suppose but few in this House, I know but few in the country—ever comprehended the extreme peril into which, by the evidence of their own commissioner, the conduct of the Government in 1886 had dragged the people of Canada in 1887. Sir, the Opposition may have been to blame; they may have done wrong; but if there is anything that the Opposition in this House are to blame for, if there is anything we have to reproach ourselves with, it is not that we have spoken out now, but that we have been reticent so long when we saw how these hon. gentlemen were abusing their trust. Sir, we had an excuse. So long as those negotiations were pending, so long as there was a reasonable chance that the Government would be able to bring them to a profitable conclusion, so long I think there was an excuse for the Opposition remaining silent; but it is only too clear, not from the words so much as from the acts of the Government, that from the moment at any rate that Sir Charles Tupper turned his back upon them, they have become utterly oblivious of the possible consequences of the events of 1886 and 1887. Seeing that the Government of Canada were entering on a dangerous policy which had already placed the country on the brink of a commercial war, we asked them if they intended to revert to the *modus vivendi*. If they did not mean to do so, then all we can say is that their conduct in refusing to say so is quite inexplicable. Now, three things, it appears to me, are perfectly clear from the facts disclosed by Sir Charles Tupper in the speech to which I have referred. One of those I have repeated—and it cannot be repeated too often—is that the Government in 1886, by their very strict interpretation of an old and all but obsolete convention, without bearing in mind the changes that have taken place in the circumstances of the country since, had brought us

into a very perilous predicament; it is equally clear that in 1847 we escaped from the peril by the skin of our teeth, almost from a mere accident, what the hon. Minister of Justice says to the contrary notwithstanding; and I take issue with him entirely as to the manner in which he spoke of the intervention of Mr. Erastus Wiman. I know perhaps not all that the Minister knows, but I know a good deal of what took place on that occasion, and I say that Mr. Erastus Wiman rendered an important service to Canada, and that the hon. gentleman has no right to attempt to underrate or belittle the services that gentleman rendered, or the language that was used by Sir Charles Tupper in recognition of them; and I am very sure that if Sir Charles Tupper were on the floor of this House to-day, he would not endorse the statement just made by the hon. Minister of Justice. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman will say, if they are at liberty to say it, that they have no unofficial communication with Mr. Erastus Wiman at this hour.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are not bound to criminate themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps not; and as this matter is being discussed on strictly legal and technical grounds I will not press that question. Now I say, knowing these things, knowing the relations in which we stood, knowing the narrow escape we had, seeing, as we do, that the Government appear to have forgotten the lessons which were taught them, seeing that they do not appear (although I am willing to hope that they are coming to a better mood under pressure) at any rate until very recently, to have at all appreciated the danger they escaped, it would be an act of criminal folly on our part if we were to allow this Session to pass without putting ourselves, at any rate, right before the country, and pointing out the proper policy which, in the interest of Canada, should be pursued. I desire to say for my own part that although I have not pretended to any technical or minute acquaintance with the subject of the fisheries, which I had very limited opportunity of mastering in detail, I say that I myself hold the wisdom of the former course taken by the Government to be most dubious. Probably enough they were legally and technically correct; I do not dispute that, but what I do say is that, on the other hand, the Americans were perfectly right in pointing out that the whole conditions were changed. You cannot ignore this. If we touched the American frontier only at the one point where our fisheries exist, if we had nothing to say to them in other matters, we might then consider this question wholly apart, we might put entirely out of view all the communications which the Americans have granted us across our frontier, through their territory, in a great variety of ways. But I say we cannot do that, and so the whole position has to be dealt with. We must face the question that we are concerned with the Americans in five hundred different ways besides the mere question of the fisheries. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman into the question as to how far it may or may not be consistent with the preservation of our treaties to accord to Americans the right to transshipment in bond or the right to purchase bait or allow them certain privileges as to entrance to our harbors. If I understood the hon. gentleman's position it amounted to this: that it was almost impossible to grant the Americans the privileges they desire without great peril to our inshore fisheries; but I find that, in the treaty of 1888, we have agreed to concede to the Americans for a comparatively small sum of money those identical privileges, if they chose to take out a license under the *modus vivendi*, which in the despatches he alleges with considerable show of reason, perhaps, could not be granted without great peril to the preservation of our fisheries. That I understood to be the hon. gentleman's position, that I understand to be the result of the treaty. If I am mistaken in this, I would be

glad to be corrected. That I understood the hon. gentleman to have repeated before and to have repeated to-night. Now, we are all prepared to protect our territorial limits to the best of our ability; we are all prepared to protect our inshore fisheries within those limits that properly belong to us. In all other respects, looking at the whole situation, bearing in mind the peril which has been incurred by the policy which the hon. gentleman has persisted in carrying out; looking at the enormous importance of the interests which have sprung up between Canada and the United States, especially within the last twenty or thirty years; looking at the use we make of their soil and territories and the privilege of transshipping—taking these into consideration, we say the time has come for a broad and liberal policy in every respect in dealing with the United States. But if we choose to stand on our strict legal rights, how are we or the British Government either to blame the United States if they elect to stand on their extreme legal rights, with great injury to both. There is not the slightest doubt, if the United States chose to put in force their Non-Intercourse Bill, they will injure as many Americans as Canadians, but that would not make our position anything better but rather much the worse. If hon. gentlemen do not do that, what we have to look forward to is this: we will have a repetition of the sorry farce which was played out in 1887. First, we will see a policy (or at least there was great danger of seeing a policy pursued) which will lead to much ill-blood between ourselves and the United States. Then things would have grown serious, then there would have been danger of collision, then England would have stepped in as she did before, and some English commissioner, or another Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, would have been sent to take the Canadian Minister by the ear and administer a double dose of humble pie. Canada would have been degraded and humiliated. We would have been forced in the long run to make all the concessions which we now propose to make freely and voluntarily, with this result; that we would get no thanks at all. Such is the certain issue, and no one knows it better than the right hon. gentleman, because it is a game that hon. gentleman has played before to his own profit, though not the profit of the people of Canada. Yet knowing that, the hon. gentleman will persist in playing this dangerous game. It seems to be absurd for the hon. gentleman and his friends to talk as if they really and sincerely desired to aid in cultivating friendly relations with the people of the United States. They must be judged by their acts. Was it to show their extreme friendliness to the people of the United States that, a year ago, they attempted to repudiate their own statutory offer to admit certain articles free if the United States did the same? Was it to give the United States a better opinion of the good faith and honor of Canada that, after Sir Charles Tupper had practically taken his colleagues by the throat and compelled them to undo their own work and eat their own words on the floor of this House—was it for the purpose of inspiring the Americans with a high idea of the honor and faith of the Government of Canada, that the Minister of Customs, backed by the Government, resorted to that most petty and contemptible evasion of the plain terms of the meaning of the statutory Act, when he imposed, not a duty on the fruit, but a duty on the packages in which the fruit was conveyed. What am I to say of the desire to promote good relations which lead to the insane folly of hon. gentlemen opposite in the matter of the export duty on logs? But the other day, as if of express purpose to challenge the ill-will of the United States, they increased the duty on saw logs, running the risk of disturbing a trade that is counted by tens of millions. They know they will have to abandon this absurd impost; and I venture again to say that long before this House rises, we will find that what they did then they will be



glad to undo and revoke. I am not going to pursue that question. It would be worth pursuing, but at this late hour I must refrain, tempting as the subject is because it shows the utter carelessness, recklessness and imbecility with which the affairs of the country are administered, the utter folly with which the Government acts on questions of trade of the greatest possible moment. Here is a trade of ten million dollars absolutely put in peril for the sake of an export duty of ten thousand dollars additional, and that when the Government must have known that at the very moment they were raising this export duty, we were importing free from the United States probably six or seven times as many saw logs as we were sending to them. The object of the hon. gentleman, I am afraid, was only too apparent to those who choose to read between the lines and to look below the surface. Those hon. gentlemen when they commit those acts, when they challenge the United States—because these acts of theirs were a direct challenge to the United States to adopt retaliatory measures, a challenge which we have seen the Congress and people of the United States no way slow to accept—when they committed those acts, their object was altogether too apparent. They dreaded the rising tide of public opinion in favor of freer commercial relations with the people of the United States. They thought that we on this side might make political gain of it. They knew that if our contention was successful, it would interfere a great deal with certain interests from which they draw much comfort and assistance from time to time. They do not dare to say they dread reciprocity in open terms. They cannot say that, because they carried the elections in which the Mackenzie Government were defeated, to an enormous extent, and especially in the Maritime Provinces, by deluding the people into believing that, by imposing enormous duties on the goods which they imported, they would, in all probability, obtain reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. KIRK. And they were not to raise the duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; as my hon friend reminds me, they were not to raise the tariff, but only to readjust it. I believe, however, that there is a change coming rapidly over the spirit of their dream. I think they are gradually awakening to the fact that, by these unfriendly acts—and they were most unfriendly acts towards the people of the United States—they are provoking a feeling which is not encouraging for the policy they have pressed to pursue. Up to a recent time, it appeared to be their policy to provoke and chafe the people of the United States, and then turn around and say to us: the United States are hostile to you, they are going to put duties on your products and there is no chance of our making reciprocal trade relations with them. This day's work shows that the United States—to their credit and honor be it said—are not actuated by hostile feelings to the people of Canada. They have extended an olive branch to us; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite are wise, if they can rise for once to the level of the post they fill, they will even at this twelfth hour endeavor for their own sakes, if not for the sake of the country, to obtain some reasonable proposition from the United States, and to make reasonable propositions to them, by which in time, if not forthwith, the structure of fairer and fuller commercial relations between the two countries may be built up. I have said that the policy pursued up to this time was one which called in the highest degree for censure at the hands of the Opposition, and of the people of Canada. That policy contained a double fraud. These hon. gentlemen thought they were perfectly safe in vamping and blustering—I mean particularly in talking as they did about having the whole army and navy of England at their back. I tell those hon. gentlemen that neither the army nor the navy of England will ever be used for

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

the purpose of allowing us to embroil them with the United States, and well they know it. They talk about this matter, they vapor and they bluster, and, when serious peril is incurred, they back down as they have done before, and then they tell the people: We stood up for your rights until greater interests came into question, and we could not interpose against the interests of the Empire. At the same time, they will say to England: We have sacrificed the rights of Canada for the sake of the Empire, and we hope you will consider it, and give us your consideration. Being traitors both to Canada and to the Empire, they will probably, like some other traitors, succeed in obtaining rewards from both. But to Canada this means injury and degradation; it means that the United States will be more or less irritated; that, in the long run, we will have to make concessions and will receive no thanks for them, because concessions which are forced out of us, and are known to be forced out of us by the orders of the Imperial Government, will never conciliate the United States. That is not the way in which the United States ought to be approached. Our position is difficult enough. I admit that it must be always, in the nature of the case, a position requiring great caution when a small country of four or five millions of people has to deal with one of the greatest nations in the world. I agree with some things which have been stated on the other side of the House. I agree that it is eminently in the interests of Canada that our policy should be firm, dignified and prudent in dealing with the United States; but where I take issue with the hon. gentlemen opposite is that their policy is neither firm, prudent nor dignified; that what they do in one day they are in haste to reverse the next, that they are consistent only in one thing, which is to inspire the United States with a feeling of contempt for the conduct of the Canadian Government. Now, if these hon. gentlemen were prepared, having counted the cost, to stand firm to any policy they had adopted, although I might think rather lightly of their discretion, I would admire their valor in thinking that they were able to contend with a power like that to the south of us. I agree, however, with the Minister of Finance, who stated that we could not single-handed contend with the United States; and, under those circumstances, it is of no service to us to advance pretensions which the Government know at a later date, and probably at a shortly later date, they will be compelled to abandon. No greater calamity could befall the people of this country than for the United States to be hostile to us; and, if the policy of this Government has made them so hostile, this Government would have committed as great a treason as they well could against the welfare and good government of Canada. In any case, it is not the part of brave men, when confronted with such a situation, to indulge in bluster or to talk about the army and the navy we would have at our back. We might have to face such a contingency, and, if we had to do so, the situation should be faced manfully, but with a full knowledge of the gravity of the situation. This is a matter in which petty provocations and small annoyances on the part of the Government are calculated to do enormous injury to this country, and also to the friendly relations which should exist between the people of Great Britain and the people of the United States. We have to study not only to be right but to appear to be right, and to show that we desire to be good neighbors to the people of the United States and to cultivate good relations with them. In that way only could the people of Canada truly serve the Empire of which we form a part. That is of all things the greatest service we can render to the British Empire, and it is clear, if we are going to do that, that it is advisable for us, in the words of this resolution, under existing circumstances, to remove any causes of irritation, especially when there is a new Government coming into power in the United States. I thoroughly and cordially endorse the

proposition of my hon. friend that, without delay and without being forced into doing what we will be ultimately forced into, we should freely offer the Americans the continuation of the *modus vivendi*, which allows their fishermen, for a reasonable compensation, all these privileges that have been in dispute between us so long, and which is now clear, from the actions of the hon. gentlemen themselves, from the very terms of the treaty, can be safely given without any danger of seriously injuring our inshore fisheries, or of seriously incommoding our fishermen.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Laurier).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Ellis,	Mitchell,
Beausoleil,	Fiset,	Neveu,
Béchar,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Flynn,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Gauthier,	Platt,
Bowman,	Geoffrion,	Préfontaine,
Brien,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Godbout,	Roward,
Campbell,	Guay,	St. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Jones,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Somerville,
Charlton,	Kirk,	Trow,
Choquette,	Landerkin,	Turcot,
Chouinard,	Lang,	Waldie,
Colter,	Langelier (Montm'ncy),	Watson,
Couture,	Langelier (Quebec),	Weldon (St. John),
Davies,	Laurier,	Welsh,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Wilson (Elgin), and
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron),	Yeo.—63.
Doyon,	McIntyre,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Audet,	Foster,	Marshall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	Mason,
Baird,	Gigault,	Mills (Annapolis),
Barnard,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Boisvert,	Guillet,	Perley,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Porter,
Brown,	Hall,	Prior,
Burns,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Cargill,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Carling,	Ives,	Roome,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Ross,
Chisholm,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Cimon,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Colby,	Labelle,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Costigan,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Coulombe,	La Rivière,	Taylor,
Curran,	Laurie,	Temple,
Daly,	Lépine,	Thérien,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson (Sir John),
Davin,	Macdowall,	Tupper,
Davis,	McCarthy,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McGulla,	Vanasse,
Denison,	McDonald (Victoria),	Wallace,
Desjarjins,	McDongald (Pictou),	Weidon (Albert),
Dewdney,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Dickey,	McGreevy,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	McKay,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,	Wood (Brookville),
Ferguson (Stenfrew),	Madill,	Wood (Wentworth), and
Ferguson (Welland),	Mara,	Wright.—108.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To pay pension to Lady Cartier. .... \$1,200

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the Finance Minister intends still to deliver the Budget Speech on Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:15 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the First Minister, I will move the resolution of which he has given notice :

That Government business shall have precedence every Thursday, on and after Thursday, 7th March next, during the present Session, after Questions put by Members.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; there is no objection to that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before that is adopted, I may say that it seems that the Government are always very anxious to get as many days in the week as they can, for public business. But how do we stand in regard to private business? There are six pages of private business standing on the Order Paper, and we know that three-fourths of that will not be reached this Session, if it should last six weeks yet. Now, I think the Government are a little premature in wanting to take away one of the days belonging to private members. We shall only have Monday—practically the business of this House in the hands of private members is confined to Monday. On Monday, we find that the private Bills come in before the motions, so we have only about three or four hours out of the week for the business of private members. We ought to have an opportunity of having our private business and private questions put before this House. Now, Sir, I wish to say that the only way that some of us can get justice done to our constituents is to take extraordinary means to accomplish it. I have had for the last three years notices on the paper for claims for damages for lands for railways that have been taken from my constituents, of which I can get no fair and reasonable adjustment. We are told, as I have been told for the last three years: "Wait till we get over the Session and we will give directions to have it done;" and although I waited three years, these promises have not yet been fulfilled. My duty to my constituents requires me to oppose this motion or else indicate to my hon. friends the course I mean to take. If they persist in this course, I shall feel it to be my duty, every time they move to go into Committee of Supply, to take up one of the notices that I have given relating to the private grievances of my constituents, and to move an amendment before going into Supply. I think the Government had better leave a little more time for private members to get through their private business, rather than have motions made on going into Committee of Supply which may take up three, or four, or five hours in discussion. Sir, I recollect a case, some years ago, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Government, when I thought that one of my constituents, a poor, unfortunate widow woman, was not treated rightly in a matter involving an amount of about \$40. Sir, I could not get the Government to act, and I took the only means open to me, which was to move an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. I did that night

after night for some three or four weeks; I felt it my duty, at the expense of the delay to public business, to do this, and it was only after some three or four weeks that my hon. friend saw the policy of at once meeting the case and dealing with it, and settling it. I want to say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, that, if they do not want another delay like this in carrying on the business of the country, they had better refrain from taking away the reasonable time which belongs to private members, at so early a period in the Session. But if they wish to avoid this, let them say at once to those private members who have business of that kind: Come over to our departments and let us go into the matter quietly and coolly between ourselves to see whether we cannot settle these claims—because I am bound to have these claims settled, I do not care what it costs, nor what time it occupies. I merely warn hon. gentlemen that if they insist in taking this day, I shall at every opportunity move one of the motions of which I have given notice, with a view of seeing if I cannot get justice done to the people I represent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will say to my hon. friend that the motion that has just been made will not prevent hon. members taking up private matters as usual. Thursday will be for public Bills, and all these notices of motions and private matters will be dealt with on Mondays and Wednesdays as usual; therefore I think that the object of my hon. friend will not stand. About the claims he speaks of, I hope that when he brings them to the notice of the Government, as he suggests, some means will be devised by which they can be set right so that justice may be done, and that my hon. friend will be satisfied with the decisions that will be come to. Therefore I hope that my hon. friend will not object to the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will just put my hon. friend right on one point. He says we will have Mondays and Wednesdays to bring these for private members' business. This is a private day, and we have five pages of notices of motion on the paper, of grievances, real or supposed, and we cannot reach one of these to-day. I would remark to my right hon. friend, who has come in since I spoke first, that we have only until six o'clock to-night. Private Bills are first taken up, and then questions put by members, of which there are two pages, and we will not get through with these before six o'clock. There is a ball going on at a very distinguished portion of this city to-night, and I should not be at all surprised if my hon. friends opposite desired to go to this ball and asked us for an adjournment, and so our whole day is taken away and we cannot reach one of these private motions until Wednesday; and no man knows better than the hon. Minister of Public Works that we have no chance whatever of reaching the notices of motions on that day. Are we to be deprived of every opportunity of placing private grievances before this House for consideration and adjustment, by the taking away of the Thursday from us? It is unreasonable. The first Wednesday is a holiday, and, I believe, they expect to get through by Easter. I want the Government to tell us whether they are disposed to deal with these private grievances? I have had for three years some of these cases before this House, and have been told, time and again, that they will be dealt with before the close of the Session, or immediately after, but the Session passes over, and I have never been able to get these claims settled. Now, if the Government will say to private members—I am speaking for myself alone—if the Minister will say to me: Come to my office and talk the matter over quietly for the purpose of settlement, then I shall have nothing more to say about it, and, for the present, I will withdraw my objections to the motion. The right hon. gentleman was kind enough the other day to send me candies across the House. I was very much obliged to him, and accepted them as an indication that the

Mr. MITCHELL.

olive branch was extended to me; and, although we have not been as cordial for the last year or two as we ought to have been as public men, I may say that if he is prepared to say to me, as the acting Minister of Railways did, that he would talk the matter over privately with me, I will be willing to withdraw my objection to this motion; but if he does not, I can assure him that every time the Government move to go into Committee of Supply I shall move an amendment for the purpose of having a discussion on my grievances, as it appears that is the only way I can get justice done to my constituents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We'll, I am like Davy Crockett's coon—I must come down. I will be very glad to sit down with the hon. gentleman if my colleague, the Minister of Railways, is not able to meet him himself, and to go over these matters with him, and to discuss them; and I shall always have a sufficient assortment of candies for the use of my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly name the day when he will do that?—because that is very indefinite; I would like to have something specific.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I won't say "to-morrow."  
Motion agreed to.

#### WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 98) to amend the Winding-up Act, chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The intention of this Bill is to make provision for winding-up companies incorporated by this Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

#### MONTREAL AND OTTAWA BOOM COMPANY'S BILL.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Montreal and Ottawa Boom Company (Mr. Girouard), read.

Mr. GIROUARD. This Bill was introduced by Mr. Perley, one of the members for Ottawa. After the first reading, I agreed to take charge of it, on condition that it would be modified so as to meet some of the serious objections I had against the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. That you had against the Bill?

Mr. GIROUARD. That I had against the Bill as introduced.

Mr. MITCHELL. A lot of us had objections to it.

Mr. GIROUARD. I will tell the hon. gentleman and the House a little later what my objections were. I had an interview with the promoters of the Bill, and I found that it did not state fairly the object they had in view. The Bill asked that the promoters should have power to build wharves, piers, slides, dams, booms, or other improvements over any part of the River Ottawa from the Chaudière Falls at Ottawa, to the north westerly end of the Island of Montreal, and either on one or both of the channels to the north-west of the said Island and on the shores adjoining the said extent of said river. The promoters, who are owners of sawmills in Ottawa, Hull and elsewhere in the country, contemplated removing to, or at least building mills on the northern portion of the Island of Montreal in my county. They point out many advantages that would be obtained by so doing. In the first place, they say that

by building over a large extent of territory, which they find north of that Island, they would be able to reduce very materially the rate of insurance which they are paying in Ottawa and Hull, where there is a little space for mills. In the second place, they say they would be able to use the sawdust in supplying their furnaces, as they intend to run their machinery by steam instead of water power, and they would at once get rid of a nuisance that is very seriously felt in the district of Ottawa and elsewhere. In the third place, they say they would almost be able to pay the wages of their men from the sale of edgings and scraps in the city of Montreal. Finally, they point out a great many other advantages that would arise from building mills near a great commercial centre and seaport like Montreal. The cost of transportation of lumber in logs being about four-fifths less than under the present mode; manufactured lumber would be made cheaper in Montreal. I need not say that if such a scheme were realised, it would be of great advantage, not only to my constituency, but also to the Island of Montreal generally, and to the whole trade of Canada. For the purpose of establishing that industry, the promoters want booming powers, not from Ottawa to Montreal as is mentioned in the Bill, and which is the very serious objection to it and to which I cannot give my consent personally—they do not ask, I say, to boom the river from Ottawa to Montreal, but, as I ascertained in the interview with the promoters, they want simply to boom the foot of the Carillon Rapids, so as to be able to catch loose logs that come down. The promoters will take those logs, tied together, above and below those rapids to the channel north of the Island of Montreal, where they want to build another boom. These are the only two points where they wish to have power to construct booms. Of course, in so booming the river, the promoters desire to give compensation to all riparian proprietors and all persons who may suffer either at the time of the construction of the boom or at any time subsequently. The promoters propose that the plans, according to which the booms will be constructed, shall be laid before the House; and not only so, but that those booms shall remain under the absolute control of the Government, and be open to the public, and be constructed at the cost of the promoters. Another condition in regard to the construction of the booms, which they are willing to insert, is that the boom shall not in any way whatever obstruct the navigation of the river, either at the Carillon Canal, or at any other place. It is not surprising, considering that the Bill does not set forth exactly the true purpose and object the promoters had in view, and considering the very extensive powers asked by this Bill, that a serious agitation should have taken place in the country along the Ottawa River, and among the forwarders, and even in the board of trade of Montreal, which looked with alarm at the booming of the whole river from Ottawa to Montreal. The Bill was not framed by me, and was not introduced by me. I objected to it from the beginning, but I consented to take charge of it in the House, on the condition that, after receiving the second reading, it should be modified in the Committee of Railways and Canals, to which I intended to move its reference. But, considering the strong feeling which has been shown in the House against the Bill by the number of petitions presented against it, I fear this course cannot succeed; and for these reasons, with notice to the House and the country that the Bill will be presented another Session with the necessary modifications, in order that its true nature and purpose shall not be misunderstood, I move for leave to withdraw the Bill, and that the Order be discharged.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** I am very glad the hon. gentleman has adopted the course he has just taken with respect to this Bill, a Bill more detrimental to the prosperity of the country and to the interests of free navigation, I can scarcely

imagine it is possible to introduce, for this Bill asks for the promoters power to practically boom the river from the Chaudière Falls to the Island of Montreal. I hope we are not so dead to the interests of justice that we will give away these rights over the largest tributary of the St. Lawrence, as this Bill contemplates. It is amazing to me that a Bill of that kind should be presented to this House, and that we should be expected to sanction and confirm it. Sir, I am glad the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has withdrawn his Bill, but I am sorry that he indicates that he will bring it up again next year. Let me make a few suggestions to my hon. friend. There is no one here who desires to prevent any one to have every proper facility to carry on manufacturing industries, and particularly that one of our principal industries, the manufacture of saw-logs. If they want to move their mills from further up the Ottawa River to the back of the Island of Montreal, in order to obtain the advantages that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) points out, it is a very proper thing for them to do, but they can do that without any Bill of this kind whatever. They can obtain the right from private individuals to put up their mills, and they can get from the Government permission to extend their booms for commercial purposes without any such Bill as this, which would give the monopoly of the whole river. There is no reason why they should put up a boom below the Carillon Falls to interfere with the navigation, not alone of steamboats, but of the barges which float the lumber from here to New York. What the gentlemen connected with this company should do is to make up their minds what property they require, and then go to the owners of that property and make a private arrangement for the purchase of it if they can; but they do not require to come to this House to ask us to give them the entire control over that great tributary of the St. Lawrence system. It is an outrage that such an application should be made, and I am glad that my hon. friend sees the folly of it. Since he has now withdrawn the Bill, I hope he will not bring it up again next Session.

**Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).** I am glad that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has withdrawn this Bill, but I regret that he announces his intention of bringing it up again, for it is certainly one of the most outrageous pieces of legislation I ever heard of. This Bill proposes to give to a private company the possession of the River Ottawa between Ottawa and Montreal; and not only will it give them power to take possession of the river, but also possession of the properties alongside of the river. I am still more surprised to see this Bill supported by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), because he is in a better position to know the objections to this Bill than any other member in this House. He does not forget—for it is not very long since he obtained a judgment in damages—and I think a very good judgment it was—against an owner who moored a raft for a few weeks in front of the property of my hon. friend. If this Bill passed, every property owner on the Ottawa River might be deprived of the view of the river from his residence, and of all the advantages of living alongside of this beautiful stream, and he could get no compensation, because this company would say that they were empowered by the Ottawa Government to build booms, or wharves, or anything they pleased along the river. There are a great number of very fine country residences, belonging to parties in Montreal, on the Ottawa River, and immense booms might be stretched in front of those fine properties, so as to render them perfectly worthless. My hon. friend, who obtained damages from the owner of the raft, knows this very well too. I do not remember the name of the person against whom he obtained the damages, but the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) will remember

that it was proved, that the simple fact of such a raft being moored in front of a country residence depreciated the value of the property. Raftsmen may be very good in their own rank, but they are not a very particular class of people; and it was proved in the case of my hon. friend, who obtained damages from the owner of the raft, that they were not desirable neighbors, and that they rendered his property almost uninhabitable. Every property on the Ottawa River would be placed in the same position if this Bill passed, and the owners would have no remedy in law. I hope my hon. friend, when he reflects on the consequences of the passage of such a Bill as this, will give up the idea of bringing it up again next Session.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am sorry that my two hon. friends do not seem to understand me in the explanation which I gave to the House. I object to this Bill myself, because the purpose of it is to get possession of the whole river.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I say that in the most explicit terms. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Langelier) that there is great objection in having a raft moored in front of any property. It is against the law at the present time; and I would never consent to have it changed without providing full compensation. I would point out that there is a clause in this Bill whereby, if anyone should suffer damages because of the construction of a boom, or anything connected with it, in front of his property, he can receive full compensation. It is a very different thing in the case of the raft referred to by my hon. friend, because the owner of that raft wished to moor it there the whole summer without paying anything

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Where is the clause for compensation in the Bill?

Mr. GIROUARD. There is a clause providing for compensation, and the promoters of this Bill intended to pay compensation for any property they might injure or take possession of. There is a provision, just at the end of section three, which says: "that they will pay compensation to any individual injured thereby." The promoters of this Bill intend to pay compensation in front of any property where they will have their boom. They intend inserting in the next Bill a clause to arrange compensation by private agreement with the proprietors, so that nobody will have cause to complain. I am surprised that my hon. friend did not understand my opening remarks. I said that the reason why I objected to this Bill was because it gave the company control of the river between Ottawa and Montreal, and I object to that. They want to have the right to boom at the foot of the Carillon Rapids, but in such a way as not to interfere with navigation. I believe that this boom can be erected without any interference with navigation, but if that cannot be done, the Bill will not have my support.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I intend to introduce the Bill in a different form next Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, we will see what the Bill looks like then.

Mr. GIROUARD. Very well.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I told my hon. friend who has this Bill in charge, that it was out of the question to have it passed in this House, because it interfered, not only with private property, but with public works of great magnitude which had cost a great sum of money to the country, and that we could not allow the company to interfere with the navigation of that river. My hon. friend

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

speaks of the compensation that the company would have to pay to private individuals, but I suppose that we should not give such powers to a private company except for very strong reasons, and because the granting of such powers would be in the public interest. The powers now asked for are purely and simply in the interests of a private company, and we should certainly respect the rights of riparian proprietors as much as we should respect the rights of a private company. If this Bill were for the public good, generally, it would be all right. Of course private rights must give way before the public good, with proper compensation; but if it is only to substitute one private interest for another I don't think it is a measure that we should support. I stated to my hon. friend, also, that I had very great doubts that the Bill could be gone on with in the modified shape in which it was intended to bring it before the committee; and I tell him now, so that the parties who wish to have this power may know, that unless they give good proof that the rights they are asking will not interfere with navigation or with the public works on the river, or with private rights to any considerable extent, he cannot expect the Bill, at all events, to have my support.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, because I think this is one of the most important matters we possibly could have to deal with—the right of navigation of one of our principal rivers. I only regret that the hon. Minister did not take an earlier opportunity to express the views of the Government on this Bill, instead of waiting until an opposition had been created on this side of the House against it. But I am glad to see that they have awakened to the public interest, and will not allow the navigation of the Ottawa River to be obstructed in the interest of private individuals.

Bill withdrawn.

#### SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS.

Mr. BARRON (for Mr. WILSON, Elgin) asked, Has the Government of Canada sold Sultana Island, in the Lake of the Woods? If so, by what right or authority did the Government exercise the power of selling? To whom was the sale made? When was it made, and for what price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A sale was made of a portion of Sultana Island, in the Lake of the Woods, containing 27·07 acres, at the rate of \$5 per acre, to Henry Bulmer, jr., Jacob Hendricks Henesy, Charles Alexander Moore, and Simmons Stuart Scoville. The sale was made under surrender dated the 8th of October, 1886, duly obtained from the Indians in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act, the Island being a part of Reserve 38 B, which was set apart for the Indians under Treaty 3, made with them in 1873.

#### THE ALASKA BOUNDARY LINE.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Government entered into any arrangement with the Government of the United States regarding the defining of the boundary line between the Territories of the Dominion of Canada and the Territory of Alaska? If such arrangement has been entered into, when and in what manner is the survey to be proceeded with? If such arrangement has not been entered into between the two Governments, are negotiations in progress looking to arrangements for the survey of the boundary line referred to?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Negotiations are in progress looking to an arrangement for the survey of the boundary line referred to, between Her Majesty's Government and the United States Government.

## TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, KINGSTON.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. PLATT) asked, Has the Government sold, leased, rented or otherwise disposed of, *Tête du Pont* barracks, Kingston, Ontario? Is it the intention of the Government to sell, lease, rent or otherwise dispose of said barracks during the present year? What use is made of said property at present?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government has neither sold, leased, rented, nor otherwise disposed of *Tête du Pont* barracks in Kingston, Ontario. It is not the intention of the Government to sell, lease, rent or otherwise dispose of said barracks during the present year. This property is at present occupied by Battery "B" of Canadian Artillery.

## CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS AT PICTON.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. PLATT) asked, Did the Minister of Justice, or any other person as Attorney General of Canada, appoint or instruct counsel to assist the local authorities in the Corrupt Practices trials held at Picton on the 6th day of January, 1888? At whose suggestion, or upon whose recommendation was such counsel appointed? Who was the person so appointed, and what fee did he receive for his services?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Counsel was so employed by the acting Minister of Justice, as required by section 73 of chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes, on the report of the judge, under section 71 of that Act, and at the suggestion also of the county crown attorney of the county of Prince Edward, Mr. Lowe, Q.C. Mr. Wallace Nesbitt was so appointed, and received \$100 for his services.

## THE DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for the loss of clothing, &c., sustained by the captain and laborers employed on the dredge *Cape Breton*, which was lost in the Straits of Northumberland during a gale in the fall of 1887?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government.

## CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER AT WEST BAY, N.S.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a custom house officer at West Bay, county of Inverness, Nova Scotia, this year?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government will establish a custom house officer at West Bay, as soon as they are convinced that the requirements of the revenue call for that step.

## CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the Indians of Caughnawaga, in the county of Laprairie, to hold an election of councillors, or an election of chiefs, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Advancement Act; if so, when do they propose to grant them permission to do so?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A recommendation has been made to the Governor General in Council, that the Indian Advancement Act be applied to the above band of Indians, and that an election of councillors under the provisions of that Act be held on the 26th March next.

## PROTECTION FOR LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sufficient sum to complete the works, already begun, to protect the village

of Laprairie from the danger of being damaged by ice and inundation; if so, what sum does the Government propose to devote to this purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to make known at present the intention of the Government on this subject. The hon. member will have to wait until the Supplementary Estimates are laid before the House.

## CHARLES SAVARY.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Is there employed in any of the departments of the Government, a person by the name of Charles Savary? If so, what is the date of his appointment, what is his salary, and what are his duties?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; he has been employed in the Department of the Secretary of State since the 24th or 25th of last month. He is to be employed two months. His salary is \$2 a day. He is connected with the correspondence branch.

## RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, LAKE ST. JOHN.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Did the Government receive a deputation from Lake St. John, asking for railway subsidies? If so, by whom was the deputation presented to the Ministers? What was the answer of the latter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I, on behalf of the Government, received a deputation from Lake St. John asking for railway subsidies. The deputation was presented to the hon. the Minister of Militia, and the answer was that their representation should be taken into consideration.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to insert in the Supplementary Estimates, a sum of money to assist in the construction of the branch of the Lake St. John Railway from Chambord to Chicoutimi and St. Alphonse, a distance of sixty-seven miles? If not, why not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The intention of the Government will be shown when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

## CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY COUNTIES.

Mr. COUTURE asked, What amount has been voted for expenditure in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay since January, 1887? 2. What portion of that amount has been expended? For what purposes? 3. Has J. A. Gagné had the patronage of the county of Chicoutimi? If so, why?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the amount of the subsidy was \$7,750. The amount spent was as follows: for the construction of a jetty, \$2,863; for repairs, \$4,394.37, making a total of \$7,215. The patronage of the county belongs to the Government, and has been exercised by the Government, who are responsible for all the appointments that have been made.

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What have been the total receipts and expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway, year by year, since it was first put in operation, and up to this date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is rather an extensive question to be answered. If the hon. gentleman would make it a motion, the papers would be brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman the information from the 1st of July to date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not.

#### LA CLOCHE ISLAND.

Mr. FISHER asked, 1. Has the Government of Canada sold Cloche or La Cloche Island, in Georgian Bay, north of Manitoulin, to any one? 2. If so, to whom? 3. At what date was it sold? 4. For how much was it sold? 5. Under what authority or by what title did the Government of Canada claim to have power to sell the island? 6. What was the extent of area and timber on said island?

Mr. DEWDNEY. La Cloche Island, in Lake Huron was sold to S. W. Bouchner, on 7th July, 1881, for \$2,500. The department sold the island for the benefit of the Indians under the authority of the Manitoulin Treaty of 1862, as being an island adjacent to the great Manitoulin Island. The island is estimated to contain 6,000 acres. There was no estimate at the time of sale of the quantity of timber thereon, but the agent of the department at Manitowaning recommended the sale of the land and timber at the above sum, but at the same time reported that the soil on the island was for the most part worthless.

#### PRINTING BUREAU.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. What sum has been expended for plant and other purposes for the Printing Bureau, from 1st July, 1888, to 1st February, 1889? 2. What total sum has been expended on account of building for said Printing Bureau to 1st February, 1889?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the plant the amount expended is \$82,452.89 to which \$531.60 are to be added for the organisation, making a total of \$82,984.49. The cost of the building up to the 1st of February, 1889, is \$129,146.01.

#### EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What amount has been expended on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, from the 1st July, 1888, to the 1st February, 1889?

Mr. CARLING. I must ask my hon. friend to let this question stand, as the information has to be obtained from two departments. I will be able to bring it down some time during the week.

#### INTERCOLONIAL DINING ROOMS.

Mr. GUAY asked, 1. Whether the persons who keep the dining rooms at the stations of Lévis, Trois Pistoies, Campbellton and Moncton, on the Intercolonial Railway, have secured that privilege under tenders called for by the Government; if so, when did the Government call for tenders, and in what newspapers were such calls published? 2. If the said privilege was not awarded under tenders, what amount do the parties keeping the said dining rooms pay yearly to the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The persons who keep the dining rooms at the stations mentioned did not procure the privilege by tenders. The Government did not call for tenders, and the parties do not pay anything to the Government.

#### EXPORTS VIA UNITED STATES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, Whether, in making up the quantity of goods exported from Canada to Great  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Britain, articles passing through United States territory, in bond, for shipment to Great Britain, are included?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

#### JOSIAH ROSS—CUSTOMS SEIZURE.

Mr. COLTER asked, 1. Whether any seizure has been made, by authority of the Customs Department, upon the property of one Josiah Ross, at the village of Fort Erie, in the county of Welland? 2. The alleged offence of said Josiah Ross? 3. The terms on which it has been proposed to release the goods of said Josiah Ross from said seizure by the Customs Department, or any employé thereof at the village of Fort Erie, or in the vicinity thereof?

Mr. BOWELL. A seizure has been made on the property of one Josiah Ross, of the village of Fort Erie, in the county of Welland, not, however, by the authority of the Customs Department, but under the provisions of the law which give customs officers power to make seizures. The Customs Department had no knowledge of the seizure until it was made, and the fact reported to Ottawa. The alleged offence of the said Josiah Ross is that of smuggling and under-valuation. No terms have been proposed to release the goods of the said Josiah Ross from seizure by the Customs Department, nor by any employé thereof at the village of Fort Erie or in the vicinity thereof, to the knowledge of the department, nor can or will any terms be proposed until Mr. Inspector Newburn, who has been instructed to make an investigation, reports fully the facts connected with the said seizure.

#### SIX NATION INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. COLTER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Dominion Government to take immediate steps for the sale of Indian lands, surrendered for sale by the Six Nation Indians in the village of Caledonia, in the county of Haldimand, and what is the total acreage of said Indian lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A number of lots have been sold in the town plot of Caledonia, and steps have been taken by the department to ascertain the names of the squatters on the unsold lands in the town plot, the value and extent of their improvements, and also the value of the lots distinct from the improvements, with a view to the same, and any other lots that are disposable, being sold at an early date. The total area of the lots in the town-plot of Caledonia is 460 acres.

#### YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION KIT ALLOWANCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I told the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) who has a motion on the paper in regard to this subject, that I would give him an answer to-day. The Government, after full consideration of the facts, have resolved to give the York and Simcoe Battalion the kit allowance while they were on active duty in the North-West.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that provision will be made for that in the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister to a point which I think requires attention if complete justice is to be done in this matter. The kit allowance was made to other battalions. It was made, for example, to the 10th Royals, who went out on service, I think, at about the same time, and returned about the same time as the battalion whose claim I have been urging. Those battalions were paid, but it will be three years and a half later when the men to whom I refer are paid. If they are to be treated in the same way as the other battalions, it will be

necessary to add to the kit allowance a sufficient sum to put them on the same footing by paying them interest for three and a half years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say we shall be able to deal with that matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I only suggest it now, in case it might be found that the amount placed in the Supplementary Estimates would not be sufficient.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. With the consent of my hon. friend, the member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), who seconds this motion, I will make a slight change in it. Before moving it, I should like to make a few remarks as to my reasons for proposing the motion. Generally speaking, I think that the immediate object of a motion like this might be accomplished as well by going to the Minister dealing with the department, and discussing the matter with him, but there are peculiar circumstances in the North-West which I think make it necessary and expedient, in the interests of the public service, that I should make the motion I do here to-day. I desire to call the attention of the House, and of the Government, to the enormous powers which are given to the commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police by the North-West Mounted Police Act. According to the 18th section:

"Every member of the force, other than a commissioned officer, who is convicted of any of the following offences:

- "(a). Disobeying the lawful command of, or striking his superior.
- "(b). Oppressive or tyrannical conduct towards his inferior.
- "(c). Intoxication, however slight.
- "(d). Having intoxicating liquor illegally in his possession, or concealed.
- "(e). Directly or indirectly receiving any gratuity."

and so on. A number of possible offences and possible breaches of discipline are mentioned, and here comes the sub clause declaring what the power of the commissioner is, that any man committing any of the offences mentioned, which reach from *a* to *v*,

"Shall be held to have committed a breach of discipline.

"The commissioner, assistant commissioner, or the superintendent commanding at any post, or such other commissioned officer as is thereunto empowered by the commissioner, may forthwith, on a charge in writing of any one or more of the foregoing offences being preferred against any member of the force, other than a commissioned officer, cause the person so charged to be brought before him, and he shall then and there, in a summary way, investigate the said charge or charges, and on oath, if he thinks fit, and, if proved to his satisfaction, shall thereof convict the offender, who shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one month's pay, or to imprisonment with hard labor for a term not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment, in addition to any punishment to which the offender is liable in respect of such offence under any law in force in the North-West Territories or in any Province in which the offence is committed."

Another clause provides that he may be summarily dismissed. What I wish to call the attention of the House and the Government to is this, that the commissioner gets a power greater than Lord Wolseley has, greater than the commander-in-chief of the Imperial forces has. There is no man in Her Majesty's service in the Empire who has power to deal with a common soldier as the commissioner of our North-West army has to deal with a constable. Any man who reads the Queen's Regulations will see that these regulations provide for a gradation of offences and a gradation of punishments. I grant that, in the early days, before you had railways and when the police were isolated more than they are now, you might give a power to the commissioner or his representative, the assistant commissioner, or the inspector, or the superintendent, as vast as he is given there. But, on the face of that Act, and particularly of that 18th clause, any man would see that there is a very great danger indeed of the abuse of such a power. Even if you were to take a judge from the bench, a man accustomed to deal with issues, and were to place him with a power like that in a case where there was no appeal, no

surveillance whatever, where he would have absolute auto-cracy within himself, there would be a danger of an abuse of a power so vast; but the average man, no matter how capable he may be, whom we get to be commissioner of the police, if he have a military training, is not fitted by that military training for the exercise of the nicely balanced judgment which is required in a judge; and, if he have no military training and no experience, and such a power as this is placed in his hands, there is a great temptation and a great danger, no matter who the man is, that the vast power so conferred upon him may be abused. My object in making this motion is to effect a general rather than a particular purpose. I find that the returns I asked for could not be ready this Session, and it has been represented to me from other quarters in the west that several of our best sergeants and other non-commissioned officers, at the present moment, are men in whose record some flaw might be found. I should be very sorry, in seeking to accomplish a public end, to place on public record stains on the past history of a man who may be now doing well and serving his country, when the object I have in view can be accomplished in another way. I, therefore, move for a return of the papers in the case of A. D. Looz of the North-West Mounted Police, the nature of his offence, before whom tried, his length of service, his previous record for good conduct or otherwise, and the punishment given, and whether the proceedings were public or otherwise, and whether the accused was allowed to make any defence. I have taken this one case from a number of others, and I think I need not say that I have not by any means taken the strongest. I have taken what I thought was an average case which was treated with great severity. It is a very common thing for a man who is unaccustomed to deal with judicial proceedings, or to exercise judicial power, or to legislate, to think—as the history of all legislatures and of all criminal proceedings in all countries shows—that severe punishments are likely to accomplish the most salutary ends. But we know very well that unless we nicely adapt the punishment to the conscience of the community that are around the person punished, the end of the punishment, instead of being salutary, is the reverse. In the mounted police, with which I am dealing just now, I have observed this—unless the punishment more or less corresponds to the offence, the salutary effect is lost. When it is too severe the strong adverse criticism in the force against the severity, reacts badly on the discipline of the corps, and outside it finds an echo, so that there is a double influence working to prevent the punishment having the effect it ought to have. Now I will mention a case that I have selected from others, which I consider requires very strong punishment; it is also a case that will strongly appeal to the sympathies—and a severe punishment will appeal to the sympathies of the people, and I have taken it for that reason, I have selected this case because I want to show that, although in learning of the facts myself, I felt indignation, I felt that a very severe punishment was necessary—yet I think I can show the right hon. gentleman who both as Prime Minister and as taking control of the mounted police, is doubly interested in this matter—I think I can show him that here is a case of severity of punishment in which, on account of its severity, the punishment fails in the very effect that it is intended to produce. This man came down to Regina; he got drunk, and he insulted a lady on the street—tried to kiss her. It was a very grave and serious offence; and when he was going to the barracks in a waggon, it seems that there was a young woman coming up in the waggon and there were several police there, and his conversation and utterances were of a very gross kind. Now, Sir, I say that man, taking into account his character and his official position—he was a constable, his position was to guard against outrages of that sort rather than to commit them—I say that it was a very gross offence. I can easily



understand how the commissioner felt indignant, both because of the offence itself, and because of its bringing disgrace upon the corps to which the man belonged. But, Sir, when I tell you that the sentence on the man was twelve months' imprisonment and dismissal from the force at the end of the term, you cannot but agree that this punishment altogether exceeded the offence. Now, there are several cases. They are all recorded over in the comptroller's office, and after the Session is over, if the right hon. gentleman—because it would be impossible to expect him to do so with a multitude of affairs pressing on his department at this time—but if he can spare an hour, or get a report as to some of the cases, I promise him that he will have the materials of coming to the same conclusion that I have come to from observation, that the sentences which have been passed for offences against discipline, in the North-West Mounted Police, for the last two or three years, have exceeded what justice demands, and in exceeding what justice demands, to a great extent have failed in the object aimed at by the punishment. Of course, I need not remind the right hon. gentleman, who is not only a statesman, but a lawyer, of what every tyro in legal studies knows, that in the history of criminal jurisprudence, punishments have had to be adjusted in accordance with the conscience and common sense of the community; and what happened in the past, must happen to-day. What I would suggest, with great respect and great diffidence, is this: That a few clauses might be added to the Police Act, not leaving such power in the hands of any commanding officer. The Queen's regulations are very elaborate; I do not think it would be necessary as to have anything so elaborate as that, but I can easily conceive that a few clauses might be added to this Act, which would place the constable who committed the offence in a position so that he would not feel as he does now, that he is at the mercy of one will. No matter how just a man is, it is a terrible thing to be at the mercy of one will without any standard whatever to appeal to; but he should feel as a soldier who is tried for any offence feels—as a soldier in the British army feels—that he has, what every man in the British dominions should feel, except in war time, whether a soldier or civilian, if he is tried for any offence, that he is tried according to law, and not at the mercy of any single will. I understand that there will be a measure brought down; but I infer that that measure only deals with pensions. Of course, I apprehend that in such a measure the suggestions that I have ventured to make, might be acted upon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend has altered his original intention of moving for a general return of the names of the various constables and mounted police who have been subject to punishment, and the nature of their offence; because, as he has truly said, it might greatly injure a deserving man—they are young men, most of them—who may have committed some offence, and may have been punished for it, and may have been all the better for that punishment. But it would be very hard that there should be put upon the record of Parliament all their offences and their punishments. My hon. friend has seen that, and has amended his motion, confining it to one man. With regard to that man I think I cannot agree that this motion should be carried, and therefore I ask that the debate be adjourned, until I look at the papers, and have an opportunity of seeing whether there has been an injustice done to that man, and injury to the discipline of the force; and I want to see whether the papers ought to be brought down. It has been decided in England, and it is known in Parliament, that the worst court in the world to try a case of insubordination or breach of discipline in the army, is the House of Commons. The principle is that each case should be judged by those who are responsible for the management and the discipline of the army; and it is only in very rare cases, and where

Mr. DAVIN.

gross wrong and gross barbarity is shown, that the House of Commons have ventured to interfere. As I understand from the speech of the hon. gentleman, the complaint is not against the justice of the sentence, but against its severity, and he says the powers given by the statute to the commanding officer are much larger than those given by the Queen's Regulations. I, at present, cannot charge my memory as to where those clauses were got, how they came to be embodied in the original draft of the Mounted Police Act, or in any of the amendments, but I presume they were taken from the general regulations which govern the Irish Police. There is a great difference between a police and a mere soldiery. Soldiers are trained to obey orders, and in time of war to fight, but their duties begin and end there, whereas a constabulary force is governed by quite different considerations. They are superior men, their responsibilities are much greater, and consequently any errors committed are much more serious. Constables are guardians of the public peace, they are peace officers, they are to see that there is no breach of the law, and are to act with great discretion; and so much is it necessary that men of discretion as well as physical strength should be chosen, that it would be quite sufficient justification for the commanding officer to discharge a man if he showed by his conduct that he was wanting in ordinary common sense and discretion. A single policeman committing an indiscreet act, when he came in contact either with an Indian, with a smuggler, or with a cattle lifter, or other persons who commit offences against the law, may cause incalculable misery, on the peaceable settlers, and therefore the laws must be more stringent, the punishment must be more instant and immediate, and the sentence should be more severe. As to this case, I do not know anything about it; I cannot know anything about it, for I never heard of it until this moment. But the hon. gentleman must remember that while the sentences may be severe, there is always such a thing as a pardon, a remission of a portion of the penalty. It may be necessary in the North-West, and it is necessary, that the sentences should be very severe, but at all times there is an appeal from the commissioner, at present to myself, as being in charge of the mounted police force, and if there has been undue severity, or if there has been marked contrition, or good conduct, or any circumstance warranting interference with the sentence, of course it will be considered, and each case will be considered on its own merits. It is of the very greatest importance, I cannot emphasise the importance too strongly, that the sentences should be immediate and severe. The hon. gentleman has spoken of this case. Here it appears is a police officer, and each police officer must be a man of education, because he must be able to read and write before he is eligible for the force, a man who is appointed to keep the peace and prevent others breaking the peace, and who has sworn to arrest all persons breaking the law—what is said of this man? First, he is drunk; next, he assaulted a lady; and, in the third place, when travelling in a carriage with a young woman, he used improper, obscene and indecent language to her. I cannot fancy a greater series of crimes in the case of a police officer than that alleged against this man by the hon. gentleman, and I think the commissioner was warranted in saying that this man was not fit to remain in the force and he deserved a long term of punishment. The warning to other officers of the force is of more consequence than the punishment of this man himself. A year, I admit, is a long time off a man's life; but, as I have already stated, the whole circumstances have to be considered. The case can be referred to me, and it will be referred to me now that the hon. gentleman has brought it up in this marked manner; I will enquire into it, and if there are any mitigating circumstances, this man will get the advantage of them.

I hope the hon. gentleman, having brought this matter up, and having obtained from me a statement that the case will be looked into, and having stated generally his views on the subject, will be satisfied, and will withdraw his motion.

Mr. WATSON. I think if this motion is allowed to pass, it should pass in the form in which it appears on the Notice Paper. I do not, however, think that the House should allow it to be withdrawn. Commissioner Herchmer was appointed by the Government to command the Mounted Police, and they, no doubt, felt he was a good man for the position. Very few constables in the Mounted Police have been punished for insubordination, and I believe that, generally, they act up to the rules and perform the duties for which they are appointed. Any person who has read the *Regina Leader* for the last few months must feel that the hon. gentleman who has brought this question up in the House is actuated more by personal animosity towards that gentleman than anything else.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. WATSON. The *Regina Leader* has abused Commissioner Herchmer, and I would suppose that the cause of this action has more connection with the editor of that paper and Commissioner Herchmer than anything else. It appears to me, as the First Minister has stated, that the punishment given this constable is none too severe; and in justice to the commissioner all the evidence taken should be brought before this House, so that hon. members will be able to decide whether the commissioner was doing his duty, as the officer in charge of the North-West police, or not.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. member has made this motion. It is, in fact, an appeal to the House from the decision of a judicial officer without the hon. gentleman having first adopted the means within his reach of taking an appeal to the Minister of Interior. Until he has done that, and until justice has been denied, I think it is a great mistake to have appealed to Parliament, and Parliament cannot too strongly emphasise its disapproval of such proceedings. We will have it announced throughout the country that this appeal has been taken from the action of a judicial officer—for the commissioner is a judicial officer, and one of the series of judicial officers extending from the highest judge in the land down to the ordinary magistrate. And if it is to be the practice that every time a decision is given against the view of an hon. gentleman, and, perhaps—I do not say it exists in this case—having a grievance, and, therefore, unable to take a disinterested view, and who may therefore assume that the decision is not a reasonable one, the case has to be brought before Parliament, that is a proceeding much to be regretted. Whatever may be the condition of affairs, I think, until every other intermediate tribunal has been exhausted, this House should not be appealed to in any case. I am glad the First Minister has expressed disapproval of the conduct of the hon. gentleman, and I trust it will be a long time before the judiciary, for this is a branch of the judiciary, will be threatened in this manner again. As one interested in the maintenance of law and order, I hold that a practice such as this will be destructive of all law and order, and we cannot too strongly emphasise our disapproval of an hon. gentleman appealing to the House under such conditions.

Mr. DAVIN. I am exceedingly glad that I brought forward this motion. I am glad for two reasons: first, because I have heard the weighty utterance of the right hon. gentleman, that the matter will be considered in the case of this man. But that is a small matter, for I have not merely done that, but, as Desdemona says to Othello, "I understand a meaning in the words but not the word." There is more in what the Prime Minister has said than what met the ear of

Parliament, because I know, from what the right hon. gentleman said, that this matter will be looked into thoroughly and that the object I had in view will be attained. As for the criticism from the hon. gentleman for Marquette (Mr. Watson) who knows so much about this thing, and the criticism full of knowledge of my hon. and learned friend the vice-chancellor of a university (Mr. Mulock) who connects the position of Commissioner Herchmer, adjudicating in offences against discipline on one of those constables, as a part of the judiciary of this country—as for their criticisms, they are beneath reply, Sir, because they are beneath contempt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. I am not surprised that motives should be attributed to me by the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), because the sole weapon which seems to their minds to have any cutting power in it, that ever is used by Opposition members, is some miserable, dirty weapon of attributing motives when they do not utter slanders. Let me tell him that, without using any unparliamentary language, I can fling back his invective.

Mr. WATSON. Can you?

Mr. DAVIN. Cannot I? I can! There is a document in the possession of the department of which the right hon. the Premier is the head, which can be produced, and which will prove that, in so far as I had any influence in the North-West, I was most unwilling that anything should be said against Commissioner Herchmer. That document is in existence.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the *Regina Leader*?

Mr. DAVIN. The *Regina Leader*! No. That document is there, and it will show that, so far from having any enmity against Commissioner Herchmer, I can say with the utmost truth that neither in the past nor at any other time have I had the least ill-feeling against that gentleman. I say that here in Parliament, and I can say it in a more solemn place if necessary, and I repeat again that I never had any enmity against Commissioner Herchmer. The criticism of that learned gentleman behind me (Mr. Mulock), who may one day be a judge in the event of two conditions—either that the hon. and learned member who leads the Opposition in such a distinguished manner should cross the floor, or if some other chance event may take place. That hon. gentleman says that this is part and parcel of the judiciary of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. How did this man come to be in jail for twelve months, if Mr. Herchmer is not a judge?

Mr. DAVIN. He comes to be in jail on account of the North-West Mounted Police Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Who sentenced him?

Mr. DAVIN. Commissioner Herchmer did. I grant you that the man who sentences another is a judge, but will any man say that the word "judge," in his case, bears the same signification as the word "judge" applied to one of the judges of the Superior or County Courts. When the hon. gentleman attempts to use an argument that way he uses a term (if I may talk in the language of logicians) that is undistributed, and his reasoning is fallacious. The North-West Mounted Police Act gives the commissioner power to deal in the most summary manner, and I can tell the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who is so fond of talking about North-West matters, and who pretends to be such a great friend of the North-West, that the people of the North-West—and that important portion of it, the Mounted Police—will not thank him for the statement he has made here to-day. It is a notorious fact, as any man who knows the North-West knows, that the sentences that have been passed during the last three years on the North-

West Mounted Police for breaches of discipline have been too severe. I stated in my opening remarks that I instanced this case, not as the worst case that could be taken, but as a case that I thought would be but a fair specimen. I hold that this was a great offence on the part of the constable, and I emphasised the fact that he had been a peace officer, just as my hon. friend dwelt on that point also, but I hold that neither the Minister of Justice, nor the Premier, nor any man in this House who is fit to pronounce a judgment on such a subject, will say that that sentence was not far too severe, and that the punishment was out of keeping with the offence committed. There are other cases of a severe character, and I repeat that it is notorious in the North-West that these punishments have been too severe.

Mr. MULLOCK. I think the hon. gentleman should not make those broad and general charges on the floor of this House against Commissioner Herchmer. If I might suggest to the First Minister a course, I think he might very properly ask that the hon. gentleman should not make those sweeping charges against this judge, without giving particulars. This is an aggravation of the hon. gentleman's original offence.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, am I to be told that on the floor of Parliament a man cannot deal with a subject which is publicly bruited about in the large district to which he belongs. Suppose we were discussing, not these constables who are completely at the mercy of any man having the uniform of an officer, before whom they are tried, but persons of great wealth and standing and great influence in this country, we should not find hon. gentlemen talking about a matter of which they know nothing whatever. I do not know what the motives of these hon. gentlemen may be, for I will not attribute unworthy motives to them, but I will tell the House that so long as I have a seat in this Parliament, so long the persons who have few friends, so long the persons who are weak and who have no advocate, shall always find an advocate and a helper in me. You cannot imagine a more helpless being than a constable in the North-West Mounted Police who should be charged with any offence. Now, as the commissioner is a judge, I will suppose for a moment—though, perhaps, I should not suggest such a thing as possible—that he should be a man of violent passions, of a vindictive turn of mind, or a man given to favoritism. Will any man tell me that it is a nice position for a constable to be placed, under the heel of a man of that character and possessing so much power? If he takes a prejudice against a man, he could give him twelve months' imprisonment for the smallest of the offences enumerated in that 18th clause. My right hon. friend, and the hon. and learned gentleman behind me (Mr. Mulock), spoke of an appeal. Of course, there is no appeal, except in a figurative sense; this Act provides for no appeal. Who hears of the case? A man is brought before this "judge;" his case is tried; he is sentenced; how are you to get at the facts? You know very well that the avenue to the true public is carefully guarded. Now, I say it is the duty of this Parliament and the duty of the Government to provide for such a state of things by such legislation as will secure—because it can be done—all the authority necessary to the officers of this force, and at the same time afford some protection to the members of the force who happen to be charged before the commissioner or before any officer. I am not now charging anything; I carefully abstained, in my opening remarks, on grounds that would appeal to any man, from making this a personal question. But I am sorry that it is from the Reform or Liberal side of this House that two voices should be raised, wantonly raised by men knowing nothing at all about the matter in issue, and raised in the favor of tyranny. My voice was raised in favor of producing a state of things that would not impair discipline or authority, but rather add to the authority of

Mr. DAVIN.

this so-called judge—because it is only in a figurative sense that he belongs to the great category of judges; my object was not only not to impair, but rather add to his authority, and also to afford to those who might be brought before him such small protection as might be given by regulations that would be quite consonant with the utmost and severest discipline. Now, with great deference to the right hon. gentleman, though I agree with him that punishment in such a force must be severe, I ask him, if you deal out the severest punishment, which is twelve months' imprisonment, for an offence that ordinary judges would regard as properly punished with three months' imprisonment, what punishment are you going to inflict when a very grave offence has been committed? I again repeat that the history of criminal jurisprudence shows that unless you adapt the punishment to the conscience of the community around you, and in some way make it balance with the offence, your punishment fails of its effect. Anyone can look at the record of this case, which will be found in Mr. White's books in the Comptroller's Office. The facts of the case are well known in the North-West, and I do not think anything would be gained by having the facts of one case placed before us. I rather think my hon. friends will find, notwithstanding their criticisms, that the object I have in view will prove to have been effected, and I hope we shall see some arrangements made whereby discipline shall be preserved, and the constables will not be wholly helpless when they stand before the commissioner. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Before the motion is withdrawn, I wish to say that I have been very much impressed, indeed, by the eloquence of the hon. member; but I understood him to state that during the past three years, sentences of undue severity have been passed upon officers subordinate to the Commissioner of the Mounted Police; and in order to strengthen the hon. member's position before this House and the country, I think he should be given an opportunity to answer this question: Has the hon. member officially communicated with the head of the department during the past three years, any case or cases where undue severity has been inflicted upon any of these subordinate officers, or has the case which he particularises, and which, according to his statement, occurred about six months ago, been officially brought by him under the notice of the head of the department?

Motion withdrawn.

#### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Order, resolution declaring the inexpediency of the practice in the House of Commons of Canada of remaining in Session past the hour of midnight, and providing for the discontinuance of the same.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Mr. CHARLTON. I thought of asking that this question should stand, but I think we can get through with it by six o'clock. It hardly needs any argument on my part, I think, to convince hon. members of this House—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to make a suggestion to my hon. friend. I understand that some of the members, the younger members especially, like my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, have appointments elsewhere this evening, and perhaps it would be as well if the House did not meet after six o'clock. That being the case, perhaps my hon. friend had better not press his motion, as the discussion would probably last till after that time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose my motion will keep its place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend's motion is not to declare that the House shall sit until twelve, but that it shall not sit after. There is no interest because the House is going to rise at six to preclude his motion from keeping its place.

#### CLAIM OF GUNNER FARLEY.

Mr. FISHER moved for :

Return of copies of all claims, correspondence, papers and reports respecting the demand of Gunner Farley, of the Shefford Field Battery, for compensation for the loss of his horse, which died in consequence of injuries received returning from the camp at Richmond, P. Q., in 1886.

He said: In view of the fact that the object I had in view in making this motion has been attained, the hon. the Minister of Militia having complied with my wishes, I beg to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

#### LÉVIS POST OFFICE.

Mr. GUAY (translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions and resolutions forwarded to the Government by the citizens or corporation of the town of Lévis respecting the building of a post office in the town of Lévis.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have but few words to add in support of the motion which I have just had the honor of making before this House. In accordance with the instructions which have been given me by the citizens of the town of Lévis—and I think that their information is well founded in fact—numerous petitions signed by the citizens of Lévis, and resolutions unanimously adopted by the municipal council of the town were forwarded to the Government some years ago, asking for the building of a post office, and a house to house delivery of letters and parcels within the limits of the town. My object in making this motion, is to engage anew the attention of the Government, and especially that of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who is the dispenser of the beneficent favors of the Government in the district of Quebec, to the fact of the importance of these petitions and of these resolutions, and to insist upon the urgent necessity which exists for building a post office in the town of Lévis, and of providing for the house delivery of letters, as is done in a great number of towns and villages of less importance than the town of Lévis. I have ascertained, Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor of occupying a seat in this House, that every year considerable sums of money have been voted away by this House, at the request of the Government, to build post and custom houses in towns which are far from occupying the important position which the town of Lévis does. In fact it must not be forgotten that the town of Lévis occupies the third place among the towns of the Province of Quebec from its population, the importance of its manufactures and the increase in its trade, and I might add from the number and superiority of its educational institutions. The population of the town of Lévis, is reckoned at the present day, to be from 8,000 to 10,000 souls. This town is the centre of a great number of manufacturing interests, and is the terminus of several railways; amongst others, the Quebec Central, the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk, and I hope before long that it will be that of the Great Eastern also, which is destined to bind together all the parishes on the south side of the St. Lawrence from Montreal to Lévis. I take advantage of this opportunity to express the hope that the Government will find the means this Session to assist in the building of this railway, in order to prolong its line from Sorel to the town of Lévis. I think that the time has come in which the Government must take into consideration the requests of my constituents of the town of Lévis, and place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to render justice to the citizens of the town of Lévis, by building

a post office in that city. One thing they may rest assured of, the expenditure which will be occasioned by an improved system will hardly cost more than the very primitive system which is carried on at the present time. There are now in the town four post offices spread over a distance of from five to six miles. A certain number of our citizens are at a considerable distance from any one of these offices. I am informed that the Government pays annually, for this very elementary postal service, nearly \$2,000. Well, I believe that after having built a post office, the Government might very easily pay the salary of a postmaster and three or four messengers to make a house delivery of the letters and parcels, without sensibly increasing the public expenditure. It must not be overlooked—and I trust that the hon. the Minister of Public Works has remarked it of his own accord—that this improvement in the public interest has been asked for not only by the citizens of the town in their petitions, but it has been asked for in a very pressing way by the Board of Trade, by the town council, by the press, and if I can credit the report, a deputation will shortly come to Ottawa to ask of the Government the realisation of this project so important to the petitioners. If I was asking for a special favor for the town of Lévis, Mr. Speaker, I might add that there is not probably in the whole Province a town which more than this one deserves favors from the hands of the present Government, the hon. the Minister of Public Works knows it as well as I do; but I do not ask for any special favor. I plead only for an act of bare justice, and I venture to hope that the hon. Minister will comprehend the importance of the request which I am making at this moment and that he will discover some way of rendering justice to the taxpayers and citizens of the town of Lévis, by providing this year for the construction of a post office, the need of which is so keenly felt in that town.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I will only reply to the hon. member, after the deputation which he announces shall have come here, I will know then more fully what they desire, although the hon. member has given me his personal views on the matter. As to what the Government will do, I cannot say now, but we shall see when the deputation has arrived.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) It would be well, Mr. Speaker, for us to understand once for all on what principle the Government is guided in the building of post offices and other public edifices. Does it regulate its conduct in this respect by the political support given to it by various localities, or according to the requirements and rights of these places? If we take the estimates for the present year, we shall find there that several localities in the Province of Quebec—not to go beyond the Province of Quebec—that several localities are going to be presented with post offices. Now, many of these places have not one-half or one-third of the population of certain other places which are not mentioned there. For example, I find that this year a sum of \$6,900 is asked to build a post office at Aylmer; we have been already asked \$7,000 last year, for this post office, and Aylmer is a village. I see also that \$7,000 is asked to complete the post office at Joliette; we voted \$10,000 last year for the same purpose. I find further, that for a post office at Laprairie, which is but a small village, we are asked this year to vote \$7,000, over and above the sum of \$10,000 which we voted last year. We are asked to vote \$6,000 for the building of a post office at Lachine. But there is nothing whatever asked for towards the building of a post office in the important town of Lévis, in support of which my friend the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) has just spoken. The hon. the Minister of Public Works knows better than any one in this House the importance of this town. It is at the present day the terminus of the Intercolonial Rail-

way, the Grand Trunk, the Quebec Central, and will be soon the terminus of other railways. Before long, the Quebec Central will be united with the great network of railways in New England, and yet Lévis has not a decent post office. We have, alongside Quebec City, a village which ought to be a city if its inhabitants were a little more ambitious or less modest; I refer to St. Sauveur de Québec which has a population of 15,000 souls. Well, St. Sauveur has no post office. How does it happen that these places have been always passed over when public buildings were being erected in small places which have not a quarter of their population? Aylmer has not one-fifth of the population of St. Sauveur de Québec; nevertheless a post office is being built there, but not a word is spoken about building one at St. Sauveur, which is, as I have stated, a locality of much greater importance. It would be well, once for all, to know how we stand. If it is understood that in order to have a post office or other public building, a county must return a member who supports the Government, then the counties which elect Opposition members will know what to expect. If, on the contrary, the Government is influenced by the needs of the locality and by the number of its population and the importance of its industries then the places I have just spoken of ought to have post offices given to them. I think that the Government should place in the Supplementary Estimates for this year a sum for the building of a post office at Lévis, and another sum for a post office at St. Sauveur de Québec. There are a number of places, I repeat, which have obtained these favors in the past and which will doubtless obtain them in the future, which do not deserve to have them half so well as the two places I have just mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

#### FISHERY BOUNTY IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for:

Copy of the names of fishermen in Prince Edward Island who for the last two years have made claims for the fishery bounty, and whose claims have been rejected; also for copies of the reports of the officers or parties against such claims, and the names and residences of such officers or parties.

He said: The fishermen of Prince Edward Island generally are not satisfied with the manner in which the fishery bounty has been distributed. This has been more particularly the case with the fishermen of King's county. The complaint on their part is that political considerations have been allowed to influence the distribution of this fund in the hands of the different officers. Year after year, for several years back, I have received letters from fishermen that, after having fished for the specified time and caught the requisite quantity of fish, and having sent in their application and sworn to its correctness, they have, notwithstanding this, on the slightest excuse, or on no excuse at all, on the part of the sub-collectors, who have usually charge of this matter, had their claims rejected. On the other hand, I had been informed that the wardens have given certain information to the sub-collector which has induced him to refuse the certificate to those who were making application, and thus the fishermen, without any further hearing, were deprived of the bounty which of right belonged to them. I desire to state a case or two in point. I think it was in 1886—but I am not quite certain as to the year—during the summer a seining boat on the coast with twelve men, fishing during the whole summer, and, when the time came for the fishermen to receive their cheques, nine of them received their cheques and the other three were without them. It is rather peculiar that the nine who received their bounties were Conservatives, and the three who were deprived were

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

Liberals. The next year one of these men wrote to me, making a statement of the facts in connection with the case. I wrote back asking for affidavits from two or three of these men who had fished with them and had received their bounties. I had sent to me three affidavits from men who had received their bounties and one from the neighboring magistrate. I then went to the department and explained the matter, and showed this to Mr. Tilton, the Deputy Minister. After overhauling the matter carefully he came to the conclusion that these men were entitled to their bounty. All the information which I could obtain was that the grounds upon which these three men were deprived of their bounty before, came from information supplied by a neighboring fishery warden. Another case in point is where a father and son fished for the season and sent in their claim, and when the time came for them to receive their cheques, they went for them. The father received his cheque, but there was none for the son. The father wrote to me during the Session, and I went to the department and found that the two cheques were sent down on the same day. I communicated this fact to the fisherman, and he went to the sub-collector of the port and told him he wanted his cheque or the equivalent in money. After a while the sub-collector said he would allow him the \$3, which I think was the amount owing to him. He said that would suit him as well, as he owed something to a local grocer, and he could give him credit for that. That was the course taken by the sub-collector. I do not desire to make any comment upon that, but I understand that these cheques must be endorsed by the parties in whose favor they are made. I could recount such cases as these by the dozen, but I think these are enough to let the Minister understand how this fishery bounty is distributed in my county. I think it is a hardship for fishermen, after fishing the season round, after getting the required quantity of fish, to be deprived of their bounties on the most flimsy pretext, and often upon none at all. The case, as it stands, is enough to show that that is the fact. It is the opinion of the fishermen, as it is my opinion also, that the bounty should be increased. If our fishermen are to pay the large taxes which they are paying year after year, for their food, their clothing, and the material which enters largely into their outfit, they should receive greater encouragement than they are receiving at the present time. For many years the French Government have given a bounty, a large bounty, I think ten francs, to the French fisherman for every quintal of fish sold in the foreign markets. Our fishermen are paying a large amount for the benefit of a few manufacturers; and if the Americans are going to continue the heavy duties they now charge, the least the Government should do is to give a bounty to our fishermen equal to the amount the Americans charge on our fish. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that he had heard no complaint from the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. That may be true, and the reason is that the fishermen have got tired of making useless remonstrances to the department and obtaining no consideration for them. I trust that the present Minister, in whom the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces have every confidence, will see that they receive the bounty to which they are entitled. There ought to be some shorter way of arriving at the fact as to who is really entitled to the bounty, than the system that obtains now. It appears to me that there are cases in which the fishery overseer should have power to make an examination, cases of fishermen whose claims were being presented. Let him go round from place to place at stated periods and ascertain the facts as relating to these matters. It could be very easily done. The fishery overseer in Prince Edward Island is not overburdened with work, and this plan would do away with a good deal of the uneasiness in connection with this matter which now prevails.

Mr. TUPPER. There is, of course, no objection to comply with the motion of the hon. gentleman, with a slight amendment, to which, I believe, the hon. gentleman does not object. I understand the hon. gentleman has no reference to those claims that have not been adjudicated upon, and, therefore, with that alteration, I have no objection to the motion passing, that is, that it be changed so as to read for the years 1886 and 1887, instead of the last two years. In reference to the specific cases which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, I am not familiar with either of them, as they were settled and decided upon before I entered upon the administration of the department. I may point out, however, that out of the 637 claims that were filed by the fishermen of King's County, to which allusion has been made, those claims represented 1,323 fishermen, and of these 637 claims, 602 were allowed, and 35 rejected.

Mr. McINTYRE. When was that?

Mr. TUPPER. That was for 1887, King's County, to which I understand the hon. gentleman alluded. If the facts were as the hon. gentleman mentioned, with regard to the crew of twelve, in which nine Conservatives were paid their bounty, and three Reformers were refused, and upon the grounds he suggested, that would be a course that I would not for a moment defend, and I should certainly look into the case, and ascertain how far the department is responsible, or to what extent any official under the department is responsible for a case of that kind. Then, in reference to dealing with these bounty cheques, that is a practice that is not tolerated or countenanced by the department, but a practice very difficult, indeed, to stop. The fishermen are most anxious, at times, to use the checks paid on the bounty, or use the credit that they gain by having filled the claims, and they are oftentimes induced to obtain a discount on these cheques by some officer in the locality charged with the investigation of the claims. Of course, that practice has been a great abuse in reference to the quasi judicial position of the officer in charge of that settlement, and the officer who reports to the department. There has been only one case specifically brought to my notice, personally, of an officer who does that, and that I am at present investigating. I may mention that, as the hon. gentleman has suggested is quite the case, that the cheques are payable to the party entitled, under the Act regulating the bounties, and under the Order in Council passed under that Act, they are made out in the names of the fishermen, and to be cashed, must be endorsed by the fishermen.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There can be no doubt that in disposing of so much money, the system may be open to abuse, and sometimes, no doubt, the system has led to abuse. I am aware of one case in my own county that I brought to the notice of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year, which was so evident that the department promised to look into the affair, though I do not know whether they have given it the investigation that was promised. The person who had charge of the distribution of the cheques, or making out the claims, in one section of my county, was a gentleman of good standing, and I did not care to mention his name on the floor of the House; but I told the Minister of Marine at that time, that according to the papers which had been placed in my hands—and they were sworn to—that man, who was a magistrate too, had returned names of parties for bounties that had not been issued at all; he had returned the names of his own sons, who were mere boys in his store, and had obtained checks in that way under various pretences. I did not pretend to say at that time, nor do I now, whether the charge was correct, but I offered to give the department all the particulars, with a view to assisting them in arriving at a correct distribution of the money, which, I have no doubt, is their desire. I am aware since that time that the prac-

tice has been continued, I think very unfortunately, of placing these cheques in the hands of local shopkeepers. I know that within Halifax city a list of the bounties there was placed in the hands of one local shopkeeper, and the fishermen coming in from the outports have come to this man, and he makes out their cheques for them, and I presume—I do not affirm it—they all have dealings with him, and that he receives a certain amount of indirect advantage. It has been stated to me, and I think it is correct, that on several occasions, notably on more than one occasion, people have gone to this man and he has made out their claims, pretending that they had grounds for making their application; where they are Conservatives their claims were always admitted, where they happened, unfortunately for them, to belong to the other side of politics of the day, the shopkeeper and the Government which he represented, did not see their way clear to grant them the same bounty which had been granted to the other fishermen along the side of them. Now, this statement has been made to me over and over again, and an investigation was held in Halifax not very long ago, under circumstances which were rather peculiar, if my information is correct. It was stated then that one man's application was made out and his bounty was granted, when he was proved to have been in the hospital at Halifax all summer. Now I do not say this information is correct, but the best evidence has been brought to prove the charge; but whether it is true or not, the whole system of distribution of the cheques of the fishermen, is open to very grave abuse. It is placed by the Government in the hands of small shopkeepers and men of that kind who are influential in the various districts, and who deal directly or indirectly with the fishermen. It is time the system was changed. The cheques have been distributed at particular times and under particular circumstances, and, as I mentioned last year in the House, during the local election a clerk was sent from the custom house in Halifax to distribute cheques along the shore. He was rather badly treated by the Government, I must confess, because he hired a team in Dartmouth to go along the eastern shore and distribute the cheques, thinking the Government would recompense him. But having lost the election, the Government did not feel inclined to make any further investment in that direction, and so a case has been before the courts in Halifax in regard to team hire.

Mr. TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman advises me to pay the claim for the horse and team?

Mr. JONES. Will the hon. gentleman act on my advice?

Mr. TUPPER. I will take it into consideration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman is willing to accept my advice on this point, I hope he will also adopt my suggestions on other points, and under these circumstances we will see an improvement in the administration of the department. I do not bring any accusation against the present Minister of Marine, for this matter relates to the past year. All this is a condition of affairs which, I repeat, calls for an investigation and for a change in the administration of the department. I suppose the Government will always favor their own friends, we expect it, and we have seen it. The Conservative party think not only the revenues of the country belong to them, but the whole country belongs to them, and whenever they obtain any money they take good care to distribute it among their own friends. But we hope they are not altogether beyond public opinion, and they are not too old to learn and improve the administration of the Fisheries Department in this particular. There is no branch of the public service which more needs improvement and change than that connected with the distribution of these bounties among the fishermen.

Mr. PERRY. I am glad the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre) has brought this motion before the House because we have had great cause for complaint in the County of Prince, which I have the honor to represent. It appears to me that when the fishermen who claim bounties declare they are entitled to them, and when they are called upon to go before magistrates and make a solemn declaration that they have fished the prescribed time and taken the necessary catch, no Government officer should be able to declare in effect that those men had taken a false oath. I hope the hon. gentleman who has taken the important position at the head of the department will see to it that during the coming summer these wrongs will not be perpetrated on the fishermen. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that the whole system is liable to be abused; but I consider it to press very hardly on fishermen that after a fisherman has gone before a magistrate and sworn that he has fished so long and has caught so many pounds of different kinds of fish, that then a fishery officer, who probably does not live within 5 or 6 miles of the fisherman, should take the responsibility of declaring that the fisherman has made a false declaration. I look upon that as a gross injustice, and I hope it will be remedied. I have three cases of this kind at Tignish, and this is the third session I have endeavored to get these cases rectified. In order to obtain an investigation by the department so much red-tape procedure has to be gone through that when the small amount is obtained after three or four years, it is scarcely worth receiving. There should be some other means by which these cases can be decided. The department has now two Commissioners in Prince Edward Island, a head Commissioner and an assistant Commissioner. And they should be authorised to judge as to whether fishermen applying for the bounties are entitled to them or not. I hope we shall not hear any longer of such wrongs being perpetrated on the fishermen.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to the cases of D. McNeill, M. Munn, F. MacLoed, all of Little Sands, Prince Edward Island. In each of these cases evidence was adduced before the fishery commissioner that they had caught the required quantity of fish, but they failed to receive their bounties during 1886. I have written to the fishery commissioners time and again, but have never received any answer from them.

Mr. TUPPER. How long ago was it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In 1886. The fishermen have to give evidence under oath that they are entitled to the bounty, and although this was done the fishery commissioner paid not the slightest attention to the claim. I am informed that the fishery warden felt so sore about the matter that he resigned his position, because the fishery commissioner had not even answered his letter, in which it was shown that the men had fished the necessary time, and had caught the required quantity of fish.

Motion agreed to.

#### RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all petitions presented to the Government by the residents of the Townships of the front of Young and the front of Escott, in the County of Leeds, Ontario, praying that an Act passed by the Local Legislature of the Province of Ontario, assented to the 23rd March, 1885, intitled: "An Act to provide for the union of the Townships of the front of Young and front of Escott," might be disallowed.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Statement showing the amount of expenditure on account of the Central Experimental Farm, from the first day of July, 1888, to the first day of January, 1889. Also the total cost of the Central Experimental Farm, to the first day of January, 1889.—(Mr. McMillan, Huron.)

Return showing the amount received by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from the sale of the \$15,000,000 of Mortgage Bonds which the Company were by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 32, authorised to issue, and the payment made, and to whom made, and for what, by the said company out of such proceeds.—(Mr. Ste. Marie.)

#### THE JESUITS ESTATES BILL.

Mr. BARRON. I was out of the House a few moments ago when my motion was called in regard to copies of a report and other papers respecting the Jesuits Estates Bill. It is absolutely necessary that this return should be brought down so that we may be able, intelligently, to discuss the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), when it is moved. I, therefore, ask that the return be brought down as soon as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Has the motion been passed?

Mr. BARRON. I ask leave to move it now, if there is no objection.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think you had better leave it on the paper.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this another effort to cut off the rights of private members?

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when this House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until three o'clock, p.m., on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in rising to make my first financial statement before this House, it would not be otherwise than natural that I should experience feelings of trepidation, and even of timidity. When I look at the line of men, distinguished Canadians, who, since Confederation, have had entrusted to them the keeping of the purse-strings of this country, men in every case of acknowledged ability and of an experience far greater than my own, when I have regard, as well, to the responsible nature of the duties which have been devolved upon me, and the fact that every action of the present leaves its impress upon the future, I would be the reverse of serious or thoughtful if I did not throw myself to-day upon the kindness of the House, and ask those who are older and more experienced than myself for their generous indulgence, and ask also for the equally generous sympathy of those who are, in point of years, more nearly my contemporaries and co-laborers in the work of this House. The wise and the vigorous policy of the preceding years, a kindly providence which, during the past year, has not forgotten this, one of her most favored countries, and a growing spirit of confidence in commercial operations, have contributed to a fullness of the Treasury, and to a peace and prosperity, general throughout the country, which serve to make easier the otherwise formidable task which has fallen to my lot. Canada to-day, standing in this her majority year, and looking back upon the record of her past, has every reason, I think, to survey that record with pride, and turning towards the future, although it may have its difficulties which are to be surmounted, I

believe that from this same vantage ground she has every right to step forward into that future, with full assurance that in it she will find peace, plenty, prosperity and continued greatness. Standing upon this point of vantage ground, this country asks no concealment of the real facts of her record, she asks no flattery, and while she does not wish to have concealed from her the difficulties incident to progress in all climes and in all ages, I think she is willing to stand by the record of facts, and whatever merits or demerits my statement may have, I trust, that so far as it goes, it will have the merit of candour, frankness and plainness of statement. With these few preliminary remarks, I beg the indulgence of the House while I proceed to the common-place and not always interesting statement with respect to the past the present and the succeeding year. For the year 1887-88 the statement of my predecessor was that Customs would yield \$22,000,000; Excise, \$6,450,000; Miscellaneous, \$7,550,000, a total of \$36,000,000. The actual receipts have been as follows:—Customs, \$22,105,926; Excise, \$6,071,486; Miscellaneous, \$7,731,050, or a total of \$35,908,463; or less than the estimate by \$91,536. This difference in the actual receipts, as compared with the estimated receipts, arises from a falling off in the Excise of \$378,513, whereas Customs shows an increase of \$105,926, and Miscellaneous, an increase of \$181,050. The following are the principal items of increase, compared with 1886-87:—

Brass, and manufactures of .....	\$ 7,152 19
Grain of all kinds .....	21,894 31
Drugs, Dyes, Chemicals and Medicines .....	37,503 25
Earthenware and China .....	7,358 57
Fruits and Nuts, dried.....	24,134 46
Iron and manufactures of, and Steel, manufacture of.....	463,758 27
Oils, Coal and Kerosene, and products of .....	7,942 10
Oils, all other .....	19,922 30
Paper, and manufactures of .....	69,668 38
Pickles, Sauces and Capers of all kinds.....	20,863 24
Provisions (Butter, Cheese, Lard and Meats).....	57,184 14
Spirits and Wines.....	237,384 35
Sugar of all kinds .....	255,805 55
Molasses .....	31,225 18
Sugar Candy and Confectionery .....	4,560 23
Wood, and manufactures of .....	24,617 48

On the other hand, the following articles show decreased revenues, viz.:—

Books, Periodicals, &c, and all other printed matter .....	\$ 4,864 89
Arrowroot, Biscuit, Rice, Macaroni, Bran, &c. ....	48,836 58
Flour and Meal, of all kinds.....	51,120 76
Carrriages .....	40,415 67
Coal and Coke (dutiable).....	423,546 89
Collars, Cuffs, and Shirt Fronts .....	19,796 39
Cotton, manufactures of.....	197,880 32
Fancy Goods .....	73,277 78
Flax, Hemp, Jute, and manufactures of.....	33,847 49
Fruits, green .....	37,910 92
Glass, and manufactures of .....	9,593 63
Gold, Silver, and manufactures of.....	16,220 33
Guttapercha, India Rubber, and manufactures of.....	8,419 18
Jewellery .....	13,122 22
Leather, and manufactures of .....	25,374 81
Oilcloth.....	9,947 10
Silk, and manufactures of .....	32,612 20
Tin, do do .....	12,875 82
Tobacco, do do .....	71,717 79
Wool, do do .....	374,914 07
All other dutiable articles.....	49,617 08

In the Excise, as I have stated, there was a falling off of \$378,513 in duty collected. The statement shows that in 1886-87 the number of gallons of spirits upon which Excise duty was paid was 2,882,265 gallons, while in 1887-88 the quantity was 2,405,716, a difference in quantity of 476,549 gallons, giving a difference in revenue of \$638,697.94—a very considerable falling off, as the House will see, in the revenue from spirits. Malt liquors, however, show a decided increase, the quantity being 48,640,467 lbs. in 1887-88, as compared with 42,630,440 lbs. in 1886-87, the increase being \$6,010,027, and the increase in revenue being \$60,102.19. In cigars there is an increase of 4,811,735 in number, and an increase in revenue of \$23,373.68. In

tobacco of all kinds, including snuff, there is an increase of 4,1439 lbs., and an increased duty of \$72,363.30. The expenditure as estimated for by my predecessor in office, was \$37,000,000. The actual expenditure has been \$36,718,494, a difference of \$281,506 on the right side, so far as the accounts are concerned. Sir Charles Tupper estimated there would be a deficiency of \$1,000,000 as between the receipts and expenditure for the year 1887. His estimate happily was over the mark, and the total deficit amounts to only \$810,031. It is, however, to be remembered by the House, and it will be remembered as well by the country, that although we speak of a deficit in 1887-88 of \$810,031, we must also keep in mind that there has been a set-off against the public debt of \$1,939,077 as sinking fund and investment for interest on sinking fund, so that there is an offset against the debt of \$1,939,077 and a deficit of \$810,031. That is to say, if we had not offset the debt by the amount named, we would not have had a deficit on the consolidated fund account, but a surplus of \$1,129,046. The items of capital expenditure in the year 1887-88 are as follows:—

Railways and Canals .....	\$1,798,704
Public Works.....	963,778
Dominion Lands.....	135,048
North-West Rebellion.....	539,930
Total.....	\$4,437,460

To this is to be added the expenditure for railway subsidies under the Acts, \$1,207,041, and a redemption of debt, \$3,185,634, making a total capital expenditure of \$8,650,159. But as the redemption of debt counts on both sides it does not affect the net debt, and the statement with reference to the net debt is as follows:—

On 1st July, 1887, it amounted to .....	\$227,313,911
On 1st July, 1888, it amounted to .....	234,531,358
Increase for the year.....	\$7,217,447

That has been explained by the different items of capital expenditure which I have read, and this House is now in possession of the facts as to the items upon which this capital expenditure was made. For the year 1888-89, the estimates made by my predecessor were as follows:—That

Customs would yield.....	\$12,500,000
Excise would yield.....	6,650,000
Miscellaneous.....	7,760,000
Total.....	\$36,900,000

Up to the 28th of February, 1889, the receipts for the eight months are as follows:—

Customs .....	\$16,303,700
Excise .....	4,619,841
Miscellaneous .....	4,693,225
Total for eight months.....	\$25,616,766

If we estimate for the remaining four months in this year a revenue equal to the revenue of the four similar months of 1887-88, there would be added to the above receipts for the eight months, in

Customs .....	\$ 8,230,271
Excise .....	2,448,302
Miscellaneous .....	3,305,955
Total .....	\$13,984,528

Which will make the amended estimate as follows:—

Customs.....	\$ 23,533,971
Excise .....	7,068,143
Miscellaneous.....	7,999,182
Total .....	\$38,601,294

To be within the mark I will call the amended estimate upon the above basis \$38,500,000, as contrasted with the \$36,900,000 estimated for last year. Then with reference to the expenditure: For the full year 1887-88, the expenditure was \$36,718,494. From the 1st July to 28th February of the present year the expenditure was \$21,972,826. If we



add to the expenditure for those eight months past, a similar amount to that expended on the four last months of the past year, which I think will be sufficient, there is to be added to that, \$14,397,565, making a total upon that basis of expenditure of \$36,371,391. There will be some further Supplementary Estimates to make up for Governor General's warrants and for some other expenses of that year, and I think it is safe to say that it will be within the mark that the expenditure for the present year will amount to \$36,600,000 as against estimated revenue of \$33,500,000, leaving for the current year, I think, without any probability of doubt, a surplus of \$1,900,000. That, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very satisfactory statement to be made to the House and the country. It is a condition of things which has not arisen from any increased rate of taxation, but under the very same tariff as the preceding year's receipts were based upon. Consequently, it shows an increased ability to consume, and therefore an increase in the prosperity of the country. The capital expenditure for 1888-89 is estimated as follows:—

## CAPITAL EXPENDITURE, 1888-1889.

	Paid to 31st January, 1889.	Estimated from Feb. 1st to 30th June.	Total.
Railways and Canals.....	\$ 2,414,557 00	\$ 358,310 00	\$ 2,772,867 00
Public Works.....	219,283 77	166,416 23	385,700 00
Dominion Lands.....	61,342 41	38,657 59	100,000 00
North-West Rebellion.....	1,205 11	.....	1,205 11
Railway Subsidies.....	614,443 09	538,985 00	1,153,428 00
Redemption of Debt.....	2,122,023 21	972,362 9.	3,094,386 12
<b>Total Capital Expenditure, 1888-89.....</b>			<b>\$7,537,586 23</b>

The estimate for the succeeding four months in this year was according to the best information that I could get from the different departments. The total capital expenditure, as I have pointed out, will be \$7,537,586.23, of which, of course, \$3,094,386 being for redemption of debt will not affect the net debt estimate. The net debt on

30th June, 1888, was .....	\$234,531,358 00
28th February, 1889.....	\$236,095,114 34
1st July, 1889 (estimated) .....	\$336,650,000 00

We now come to the year 1889-90, about which there is, of course, less certainty. Having regard to the state of things in the present year, and to the very general favorable outlook for commerce and trade, not only in our own country but in the great commercial countries of the world, I have made an estimate for 1889-90, which is based upon the continuance of the prosperity and the continuance of those results of trade which have obtained for the present current year, and I have simply calculated for increased revenue on the increase of population, which you may expect in the year, of 1½ per cent. My estimate for 1889-90, is as follows:

Income—Customs .....	\$23,900,000
Excise .....	7,125,000
Miscellaneous .....	8,150,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$39,175,000</b>

This is based on the present rates of tariff and a continuance of the present condition of the country, as I have said before. The estimates that have been laid before the House amount to \$35,400,000. I cannot say with certainty what will be the total amount of the supplementary estimates yet to be brought down. If we can succeed in curbing the naturally kind and generous heart of my colleague the hon. Minister of Public Works, and if we may rely on the general sense of

Mr. FOSTER,

economy and desire to do with as reasonable an amount as possible which has been so eminently manifested by members on both sides of the House, I think I may fairly expect that the supplementary estimates will not reach an exceedingly high figure. However, to make an estimate which will be inside the mark, suppose we say that the estimates now brought down shall be increased to \$36,500,000, we shall then have a surplus for the year 1889-90 of \$2,675,000. That, I think, will also be satisfactory to the House, inasmuch as this estimate is not based upon any increase in the rates of tariff, but simply upon the present rates of tariff, and the general condition of the business of the country. It might not be unprofitable to call the attention of the House to the items of the estimates brought down, as compared with the estimates of the preceding year, because I think they show a fairly satisfactory list of decreases. The items in which there are increases are not very many, and can be easily explained. For the public debt, including sinking fund, there is an increase of \$18,061, because, of course, the debt being larger on account of the loan, and the sinking fund investments increasing year by year, there must necessarily be an addition. In Civil Government there is an increase of \$5,107; but the House must bear in mind that we have transferred this year an item of \$13,053 from the immigration vote, where it formerly was, to Civil Government; so that, taking into account that transfer as well as the statutory increases which have been provided for, an absolute saving of some \$3,000 has been made. The total amount of the statutory increases for 1888-89 are \$20,702, which, added to the amount of the transfer from the immigration vote, makes \$33,785; from this amount take the net increase of \$5,107, and the result shows that we have saved, outside of the statutory increases, \$28,678 in other items of Civil Government, which, although not a large sum, indicates economy, and, I hope, is but a step in the right direction. The next increase is in the administration of justice, \$12,060. As this is vouched for by my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Justice, I have no doubt it is a perfectly satisfactory increase, and one which will be quite palatable to the gentlemen of the legal persuasion on both sides of the House, who, I observe, never object to an increase in the salaries of the judges. This, however, is not caused by an increase in the salaries of the judges, but is owing to appointments of new judges, and also to the expense incurred in the establishment of the new Exchequer Court. There is a slight increase in Dominion Police, of \$1,400, rendered necessary by the employment of extra men about the new building, which will soon be occupied. The other increases are not large, until you come to the Department of Indian Affairs, in which there is an increase of \$32,138, made necessary by the establishment of industrial schools, a policy which has been tried with most excellent results in the country to the south of us, and which is based upon a sentiment which I am sure will commend itself to both sides of this House. The other large increase is in Railways and Canals, \$293,625, which is largely on the Intercolonial Railway, rendered necessary by the purchase of new rolling stock for the accommodation of an increased traffic, and which will be offset in part, if not altogether, by increased earnings. When you come to the list of decreases, it is fairly long and fairly satisfactory. There is a decrease in the management of penitentiaries of \$4,322, in legislation of \$9,335, in arts, agriculture and statistics, of \$14,000, and in immigration of \$21,254. Assisted passages have been entirely done away with, and all arrearages with reference to them have been paid up. There is a reduction in quarantine of \$24,200, in pensions and superannuations of \$15,965, in militia of \$29,700, in railways and canals (income) of \$74,643, and in public works of \$1,007,894, though I suppose, when the supplementary estimates are brought down, the last figure will be

somewhat reduced. In lighthouse and coast service there is a reduction of \$59,500. That, however, does not mean that there will be less efficiency in that service, but it is owing to the fact that for a number of years past, a larger vote has been taken for this service than has ever been expended, and the experience of a number of years has shown that it is possible, with due regard for events that may occur, though at present unforeseen, to make the vote that much smaller without impairing the efficiency of the service. In subsidies to Province, there is a decrease of \$8,454, based upon changes which have taken place in the arrangement, which, I may say, is now practically concluded, between the Dominion and the old Provinces of Canada, with reference to the settlement of their accounts. There is a decrease in the Mounted Police vote of \$26,783, and in miscellaneous of \$162,621. In all, the decrease from the estimate of last year amounts to \$1,328,977, which will, no doubt, be somewhat pulled down, as I have stated, by the supplementary estimates which have yet to appear. Now, after having given as best I could, without occupying too much of the time of the House, an explanation of the expenditure of the three years of which I have treated, I wish to say a word or two with reference to the condition of the debt of Canada as it stands at present. In 1867, the net debt of Canada was \$75,728,641; in 1874, when we had completed the Union of the Provinces, which now form Confederation, it was \$108,324,964. At present, it is \$234,531,353. The burden of carrying a debt is measured by the amount required to pay the interest. Measured in that way, we find that in 1868, it required a *per capita* payment of \$1.29 to meet the interest; in 1874, it required a *per capita* payment of \$1.34; and in 1888, a *per capita* payment of \$1.79. The increase in 1888, over 1868, was, therefore, 50 cents per head, and over 1874, 45 cents per head. It is also important to note the decrease in the rate of interest. In 1868, the rate of net interest averaged \$4.51; in 1874, it averaged \$3.62; and in 1888, the average net rate of interest has fallen to \$3.12. It must also be remembered, in making a fair estimate of this debt, that there was assumed, as debts of the Provinces, not created for federal purposes, a sum of \$109,430,148.69 which, although it added that much to the indebtedness of the Federal power, relieved the different Provinces by exactly the same amount, and placed the management of that large indebtedness in the hands of the Federal Government, where it is managed at a smaller rate of interest and with less burden to the country in general than if it had been left in the hands of the Provinces. Deducing this debt assumed for the Provinces of \$109,430,148.69 from the net debt, in 1888, of \$234,531,353, we have a federal net debt of \$125,101,209.51 in excess of the assumed debts, and which is offset by this consideration, that during that period named there has been a total capital expenditure of \$179,709,974. Thus, our capital expenditure, which has been almost entirely for public works necessary for this country, has exceeded the increase of the debt for strictly federal purposes by \$54,608,764.69. I may say that the excess in the net debt per head necessary to bear the burden of this debt, in 1888, over 1868, is 50 cents *per capita*; over 1874, 45 cents *per capita*; over 1879, 20 cents *per capita*; and over 1880, only 15 cents *per capita*. In 1880, my hon. friend who preceded me (Sir Charles Tupper), and who to-day I am glad to see on the floor of this House, was struggling with the problem of railway connection between the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard of this country—a problem which had engaged the best attention of the best minds of this country since Confederation, and which bore so intimately on the future prosperity and progress of Canada, that it assumed the status of the foremost question in our politics, the solving of which would reflect credit on the minds engaged in it and would cause them to be held in grateful remembrance by this country. In 1880,

we had not made the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we had not commenced to incur that vast expenditure which we afterwards incurred in the subsidy we gave for finishing the remaining part of the Pacific trans-continental railway, which had not been undertaken as a Government construction. Taking the net interest per head in 1880 and comparing it with that of 1868, when the Pacific Railway had been finished and the large expenditure we had incurred to complete it was added to our public debt, as it is, we find that the additional interest burden which the country was made to feel to carry that indebtedness was but 14 cents per head of its population. It is a common error to take the debt of Canada and compare it with the federal debt of the United States, in order to make a point as against Canada and in favor of the United States, or, to speak more truly, to make a point against the Government which is now in power on account of its alleged extravagance in increasing the public debt. I do not know that a more unfair comparison could be instituted than a comparison between the Federal debt of the United States and the federal debt of the Dominion of Canada. Broadly stated, the comparer says: Look at the United States; to-day it has a debt of \$20.42 per head of its population. Look at the Dominion of Canada; to-day it has a debt of \$17.16 per head of its population; and the comparison always tends, as these financial comparisons must, to prejudice the minds of those who do not see through it, in favor of the country which, seemingly, has a lighter debt and against the country which, seemingly, has a heavier debt. Now, if by a simple statement to-day I can set, to a certain extent, at rest and dispose of this comparison of two things so dissimilar, I shall feel that I have performed a duty, not only to the party in power, but to this House and to the country as well. Things which are dissimilar cannot be fairly compared. The constitution of the United States and the constitution of Canada are very different, so far as financial matters are concerned which lead to public debts and to public expenditures. The United States, in the first place, assumes no debts of its different States. The Dominion of Canada has assumed the debts of its Provinces to the amount of \$109,430,148.69. The United States pays no subsidies to its different States. The Dominion of Canada has paid in subsidies to its different Provinces, since Confederation, \$72,316,029.95. The United States, assuming no debts of its States, pays no interest upon the debt which it does not assume. The Dominion of Canada has paid in interest on the debts assumed for the different Provinces, \$98,344,248.20 from Confederation up to the present time. Then, as regards the Administration of Justice, I think I am right in saying that, in the United States of America, they pay the nine Judges of the United States Supreme Court, they pay Circuit Judges, nine in number, and they pay District Judges thirty in number. Outside of that, they incur no expenditure for the Administration of Justice. In the Dominion of Canada, we all know the state of things in relation to the payment for the Administration of Justice, and from Confederation up to the present time there has been paid for the Administration of Justice, \$10,821,542.90. If Canada had based her system on the same foundation as that of the United States in reference to the Administration of Justice, we would certainly not have had to pay more than one-half of that amount. Then, in regard to Immigration and Quarantine, we find that we have paid \$5,571,631.81 since Confederation. The United States Government pays little or nothing for Immigration and Quarantine. For Militia and Defence, this Government has paid \$21,851,635.50 since Confederation. In the United States, they keep up West Point Academy, and a small standing army, but the Militia throughout that vast country is kept up at the expense of the different States, so that, if Canada had been in the same position as to these matters as the United States, it would

have saved at least one-half of that sum. For Penitentiaries, we have expended since Confederation, \$5,611,696.54. The Penitentiaries in the United States are supported, not at the charge of the Federal power, but at the charge of the different States. Then, we have expended for the salaries of Governors, \$2,250,643.01. In the country to the south of us the salaries of the Governors are paid by the States and not by the Federal power. If Canada had set out on the same basis as the United States, she would have saved the assumed debts of the Provinces, the subsidies paid to the Provinces, the interest paid on the debt assumed from the Provinces, the amount paid out for Penitentiaries, the amount paid for the salaries of Governors, at least half the amount she has paid for Militia and Defence, at least half the amount paid for the Administration of Justice, and the whole amount paid for Immigration and Quarantine amounting in all to no less a sum than \$309,860,987.40. The net debt of Canada to-day is \$234,531,353; so that, if Canada had set out from the first on the same basis as the United States, and had made no payments that the Federal Government in that country does not make, she not only would have had no debt at present, but would have had a surplus of \$75,329,624.40.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen may treat this as a good joke, but from their point of view it is no joke, for, as soon as this gets before the people and into the minds of the people, a stock argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite will be forever taken from them, which is their comparison on an unfair basis of the debt of the United States with ours, and always to the advantage of the United States and to our disadvantage. But, coming to the question of debt, Canada is not the country most burdened in the world in that respect. The whole of the Provinces

of Australasia show a debt per head of \$218.65; New South Wales, \$199.20; Victoria, \$156.82. Then France has a debt of \$179.66 per head, and Belgium of \$62.15. So that this country, as far as its indebtedness is concerned, has, in the first place, a debt which I believe is not disproportionate to its ability to pay; and in the second place, that it is not in a disadvantageous position when compared with other progressive countries in the world. Sometimes we talk of national debt as if it meant ruin and disaster. I have before me a table showing the net and funded debt of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia. Those five cities combined have a debt of \$243,252,729, or \$57.48 per head. Leaving the question of the debt for a moment, I come now to the question of taxation and its incidence upon the country. Before taking up that question, however, with the kind indulgence of the House, let me ask their attention to a fact which is patent to all hon. members, but which I repeat in order that we may bear it in mind as this discussion progresses. That is, that it is unfair to take the total revenue of the country as an index of the burden of taxation on the people. The total revenue is made up of the Customs tax and the Excise tax, and what we may call the gross earnings, such as the proceeds of our Post Office, the proceeds of our Railways, the proceeds of our Public Works, the tolls and fares, and fees, that are paid upon them for services which they render to the country. There are also public funds which are invested in different ways, which earn and yield so much to the revenue of the country, so that, in every case, we have first to take away the earnings from the total revenue in order to get at what is really to be denominated the taxation of the country—that is the Customs and Excise duties. I hold in my hands a tabulated statement as follows, showing:—

EARNINGS AND TAXATION by Customs and Excise Duties, and proportion to population, 1868-1888.

Year.	Earnings.	Amount per Head.	Customs.	Amount per Head.	Excise.	Amount per Head.	TAXATION.		Percentage of Total Revenue.
							Gross Amount.	Average per Head.	
	\$ cts	\$ cts.	\$	\$ cts	\$	\$ cts.	\$	\$ cts.	
1868.....	1,987,247 41	0 59	8,578,380	2 54	3,002,588	0 89	11,700,681	3 47	85.48
1869.....	3,266,601 51	0 96	8,272,879	2 42	2,710,028	0 79	11,112,573	3 26	77.28
1870.....	2,424,342 98	0 70	8,334,212	2 70	3,619,822	0 05	13,087,882	3 79	84.37
1871.....	3,015,192 11	0 86	11,841,104	3 56	4,295,944	1 22	16,320,368	4 64	84.41
1872.....	2,909,261 64	0 83	12,787,982	3 54	4,735,651	1 31	17,715,552	4 91	85.52
1873.....	3,196,914 67	0 87	12,954,164	3 53	4,460,681	1 22	17,616,554	4 80	84.64
1874.....	4,075,907 37	1 07	14,325,192	3 74	5,594,903	1 46	20,129,185	5 26	83.16
1875.....	3,983,836 08	1 03	15,351,011	3 95	5,069,657	1 30	20,664,878	5 32	83.84
1876.....	3,973,172 03	1 01	12,823,937	3 26	5,563,487	1 41	18,614,415	4 71	82.41
1877.....	4,361,349 29	1 09	12,546,987	3 14	4,941,987	1 23	17,697,924	4 41	80.23
1878.....	4,533,073 69	1 11	12,782,824	3 13	4,858,671	1 19	17,841,933	4 37	79.74
1879.....	4,040,768 79	0 97	12,900,659	3 11	5,390,763	1 30	18,476,613	4 46	81.05
1880.....	4,877,830 25	1 15	14,071,343	3 34	4,232,427	1 00	18,479,576	4 38	79.29
1881.....	5,693,158 59	1 31	18,406,992	4 23	5,343,022	1 23	23,942,138	5 51	80.19
1882.....	5,834,409 07	1 32	21,581,570	4 87	5,884,859	1 33	27,549,046	6 22	82.52
1883.....	6,524,950 99	1 44	23,009,582	5 09	6,260,116	1 39	29,269,698	6 48	81.77
1884.....	6,378,762 54	1 38	20,023,890	4 43	5,459,309	1 18	25,483,199	5 53	79.98
1885.....	7,412,471 90	1 58	18,935,428	4 03	6,449,101	1 37	25,384,529	5 40	77.99
1886.....	7,950,584 18	1 66	19,373,551	4 04	5,852,904	1 23	25,226,456	5 23	76.03
1887.....	7,067,991 32	1 45	22,378,801	4 59	6,308,201	1 29	28,687,002	5 89	80.23
1888.....	7,731,050 35	1 55	22,105,926	4 44	6,071,487	1 21	28,177,413	5 66	78.47

From this table it will be seen that in 1868, the earnings of the country amounted to \$1,987,247.41, which was equal to 59 cents per head of the population. In 1888, the earnings amounted to \$7,731,050.35, or \$1.55 per head of the population. That is a gratifying increase in the earnings, which do not mean taxation, from Confederation up to the present time. The Customs receipts in 1868 were \$8,578,380, or

Mr. FOSTER.

\$2.54 per head. The yield from that source in 1888, was \$22,105,926, or \$4.44 per head. The Excise revenue in 1868, was \$3,002,588, or 89 cents per head, while the yield from Excise in 1888 was \$6,071,487, or \$1.21 per head. The gross amount of taxation in 1868 was \$11,700,681, an average of \$3.47 per head, and in 1888, it was \$28,177,413, or an average of \$5.66 per head. That is a fair, plain

and our did statement of the increase which has taken place in the earnings and in customs in this country from 1868 to 1888. Now, a distinction might be made between what we may call voluntary taxation and that which is not denominated strictly under that name, but which it is difficult indeed to find a term well to define. What I mean is this — and the statement may go for what it is worth, and it is made particularly with reference to a favorite method of comparison or calculation which states that the taxation of this country is so much per head of its population, as indicating, by the naming of it in that way, that every man, woman and child in the country has perforce to pay that much per head into the coffers of the country. Taxation, then, may be of two kinds—voluntary, and what you may call involuntary taxation. What I mean by it is this: I, for my part, do not use tobacco and do not use intoxicating liquor. My case, which is the case of hundreds of thousands, I think of millions, of people in this country —

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. If not of millions now, it will be by-and-by, at no very long period, when my pleasant friend, who is looking upon me, comes to think as I do, and as so many others of the people of this country do think. The total revenue for 1887-88 was \$35,908,463.53, or an average of \$7.22 per head. The earnings amounted to \$7,731,050, which was \$1.55 per head. That leaves \$28,177,413 for what we call taxation, an average of \$5.66 per head. But out of this £8 million odd dollars there was paid into the coffers of the country \$8,084,780 for tobacco and liquors alone, an equivalent of \$1.78 per head of the people. Now that is a voluntary tax. A man may pay that or he may not. If he chooses to think that these are luxuries which he wishes, or if he chooses to denominate them necessities which he must have, he pays a tax upon them. They do not fall in the line of such necessary articles as the staple foods and the staple articles of wear; so that if you take them out, it leaves a *per capita* taxation, on an average, in this country, of \$3.88, instead of a total taxation of \$5.66 per head. But, Sir, I wish to go a step further, and say that this method of *per capita* calculation is a clumsy and a misleading method, in my opinion, and I wish to give the House my reasons for it. The critic says: "There is a certain revenue which is collected in this country; divide that by the number of people in the country, and it gives you to-day \$5.66 per head. For a family of five this means that they pay \$28.30 into the coffers of the country. That is an inordinate taxation, and the poor man especially who lives by his day's work, is not able to pay that and keep his family together and live fairly prosperous in the world." Now, I say that the incidence of taxation, so far as my opinion goes, is not fairly stated by a calculation of that kind. I think we all agree that luxuries should pay most, and that necessary and staple articles should either pay less, or pay nothing at all; and that if taxation is to be laid, we, at least on this side of the House, believe that it should be so laid as to compensate, by its stimulation of industries, its employment of labor, and the increased consumption which it gives, for the taxation which is laid upon the country, and which is necessary for the carrying on of the Government. Now, if that be true, I affirm that Canada to-day, in her geographical position, with her natural resources, of the peculiar kinds that they are, is a country which is particularly happily situated for the system of taxation which has been the policy of this country from 1878 until the present day. For, Sir, Canada is a country which, in comparison with most other countries in the world, has an advantage in possessing an over-supply of the great staples which are necessary for food, for lodging, and for the staple wants of the country. She has her forests with their immense resources, and the houses that are to be built, the barns that the farmers

and the people require, and these works which require lumber as their staple, find in the country itself great resources in that respect, with a surplus going every year into the foreign markets of the world. The same is true with reference to the great cereal productions of the world. Canada is a country which produces more wheat, produces more barley, produces more staple foods of most kinds than is necessary for the sustenance of her people, and in those ways she is happily situated so far as the great necessities of life are concerned. Now, to come down to what may be considered a very common, but I think, a very practical illustration, let me take the case of three persons to illustrate the incidence of the taxation. Here is your well-to-do man, who has means, who has luxurious tastes, and who is disposed to gratify them. With that no one finds fault, but this country says that if he is disposed to gratify them, and has the means to do it, he shall pay a tax for doing it if he goes outside the country to get his luxuries and to get the things which he desires. Sir, if such a man as that buys in the city of New York \$1,000 worth of fine furniture and brings it into Canada, the country taxes him to the extent of \$350 upon that. If he is musically inclined and buys a piano which is worth \$1,000, he pays upon that, when it comes across the customs line, \$230. If he is fond of statuary and makes an investment in that line to the extent of \$500, he pays \$175 in duty in bringing it across the line. If he buys expensive plate to the value of \$500, the duty upon it is \$150. If he wears jewelry, or buys it for his household and brings it from a foreign country to the value of \$500, he pays \$100 duty upon it. If he is fond of wine and lays in 20 dozen of champagne, he pays upon that a tax of \$130. If he requires silks for the wear of himself and his family, to the modest tune of \$300, and imports them, he pays a tax of \$90. If he wishes a fine carriage and sees one to satisfy him there, and brings it across the line, and pays for it \$500, he pays a duty of \$175 upon it. Upon carpets for his house of extra make, which he may buy in a foreign market to the extent of \$800 in value, he pays a duty of 25 per cent, or \$200. Upon that modest stock of luxuries for a man of means who is disposed to gratify his desires in that respect, he has paid into the treasury of the country \$1,600 in duty. That is one man's contribution, but it is the contribution of a rich man who wishes these luxuries, who imports them from abroad, and who, the country says, being able to pay for them, must keep up the revenue of the country by paying a tax upon them. Now, Sir, we will take No. 2, and that is the case of the farmer of this country, whom we all love, and for whom we all desire to do the best we can. The farmer of this country lives upon his farm in the rich Province of Ontario, we shall say. Nearly all the foods that are used by the farmer are raised upon his own farm and pay no duty; the wheat he raises he has ground at the neighboring mill, it is brought into his home and he pays no duty upon it. The home itself, the outhouses, the barns, all that is necessary in the way of housing for the work of the farm is built out of woods which grow in this country, of which we have a surplus and upon which he pays no duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about the nails?

Mr. FOSTER. The clothing for himself and his family is in many cases made from the wool which is raised by the farmer himself, or, if not raised by the farmer himself, he clothes himself and his family with the products of our mills, the raw material of which is admitted free. His lumber of all kinds, his furniture of all staple and solid kinds, his farming machinery, is made, and made to the best advantage, out of the woods of his own country. His fuel grows in the forests which are all about him, or is found in the mines in inexhaustible quantities in this coun-

try. So that, taking it in the gross, in the rough, the staple articles of consumption, and of housing, and of fuel for the farmer are those of which this country produces a surplus, which are free within the borders of this country and upon which not one cent of tax is paid. An hon. gentleman said: "What about the nails?" With that infinitesimal cast of mind which characterises him, out of the hundreds and thousands of dollars which are required to buy raw materials for the home, and which are free to the farmer who buys them, the hon. gentleman's mind leads him to look at the few pounds of nails which are necessary to keep the structure together, and upon which a duty may perhaps be paid. That argument, as an hon. gentleman suggests, is clinched.

Mr. LANDERKIN. All our farmers do not wear home-spun.

Mr. FOSTER. No. 3 is the artisan. He does not live on a farm on which he is able to raise what he consumes, but he lives in a village or town; but the articles of food which he buys, the clothing which he wears, the lumber he requires for house purposes, the furniture which he puts into his home, the tools which he uses to a large extent and the fuel he burns, which are the larger items in the expenditure of the artisan as well as in the expenditure of the farmer, are obtained in this country, which produces a surplus of them, and no duty is paid upon them. So, I say, that in this country with its present fiscal system and with its peculiar natural advantages, the system of tariff arrangement under which we live is one which brings the incidence of taxation where it should rest most heavily, upon the man who buys luxuries and has expensive tastes and is willing to gratify them, and least heavily upon the farmer, the well-to-do middleman and the artisan and upon the laboring class. There is this other fact, which I think is one of considerable importance, that the peculiar structure of our tariff arrangement makes this almost a necessity, at least it makes it a possibility, that the raw material which comes in as the material for manufactures is untaxed, and while the manufactured article pays tax, the stimulus given leads to the establishment of new industries, which in their turn gather about them labor and so afford employment to the people, and make in their turn centres for the consumption of the surplus products of the country. Sir, to make that argument just a little stronger, let me say that if hon. members will look into the customs returns they will find that more than 200 articles which enter into the manufacture of goods come in duty free, and that one-third of the total imports for home consumption were, in 1887-88, admitted free of duty in this country. Sir, the comparison is made as well between the debt of the United States and the debt of Canada as it is between the taxation of the United States and the taxation of Canada, and the basis in one respect is almost as unfair as the basis in the other. But, Sir, I have looked through the figures of the taxation borne by the people of the United States, and I find that if you take twenty-one years, corresponding to the life of the Dominion of Canada, in the United States, in Customs and Excise—that is what you may call tax—they have paid at the rate, taking the average of their people, of \$6.64 per head during that period. If you take the amount paid by the people of Canada for Customs and Excise in the same time, the average for its population is but \$4.94 per head, a difference in favor of the Canadian citizen of \$1.70 on the amount of Customs and Excise taxation for the period of twenty-one years ending 1887-88. That is, if Canada, during those twenty-one years, had been as heavily taxed for Customs and Excise as were the people of the United States, they would have paid, taking our average population at 4,000,000 souls, \$142,800,000 more than

Mr. FOSTER.

the people did pay under our reduced system of taxation as compared with that of the United States. If you take the last eight years, from 1881 to 1888, the taxation paid in the United States was \$5.87 per head, and in Canada \$5.74, a difference of 13 cents per head in favor of Canada for that period. For the year 1888, the tax per head in the United States was \$5.51 per head, whilst in Canada it was \$5.66, a difference of 15 cents in favor of the United States, which arises from the fact that the United States, undertaking none of that large class of expenditures such as we have in Canada, and which I mentioned a few moments ago, has from her surplus, with her large population and immense trade, paid a large amount towards reducing her public debt, and, consequently, is reducing the per capita rate of taxation which the people are obliged to pay. But, when you talk of taxation in the United States, you talk simply on the line of comparison of the federal taxes, forgetting that each State has also its taxes, and, if you add the taxation of the different States for 1887-88, which amounts to \$1.08 per head, to the federal taxation of \$5.51 per head, you obtain the total corresponding taxation paid by the people—\$6.59 per head in the United States as against \$5.66 in Canada, a difference in favor of Canada of 93 cents per head of the population. Why, sometimes people think that only a country like Canada, enjoying a protective tariff, has to pay Customs and Excise taxes. If we go to Great Britain, what do we find? We find the taxes gathered there in 1888 were as follows:—

Customs .....	\$ 85,158,253.36	amount per capita.	\$2.30
Excise .....	124,551,485.20	do	3.36
Stamps .....	63,457,777.00	do	1.71
Land Tax.....	5,005,800.00	do	0.13
House Tax.....	9,428,400.00	do	0.25
Property and Income Tax...	70,178,400.00	do	1.89
Total Revenue .....	357,780,115.56	do	9.64

So there is a tax paid under these different heads of \$9.64 per head of the population in free trade Great Britain. I undertake to say, after carefully looking into this matter, that taking the incidence of taxation in Great Britain and comparing it with Canada, it is much more severe and onerous upon the poorer classes of Great Britain than it is upon the poorer classes of Canada, and it does not have the beneficial effect there in the way of stimulating industries and giving employment to labor as it has in Canada. I find in France the tax per head reaches \$12.86, or a difference in favor of Canada of \$7.20 per head. In Australasia the tax per head is \$12.79, or a difference in favor of Canada of \$7.13. I think you will agree with me that in considering taxation, it is always necessary to have regard to the application of the money which is raised by taxation, and when we come to look into that a little we will find that Canada stands in a position of immense vantage ground in this respect, as compared with the United States of America or Great Britain. In the United States for the last year we find that they made the following payments:

Paid interest on debt.....	\$44,715,007
Pensions.....	80,288,508
Civil expenses.....	22,852,334
Redemption of debt.....	83,084,405
Military.....	38,522,436
Navy.....	16,926,437
Total.....	\$286,389,127

So that for those expenses alone, nearly all of which are for war, or for the results of war, or for the keeping up of the

military status, there was paid by the United States \$286,389,127, out of a total expenditure altogether of \$342,738,364. Now, Sir, when you look at Great Britain, you will find my statement equally true with reference to the application of taxation. Great Britain last year paid the following sums in expenditure:—

Interest on debt.....	£28,213,911
Naval and military.....	30,758,687
Civil list and administration.....	19,691,950

Or a total of £76,674,548 sterling for these services, while only £10,749,097 was paid for the collection of revenue, Post Office service, telegraph service and packet service. I say that, having regard to the application of taxation, there is no comparison, as far as the benefit to the people is concerned, between the taxes which are raised in Great Britain and the United States and those which are raised in Canada. With the exception of the money expended as a result of the unhappy outbreak in the North-West, every cent of taxation, speaking in the gross, which is raised in Canada, and which has been raised here since Confederation, has gone, not for war, not for waste, not to make up the ravages of war or to pay for the consequences of war, but it has gone to construct productive public works which have repaid the country for the outlay and have made this a country where business is speeded, where commerce finds splendid facilities, and where the people have every resource at their command to make them a business people, with profit to themselves and prosperity to the country. It is sometimes said, and it is a potent word to conjure with, that "taxation" is a bugbear to the people. It is a bugbear to unintelligent people, but it is not a bugbear to intelligent people, and if conjurers conjure with it to-day they conjure with a word and an instrument which is not less reprehensible than the old instruments of the conjurers of other days. I believe it is a fact which stands upon a basis sound and certain, that taxation is the only gateway to progress and development in a country, and that if a people sit down and determine that from this day forth no taxation is to be raised, they sit down to a condition stationary and without progress and which will soon leave them very far behind in the race of nations, with the keen competition of to-day. Take a town of 10,000 people which to-day is without a sewage system, without a proper street system, without a police system, without lighting system, without a fire protection service; bring those 10,000 people together and let them look into the matter and come to the conclusion that it is necessary for promoting the health of the city and for their status, as compared with other and competing cities, that they shall have all these great public services. How are they to secure them? There is only one gateway through which they can march to the enjoyment of those enlightened and efficient services for their town, and that is through the gateway of taxation. The people of the city and the property of the city must be taxed, or they cannot secure, and cannot maintain the efficient services which every progressive city of to-day holds it must have. What is true of the city is true of the country as well. The point to be looked at is, as to how the taxation is applied, as to whether more is raised than is necessary for its proper application, and in considering whether or not the country is overtaxed, or unduly taxed. What have we in Canada as a result of what the people of the country have paid into the public treasury? We have, in the first place, an enlarged domain, and an enlarged population; we have added to the original four Provinces of Canada three other Provinces, and an extensive, almost illimitable country, illimitable in its acreage, and still more illimitable in its wealth of minerals and of timber, and of resources to be

reaped from the cultivation of large and fertile tracts of land. That cost us money, and money had to be paid into the treasury, and out of the treasury again, in order to get this enlarged domain, and to make a place for this enlarged population. That is something to be considered as an offset against the amounts that have been paid in taxation. We have added to and developed our productive capacity as well. Lands that were useless because there was no access to them, and where, even if persons got to them, there was no way of getting the produce back from them, have been opened up by railways and by facilities for transporting these products. There was no other way of getting these facilities but by levying taxation upon the people and obtaining the money with which to build and with which to make those improvements. Why, Sir, not later than 1877, in Manitoba and the North-West Territories we were confronted by the fact that only 500 bushels of wheat were exported. In 1887 from Manitoba alone were exported 10,400,000 bushels of wheat, and in 1889 the estimate for Manitoba and the North-West is that their wheat yield will supply all the needs of the country and leave for export 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, with an acreage of 700,000 acres under crop. That is possible to-day because the people of this country chose to tax themselves in order, in the first place, to obtain possession of that part of Canada, and in the second place, to open up the country with railways and public works so as to make it possible for the people to till the land and to get the product of the land to the market. Then, Sir, we find that the transport charges have been very much cheapened. We have paid heavy sums of money for our canals, but we have got increased facilities and cheapness of transport for the outlay, and if these public works do not add directly in revenue to the treasury, they are of great advantage to the progress of the country and of almost untold benefit in promoting our commerce. In 1872 the tolls per ton through the Welland Canal were 16.26 cents, and in 1888 the tolls were only 12.52 per cent.; thus between 1872 and 1888 there has been a reduction in tolls on the Welland Canal of 23 per cent., and a reduction of the St. Lawrence rates of 48½ per cent. That is so much actually saved in the transport of those staple cereals and articles of commerce which floated out from the interior of the country towards the seaboard and to the great markets of the world, as well as the staples which come from foreign countries, and which make their way into the interior of this country by the same route; and although it is true to say that no increased revenue comes from these works, there is a broader way of looking at the matter. Although the public treasury is not enriched, yet the public business and the general prosperity of the country are made greater by the reduction of the tolls, and by another great fact, that the enlargement of these canals renders possible the use of a larger class of vessels, which carry a larger quantity of grain, and consequently at cheaper rates than could prevail with the old depth of water in the canals, when very much smaller and inferior vessels had to be used. And so we may set down as compensations for this expenditure, these facilities for business and an added attractive power which distinguishes the country in competition with other countries which do not possess these improvements; and if we are to go forward in the race of competition with other new countries to-day, it is a necessity, as well as a wise and prudent policy, to open up our country; but to open it up we require money to establish and maintain all these lines of communication, and we can only get the money by asking it from the people. But, I may be asked, is this thing to go on forever? Are we to be continually increasing our debt? Are we to be continually increasing the amount that we raise from the

people in the way of yearly contribution? Sir, I think that to-day Canada, standing on the vantage ground of twenty-one years of progress, is in a better position to look out upon the future, with a greater probability of accurately forecasting what will be the result, than she has been at any preceding year of her history. The debts of the Provinces had to be assumed as the old Provinces were brought in. These have now been brought in. In the great territory which lies to the west of us, there are materials for other Provinces which, by-and-by, will have to be formed and furnished. The great St. Lawrence channel has been deepened; our canals have been largely built, and when the expenditures which are at present contracted for shall have been made in the course of about three years, we shall have a line of communication from the extreme end of the Great Lakes down to Montreal; we shall find a depth of water on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal of 18 feet, on the Welland Canal of 14 feet, and on the St. Lawrence canals and river a depth sufficient to carry the vessels which go through the Welland Canal down to Montreal, and so to the seaboard. We have built the Intercolonial Railway, the great line of communication between the Maritime Provinces and central part of this country; we have built the Canadian Pacific Railway, giving our large contribution to it, which connects that line of railway with the Pacific; we have given our contribution to the Short Line Railway, which within a few months will be open to the Maritime Province ports; and we have given other contributions to other lines of railway, more local, but not less useful in their nature. All the vast initial expenses incident to this opening up of our territory, and this completing of the channels of communication between our different Provinces, have been incurred; and it does seem as if to-day we are in a position to take stock of the future, and fairly to answer the question as to whether or not we shall go on rolling up the debt, as some of my friends would say—whether or not we shall go on taking larger amounts of taxation from the people. The engagements for the next three years for capital expenditure are, on a fair estimate, something like this:

	1889-90.	1890-91.	1891-92.
Canals.....	\$2,636,521	\$3,111,576	\$3,310,103
Railways.....	1,200,000	.....	.....
Public Works.....	407,000	Est. 250,000	Est. 250,000
Railway Subsidies.....	1,095,204	229,387	.....
Redemption of Debt.....	2,417,267	5,000,000	1,800,000
Dominion Lands.....	100,000	100,000	100,000
	\$7,855,990	\$8,690,963	\$5,460,103
Less—Redemption of Debt.....	2,417,267	5,000,000	1,800,000
	\$5,438,723	\$3,690,963	\$3,660,103

Making a total for the three years of \$12,789,789. Now, Sir, what have we to meet this with? We have an estimated three years surplus of \$6,000,000; a balance from the loan still on hand on the 1st of July, 1889, of \$2,500,000; and a sinking fund, which is to be offset against the public debt,

Mr. FOSTER.

of say \$2,000,000 per year, making \$4,000,000; a total of \$14,500,000, to meet the capital expenditure of \$12,789,789, leaving \$2,000,000 for other capital expenditures than those I have mentioned. So that, putting these two facts and these two sets of items together, my own opinion as a member of the Government, and it is an opinion in which I know I shall have all reasonable support from my colleagues in the Government in retaining and maintaining, is that, taking for granted that the condition of the country during the three years to come shall be equally prosperous with its condition to-day, should no extraordinary events arise to cause extraordinary expenses, for the three years ending on the 30th of June, 1892, we ought to meet our capital engagements, pay what we have to pay in the running expenses of the country, and add not one dollar to the net debt of the country. What I mean is this, if I have not made myself clear, that counting in the sinking fund investment, which is laid up as against gross debt, we ought in the next three years to meet all our capital engagements to the amount I have mentioned, and at the end of that time have no greater net debt than we shall have on the 1st of July, 1892; and this is estimated on the basis of the tariff which we have to-day, without contemplating any increase in the tax rate. After 1892, with equal prosperity, with an increased population, and with consequently increased consumption and increased contributions to the revenue, on the same rate of tariff, I believe that, unless extraordinary events occur which call for extraordinary expenditure, this country ought to go on for a series of years without any increase of debt at all, providing for necessary capital expenditure and the services of the country out of the revenues which come in to make up the consolidated revenue of the country. That is my forecast, and one which I believe, if nothing intervenes of an unexpected character, will be fully carried out by the march of events. Now, I come to the question of the loan which has been put upon the London market, through the instrumentality of the High Commissioner, in June, 1888. It was placed on the market on the 15th June, 1888, the conditions being that the interest should be payable one-half yearly, 1st of January and 1st of July, at 3 per cent. per annum. The lowest rate at which a Canadian loan had been floated heretofore was 3½ per cent. This loan had been floated a few years ago, and it was believed, in looking over the field and seeing the state of our own securities and our 3½ per cents. and the state of the money market, that there was a favorable opportunity for placing upon the English market a Canadian loan at 3 per cent.—or at a less rate of interest than that at which any colony ever floated a loan in the London market. The minimum price fixed for this 3 per cent. loan was 92½, which rate was fixed, calculating upon the value of our 3½ per cents., which at that time, were bringing 104 or 105 in the market. The amount placed upon the market was £4,000,000, and the time fixed for the loan to run was 50 years. The reception of that loan upon the London market was gratifying, I am sure, to all Canadians. Not only was the amount asked for taken up, but £12,000,000 were subscribed, being three times the amount asked for. There is no doubt circumstances were somewhat favorable to the placing of the loan upon the market at that time, and I think great credit is due to the High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) for selecting the precise time at which he should call for tenders. Being in London, his advices were acted upon by the Government, and having full knowledge of the state of the money market, he chose the time which, as circumstances afterwards proved, was the most opportune that could have been chosen in the year 1888, for the floating of the loan. I hold in my hand a statement of the different loans which have been placed on the London market since 1867. It is as follows:—

MEMORANDUM respecting Canadian Loans placed on the London Market since 1867.

Loan.	Price in prospectus.			Price realized.			Duration of Loan, years		Total Issue.	Discount or Premium.	Amount realized.	Charges, including Discount for immediate payments and interest on part payments.	Net Amount of Cash realized.	Rate of interest, taking into account interest on instalments as well as preceding deductions.		
	Year	Month	Day	Year	Month	Day	Rate	Rate								
Intercolonial R'y, 1869, guaranteed.	105	12	11	35	5	5	4	1,500,000	P. 112,946	2,112,946	29,896	18	5	2,083,049	7	*04125
do 1869, unguaranteed.	105	12	11	35	5	5	4	500,000								
do 1873, guaranteed.	105	12	11	35	5	5	4	1,500,000								
Rupert's Land, guaranteed.	104	7	8	31	4	30	4	300,000	P. 78,971	1,878,971	33,449	18	11	1,845,521	7	*03916
Loan of 1874.	90	90	3	30	4	30	4	4,000,000	D. 393,471	3,606,523	60,289	9	9	3,546,233	12	*04875
do 1875, guaranteed.	99	1	8	30	4	30	4	1,500,000								
do 1875, unguaranteed.	99	1	8	30	4	30	4	1,000,000	D. 21,936	1,247,069	42,847	6	1	1,243,221	14	*0416
do 1876.	91	91	...	30	4	30	4	2,500,000	D. 225,000	2,275,000	57,122	9	7	2,217,877	10	*0175
do 1878.	96	11	9	30	4	30	4	1,500,000								
do 1878.	96	11	9	30	4	30	4	1,500,000	D. 102,347	2,897,652	36,602	15	7	2,861,049	11	*013
do 1879.	95	95	1	29	4	29	4	3,000,000	D. 147,206	2,852,793	17,988	8	3	2,804,805	5	*045
do 1884.	91	91	2	25	4	25	4	5,000,000	D. 445,870	4,554,130	91,693	3	4	4,462,436	16	*0423
do 1885.	99	101	1	8	25	4	4	4,000,000	P. 43,416	4,043,416	82,098	2	1	3,961,317	17	*04083
Canada Reduced.	24	4	2	9	2	9	2	6,442,136	D. 54,576	6,388,660	33,977	1	0	6,255,583	19	*041
Loan of 1888.	92	95	1	50	3	50	3	4,000,000	D. 197,904	3,802,096	67,598	4	3	3,734,497	15	*0327

\*Or 50 years calculated for 25 years only.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state the exact net product of the loan?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of the loan was £1,000,000. The discount paid was £300,419 15s. 9d.; one per cent. commission, £10,000; stamps, £1,026 12s. 6d. Total amount passed by the Auditor to date, £243,446 8s. 3d. One quarter per cent brokerage £10,000; stamp duty, £9,778 11s. 3d.; printing and advertising, £2,350 13s. 0d.; stamps, £ 80; being a total of £222,309 4s. 3d., which is still held by the Auditor General for fuller information, but which, he informs me, he considers will be all right and be in the end paid. Total amount to be taken from the face of the loan for all charges, £265,755 12s. 6d., leaving £3,734,244 7s. 6d. as the net amount of the loan, and the rate is 3.27 per cent. The favorable nature of a loan is measured by the returns it gives to investors in comparison with other loans running upon the British market. Our 3½ per cents. at that date were quoted at 105½, which would return to the investor, redemption included, £3 4s. 6d per year. Our 4's, due in 1904 and 1908, were quoted at 109½, which would return to the investor, redemption included, £3 5s. 9d. Our 4's reduced, falling due in 1910, were quoted at 110½, which gave to the investor £3 6s. 0d. Our 4's, 1910-35, were quoted at 112½ which gave to the investor £3 9s. 0d.; whilst the 3's gave the investor, redemption included, as in the other cases, but £3 4s. 1d.; and as the advantage of a loan, as far as we are concerned, and the return to the investor bear an inverse proportion, it will be seen that the loan placed upon the market in 1888 is more favorable for Canada than the quotations as to the running loans upon the market and the other securities that I have mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this loan bear a sinking fund?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I desire to say a word as to the amount which was asked for. Some criticism has taken place in the press, and no doubt some criticism will take place here, in regard to our having asked for a loan of £4,000,000, when we have, by our own admission, a certain surplus on hand unused. At that time we had to meet temporary loans at Glyn's and Baring's, amounting to \$6,252,106; we had to meet sinking fund and inter-

est, payable in London on the 1st of July, amounting to \$2,147,354; we had to meet the redemption of debt in the current year of \$3,594,386, making in all, \$11,793,845. We had also to meet the redemption of debt in 1889-90, amounting to \$2,417,267, making in all, \$14,211,113, which we had to meet either on the 1st July, in reference to the temporary loans and the redemption of debt for that year, and during the current year for the redemption of debt in 1889-90. That would leave a surplus of \$4,250,177. Then we had to face a large capital expenditure which Parliament had already authorized on the canals, on the Sault Ste. Marie canal—prospectively, at least, and which is now under contract—and an expenditure for the St. Lawrence canals, running over three years. In addition to that, we had the railway to Cape Breton, which was under construction, and which will not be completed until the end of the current year. For all these, a large capital expenditure would have to be incurred. Taking these into account, it became a matter of choice if we should go on the London market for a loan of £3,000,000 at that time and pay all the calls upon us, with the prospect of incurring a larger amount of expenditure afterwards, leaving four or five millions of dollars which would be required within the next year or eighteen months for which we would have either to place temporary loans or to go on the market again, and it was decided that the most economical course was to take the whole amount at that time, because of the state of the market then, and because of the fact that the money would be required within the period I have mentioned. Besides, for temporary loans we have to pay 4 per cent., and sometimes more. We have not been able to get them at a rate less than that. It was, therefore, thought that the most economical course would be to borrow the larger amount and preclude the necessity of getting these temporary loans or going on the market for another loan. I suppose something will be said as to the disposition of the surplus, and I may as well make a statement to the House at this time as to that matter. On the 1st July we had at our command £1,000,000 which we needed to place somewhere. That million was in London. It was impossible at that time to get a rate of more than 7-8 per cent. for that money in London. The money market seemed to be filled. Rates were ruling very low, and there was



no possibility of saying at what time a change would take place so that we might get a larger rate. Therefore, after thinking the whole matter over, it was considered best, as exchange was largely in our favor from London to New York at that time, to send the money by exchange to New York, under which operation we gained a fair sum for the exchange. We were running the risk of placing the money at a better rate of interest here than we could get in London. It was certain that we could get a considerably larger rate, and we could not know how much larger amount we might possibly get. Under these circumstances, the money was exchanged to New York, and, as I said before, a certain sum was made by the exchange. The money was then placed in four Canadian banks at the best rate they would give at that time, which was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. It was the intention of the Government, taking into consideration the rates of exchange as they have been on the average for a number of years, to keep that money on deposit until the 1st January, and then, as the exchange would be, according to previous experience, likely to be favorable, to send the money from New York to London, under which arrangement a large amount would have been gained by the re-exchange, and those two sums so gained, being added to the amount received for the money deposited here, would have given us a much larger interest than we could have obtained by leaving it in London.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did that work out?

Mr. FOSTER. It did not work out as we expected. The rates of exchange during the past year, as my hon. friend knows, have been altogether abnormal, owing to the slow movement of the cotton crop, the cost of wheat in consequence of the speculative prices which prevailed here and which precluded shipments, and to the large imports into the United States. Consequently, there was a difference in the exchange between New York and London which had not obtained for a long series of years, and there was altogether a difference in the normal rulings of exchange, so that, when the 1st January arrived, instead of there being the usual state of things, gold was being shipped to London, and it would not have been profitable for us to exchange to London. Under those circumstances, we made arrangements with the banks, and, according to the statement which I brought down to the House a few days ago, a large amount of this money remains in deposit in the Canadian banks at from 3 to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., running until the 1st July, 1889. I suppose that no person can well make calculations in business matters extending over a number of years, on the basis of the records for that period, who is not liable to be upset in his calculations by the force of abnormal causes. Those causes have rather upset the calculations made for the present year, but this fact remains, that, when this money will have been returned to pay what we have to pay in London, taking all the cost and all the interest we have received for deposits, we shall find at the worst that we shall have paid for the million of pounds that we had on surplus for the year a rate not exceeding 4 per cent., which is certainly not more than we would have had to pay for a temporary loan which we would have had to make a year afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him one question? Was any obligation formally entered into on the part of the Government of Canada that they would use their sinking fund to purchase those 3 per cent. securities, and, if so, was that a positive obligation?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend means, if I understand him, are we to buy—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you to use your sinking fund to make purchases out of the 3 per cent. loan?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, so far as my information goes, that our investments for sinking fund purposes are to be made out of the 3 per cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a positive pledge?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it was a positive pledge, I cannot speak certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's predecessor can tell him.

Mr. FOSTER. But I know that is what we are doing, and that is, I think, what we should do, because I think it has its advantages, taken all in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman returns after six perhaps he will be able to tell the House whether the pledge was a positive one or not. Something depends upon that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be able to say, but I do not think it was a positive pledge. As showing the favorable nature of that loan of which I have been speaking, as compared with loans of other countries which were negotiated during the same year, I will read the following table, showing the loans effected by various countries in 1888, with the per cent., and price received:

	Loan.	Per Cent	Price Received.
Victoria .....	£15,000,000	4	£108 $\frac{3}{4}$
Mexico .....	3,700,000	6	78 $\frac{1}{2}$
Brazil .....	6,000,000	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	97
New South Wales.....	3,500,000	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	103-12-2
India .....	7,000,000	3	96-7-0
Queensland .....	2,500,000	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	94-16-6
Argentine Republic .....	3,933,580	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	87
Uruguay.....	4,255,300	6	82 $\frac{1}{2}$

In respect to the Indian loan, we all know that it is much the same as a loan by the Government of Great Britain itself. Some of those countries are fair countries for comparison with Canada; others may not be so fair; but, as is shown in the case of all of them, even of that of India, I think, considering the circumstances which rule in an Indian loan, as compared with a colonial one, the late loan by Canada, may be considered to be very satisfactory indeed. So much with reference to the loan. I now ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I turn to another and more interesting subject—the commerce of the country for the past year. In speaking of the commerce of Canada one can scarcely avoid taking into consideration the state of commercial operations and commercial confidence in Great Britain and the United States of America, because these two great countries, with which we have so large a commerce, and which have so large a commerce with the rest of the world, are, as it were, barometers of the commercial feeling and of the commercial enterprise of the world. I find that in Great Britain the year that has just passed has been a fairly prosperous year, taking it through and through, and trade in Great Britain, as shown from all advices, has steadily improved. It has been sound and progressive, and there has been an absence of speculation, which has been especially marked, and business is reported as being more active at the present time than it has been for many years past. A great impetus has been given to the shipping trade, and to shipbuilding in Great Britain, as in our own country, by the

rise in freights that has taken place within the last year, and I find that the tonnage which was built in 1888 in Great Britain was nearly double the tonnage which was built in 1886, and largely in excess on that which was built in 1887. As a consequence of the revival in the shipbuilding trade and in the carrying trade, there has been a stimulation of the coal production, and the demand by shipowners and shipbuilders has caused a large output, and a rise of wages for those who work the mines. The iron industry has been helped as well, and cotton shipments have increased. One very good index of the state of Great Britain is that, whereas at the end of 187, 20 labor societies, reporting a membership of 197,000 men, reported 13,700 unemployed, or 7 per cent., at the end of 1888, 21 societies with a membership of 249,000, reported only 8,200 unemployed, or 3 per cent. Throughout Great Britain, according to latest advices, there is a growing confidence and a cheery outlook for the trade in the future. Much the same may be said with the trade of the United States. The features of the trade of the United States for the last year have been its heavy output of pig iron, the highly satisfactory condition of its various industries and its cotton trade especially, and the large output of anthracite coal, the largest, I think, in the history of the country. In reference to Canada, hon. gentlemen are, I suppose, as well acquainted with the condition of the country as myself, and it would not be news to them to state that throughout Canada there has been a fairly average, or more than an average condition of trade, during the past year; that although the harvest was not of the best, it was compensated for its deficiency in quantity, in some parts, by a larger growth in others, and over the country generally by an increased scale of prices. The manufacturing industries are fairly prosperous, the textile industries especially, the large stocks which were held, as was the case in Great Britain and the case in the United States, having been worked off, the mills are now running on low stocks, with orders in advance, which is a far more healthy state of things than having large stocks on hand. I find that in Great Britain and the United States, and in Canada as well, there is an advance in prices, and there is an indication, in addition to an advance in prices, of a significant addition in wages in the large industries of the country. It would not be well for us to do otherwise than to note in our own country what is of so much importance to the shipping, especially of the Maritime Provinces, the large increase of freights which has taken place and which has made that industry, which, as far as the carrying trade is concerned, has not been very prosperous for the last number of years, look very encouraging, and bring in good returns to the owners of vessels. With reference to our foreign trade, the total in value was, in exports, \$90,203,000, and the imports were \$110,894,630, an increase in the exports of \$687,189, and a decrease in the imports of \$1,997,606; being a total decrease in the trade of \$1,310,417. Our exports, I find, increased to the United States, France, Portugal, the West Indies, South America, China and Japan, Australia and other countries; and they decreased with respect to Great Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Newfoundland and Switzerland, the decreases being small, with the exception of Great Britain, and the decrease in trade with Great Britain being largely due to the smaller shipments of cereals and cattle for which the causes are apparent to the country. I find the exports last year were the highest, with the exception of those of 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884. The imports were the highest since Confederation, with the exception of 1883, 1884, 1887, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875. The balance of trade is less against the country than in the preceding year, the percentage this year being 18.6 excess of total imports over total exports as against 20.7 last year, and against an average of 20.4 for the last six years. I am not going to

discuss the oft-discussed question of the balance of trade which has been well threshed out in this country, and which I suppose is well understood by both sides of the House. But, Sir, I wish to say a word with reference to what I consider to be a very important point in comparisons, and in order to introduce it, I will read an extract from a speech which I think was delivered by my hon. friend opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Oakville, on August 13th, 1888, and the extract I have taken is from the report in the *Globe*. The speaker said:

"How is it that we find that while in 1873 the total volume of the trade of the Dominion was \$217,000,000 in value, yet in 1887, after eight or nine hundred thousand people had been added to the population in spite of exodus and misgovernment, instead of increasing, the volume has fallen off and sunk to about \$200,000,000? How is it that we find that whereas fifteen years ago we had a total trade amounting to \$58 per head, we have now, taking the figures of our opponents, a total of but \$42 per head."

Sir, I think that the hon. gentleman need not have gone further than his own intelligence, and his own knowledge of commercial affairs, to have given the question a satisfactory answer. I wish to refer to it here, because I consider it is a comparison which is not strictly fair, and that other facts ought to be brought out in the statement of comparative trade, as shown by our returns, comparing 1873 with 1887, for we find, on looking into the values of goods in this country, in the United States, in Great Britain, and the world over, that 1873 was the highest year for values in a series of years from 1868, I might go further back, down to 1887, and that the lowest series of values was reached in 1887-88. There are two ways by which you can compare the trade of the country. You can compare it by its value, and by its volume. Our returns simply compare by value, and not by volume; and if, for instance, wheat falls 50 per cent. one year as compared with another, this country might export twice the quantity at the time of the lowest value, yet, according to the trade return, the exports would be no greater, and the idea conveyed would be that there was no greater production, and that no greater results came from the increased production of this country throughout. I have here a statement which has been prepared for a number of years, and brought up to date by Mr. Griffin, Secretary of the Board of Trade of England, giving the values of enumerated articles of export and imports for 1873, and from that year up. The *modus operandi* of getting at these returns is simply this: Mr. Griffin goes to the custom houses and obtains the declared value of goods as entered at the custom houses, and he then deduces therefrom the rate value. Having got the rate value in 1873, he applies that to the year with which he compares 1873, and he thus obtains a fair comparison of the volume of trade upon equal rates as between the different years. Looking at the matter in that light, we find that the total exports from Great Britain, according to the declared values, were, in 1879, \$363,000,000; 1883, \$427,000,000; 1884, \$380,390,000; 1885, \$371,000,000; 1886, \$350,000,000. Those are at the declared values; but if we take the values at the rates of 1873 and compare them, we find, for instance, that whereas the declared value of the exports of Great Britain for 1886 was \$350,000,000, its value calculated by the prices of 1873 was \$509,000,000. That is to say, that, instead of the trade being but \$350,000,000 in 1886, if the prices had been equal to the prices of 1873 it would have shown \$509,000,000, or more than 50 per cent. increase in the volume of trade as compared between 1873 and 1886. If you take the imports in like manner, the declared value of imports in 1886 was \$212,000,000; the value of the imports at the rate of 1873 was \$349,000,000. So, in the case of exports they were 45 per cent. higher at the rate of 1873, and the imports 64 per cent. higher, as will be seen by the following figures:—

TABLE which shows in millions of dollars the value of exports and imports of enumerated articles and of all articles for the years named, both as declared and as calculated, at the rates of 1873.

	Enumerated Exports.		Enumerated Imports.		Total Exports.		Total Imports.	
	At declared values.	At prices of 1873.	At declared values.	At prices of 1873.	At declared values.	At prices of 1873.	At declared values.	At prices of 1873.
1873.....	172 M	173 M	378 M	308 M	371 M	371 M	255 M	255 M
1879.....	122 "	174 "	289 "	319 "	363 "	438 "	181½ "	273 "
1883.....	146 "	212½ "	336 "	403 "	427 "	512 "	240 "	349 "
1884.....	140 "	208 "	300 "	383 "	390 "	498 "	233 "	346 "
1885.....	131 "	201½ "	281½ "	384½ "	371 "	507 "	213 "	328 "
1886.....	131 "	215 "	263 "	382½ "	350 "	509 "	212½ "	349 "
Increase of 1886 over 1873, at prices of 1873, over declared values.....					45 p.c.		64 p.c.	

While it is fair to say that there are the returns, and the values show so much in 1873, and so much in 1886, it is also but right to go behind that statement and enquire whether there has been a fall or a rise in prices as between those two years, and ascertain how the volume of trade compares between those two periods, for, unless you obtain those facts, you have not a fair comparison and you cannot make a fair statement with respect to the trade of a country. A comparison of the prices of various articles in 1873 and 1886 as shown by British Customs declared values shows the enormous fall that has taken place in prices since the first named year, as will be seen by the following figures:

AVERAGE prices of articles mentioned, from declared Customs values in £'s and decimals of a £, and in shillings and decimals of a shilling.

EXPORTS.	1873.	1886.	Decrease per cent.
Iron, pig and puddled.....	£ 124.65 ton	£ 43.17 "	65
Angle bolt and rod.....	£13.77 "	£ 5.79 "	58
Bar and B.R.....	£13.21 "	£ 5.13 "	61
Wire.....	£23.52 "	£13.84 "	42
Galvanised.....	£28.95 "	£12.07 "	55
Hoops.....	£14.58 "	£ 6.11 "	58
Manufactures of steel.....	£69.65 "	£29.99 "	57
Brass (all sorts).....	£ 5.99 cwt	£ 3.74 "	38
Lead, pig and pipe.....	£23.75 "	£13.85 "	42
Tins, wrought and unwrought.....	£ 24.92 "	£13.55 "	46
Refined sugar.....	£ 30.02 "	£14.23 "	53
Wool (sheep and lamb).....	21.18d lb	10.07d "	52
Flannels.....	18.10d yd	12.49d "	31
Carpets.....	38.64d "	25.41d "	34
<b>IMPORTS.</b>			
Cheese.....	£ 2.99 cwt	£ 2.23 "	25
Wheat.....	£13.01 "	£ 7.55 "	42
Barley.....	£ 8.69 "	£ 5.78 "	33
Oats.....	£ 8.06 "	£ 5.89 "	27
Maize.....	£ 7.06 "	£ 4.91 "	30
Wheat flour.....	£18.83 "	£11.20 "	41
Fish.....	£ 27.94 "	£25.71 "	8
Tow and Cordilla of flax.....	£ 35.55 "	£23.57 "	34
Hops.....	£ 4.91 "	£ 2.91 "	41
Lard.....	£ 44.37 "	£34.50 "	22
Copper ore.....	£16.54 ton	£ 6.85 "	58
Copper registers.....	£40.80 "	£22.74 "	44
Iron and copper pyrites.....	£ 50.02 "	£36.98 "	26
Sawn timber.....	£ 3.24 load	£ 2.16 "	33
Sawn and split.....	£ 3.06 "	£ 2.17 "	30
Staves.....	£ 9.96 "	£ 4.07 "	59

Now, what I hold is this, and I think it is plain to every member of this House, that there has been a large fall in prices between 1873 and 1886, and 1887 and 1888. These prices taken in England, may be held as a fair index of the

Mr. FOSTER.

B

rise and fall of the prices in Canada—not in all articles, but in the staples in which we trade with Great Britain in the way of imports and in the way of exports. Therefore I think the conclusion is fair, that in saying that in 1873 the trade was \$217,000,000, whilst in 1888 it was but \$201,000,000, and thereby, trying to deduce the fact that the country is not so prosperous so far as its trade is concerned, you do not state the whole truth of the case. You have to go still further than this and calculate that there is a fall in values in the articles which I have mentioned, and to the percentage which I have mentioned, and in almost all other articles to a greater or lesser extent, and then you come to what I believe to be the true basis of comparing the commerce of the country, so far as regards the real advantages which are derived therefrom. You have to take into account the volume of trade, which you can only get by a comparison of prices between the years. A sufficient answer to the question of my hon. friend is this: that although the values in 1873 showed \$217,000,000, the volume of trade in 1873, as can be easily seen from the fall in prices, was far less than the volume of trade in 1887, and, therefore, the prosperity of the country in all that pertains to enlarged commerce so far as this volume of trade is concerned, was greater in 1888 than it was in 1873. Now with reference to the foreign trade of the country. I think it can be discerned in the spirit of the country, and I find it in conversation with business men and on examination of the business enterprise of the country, that the spirit is developing in this country for increasing our foreign trade more than it has been increased for a number of years past, and for this there are causes which I shall mention presently.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My friends on the other side are quite willing to bear me out in that statement, because, if it be true, as I have no doubt it is, they try to gather from that statement, some comfort for a lost cause of their own. The spirit for increasing foreign trade is developing in this country, and it is developing because of this reason. The time was when the trade and industries of this country were in a depressed state, when from 1874 to 1873 the doors of Parliament were besieged by the representatives of the industries of this country which were being slaughtered from the United States markets. Those representatives then came here and besought the hon. gentlemen who then occupied the Treasury benches to protect the industries and the trade of this country against ruinous competition. Why did they do this? Because, Sir, from 1866 until that time unavailing efforts had been made by both Governments, and by both parties, in all candor and earnestness, to have the trade between our country and the United States again placed on the basis of 1854 or some reciprocal basis. All these negotiations were unavailing, and in the end events had come to such a crisis that the people of this country were rapidly coming to the conclusion that if we could not get a reciprocity treaty with the country alongside of us, we should at least carve out a policy of our own, we should build up our own industries, we should give them the protection that was necessary towards building them up, we should make a commerce internal which we had been strangers to up to that time, and we should lay the foundation for reaching out to a foreign trade which can be only reached out to after that foundation has been laid in the internal industries and commerce of the country itself. Just as this Government came to the aid of the people in 1878, and gave them that measure of protection which established their industries, and which has encouraged and fostered them from 1879 to the present, just as the Government came to the aid of the country then, the Government is ready and willing to come to the aid of the country now and implement to the best of its ability

this desire which is growing and stretching out from the true and solid basis of trade prosperity at home, into a foreign trade with other countries, so that we may compete with foreign countries in the different wares that we make and the different products that we raise. This country and this Government has always been desirous of extending its trade to foreign countries. In all honesty and candor that can be maintained and it cannot be denied. No matter what Government has been on the Treasury benches, no matter what party has been in power, there has been a continuous and a persistent attempt to cultivate better trade relations between this country and the United States of America in a reciprocity that should be fair and equally beneficent to both countries. The negotiations of 1866, of 1869, of 1871, and of 1888, all bear testimony to that. But, Sir, if the country to the south of us will not go upon the lines of the late Reciprocity Treaty, if it will not trade upon lines which are fair and equal to both countries, and if it continues to show, as it has done in the Senate Bill, and as it has in the President's Message, delivered only yesterday, its reiterated adherence to the high and strong protective system that it has placed about its trade—then, Sir, it becomes this country to build upon its own foundations, to develop its own vast natural resources, and to further strengthen the internal industries of the country which will enable her to extend her trade into other countries, and to meet there the competition which will be encountered as Canadians can meet it. This spirit of the people is being implemented by the Government. There are, lying to the south of us, countries that are willing to trade with us and in which an advantageous trade to Canada could be established. The vast country of South America, with its different governments, with its vast natural resources, with its demand for certain articles which we can supply of the best kind, is ready for trade with us on equal conditions with all other countries of the world. The West Indies, rich in elements of trade which complement ours and needing a great many of the products and manufactures which we can supply, afford a field for what we believe to be a permanent and profitable trade. In order to carry out that trade profitably we believe there must be not only regular communication between the two countries, but that there must be also fairly rapid communication as well. This Government is prepared, and has given indications of its determination, to implement the desire of our people to trade with those countries and build up a profitable commerce, and the Government has put in the Estimates, as we have seen, a sum which Parliament will be asked to vote to establish steam communication between this country, South America and the West Indies. I have no doubt at all that if this policy is fairly carried out, as I believe it will be, there can be worked up between Canada and those countries of which I have made mention a large and profitable trade even in the existing state of the tariff relations of the countries concerned. Lying far out to the east of us are China and Japan, and the Government mindful of the possibilities of trade in that direction which has already been developed, has pledged itself to implement the subsidy of the home Government to a direct line of steam communication between the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Pacific coast and those countries. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has already for a number of months had its steamers on that line, and the possibilities of working up a fairly remunerative and profitable trade have been abundantly shown in that time. Why, Sir, to-day the surplus product of our cotton mills finds a profitable market in those distant countries, which a few years ago were inaccessible to a profitable trade, but which to-day, thanks to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the enterprise of this country in assisting in the construc-

tion of its road, and thanks to that same company for putting on this line of steam communication, we have a direct line, and one of the best lines, of communication with those great countries to the east. Then, down on the Southern Pacific Ocean lies a vast continent of islands, which have certain wants which Canada can implement, and certain productions which Canada can take; and the Government proposes to ask Parliament to aid in the establishment of a direct line of communication between our western coast and the colonies of Australia and New Zealand; and I think I am permitted to state here that advices which have been received from the Australian colonies are favorable to the consideration of the question of closer trade relations between Canada and the vast countries which lie in the Southern Pacific. Then, we have had an Atlantic service which for a series of years, though fairly good, has not been as good as it should be, taken in connection with the competing lines sailing to the great ports to the south of us; and the Government to-day are considering what means are best adapted for improving that service, and placing it on such a footing that Canadians need not be at all ashamed to compare their route with the lines of steamships which connect with the ports of New York, Boston and Baltimore. In all this there has been the double aim to develop the industry of the country within, and to extend our trade and commerce without. We have done the first, and now our competition is overflowing the borders of our domestic markets and seeking profitable markets outside; and I could, if time permitted, give the House facts which have been gathered from different manufacturers in this country showing to what an extent they have worked up profitable fields for their goods during the last three years in those distant countries of which I have spoken. And, Sir, I believe that to be the proper Canadian policy, that we should look first to this country, first to its industrial improvement and to the development of its great natural resources, that we should live in comity and peace with the nations to the south of us and all other countries in the world; but at the same time, that neither threats of non-intercourse, nor blandishments from without, nor specious pleas from within, should ever be sufficient to induce this country to hand over its commercial independence to any other country in the world. With a share of this continent larger in size than the Republic to the south of us, and immeasurably rich in natural resources, with a population the most hardy in the world by virtue of our climate, with immense productions of the great staples of the world's consumption and use, with a future before us of peace assured under a flag of a country which is the most powerful on the sea and the most powerful the wide world over, I believe that Canada's future lies in a path of steady, courteous treatment of all countries with whom we have intercourse, and of a steady persistent development of her own commercial lines of policy, for the benefit of her own people, and for a land which is to be the home of future millions.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. When the House took recess, I was making some remarks with reference to the commerce of Canada and her development in one line of commercial enterprise. That was especially with reference to her foreign commerce, the tables for which are given in our blue-books, and which are the data upon which we must rely for our chief calculations with reference to the improvement of our foreign trade. It will, however, be apparent to the House that the foreign trade of a country is but one branch of the great stream of commercial life and enterprise which helps to develop a country and to transport its

products from the place of production to the place of market. There is another branch of the commerce of a country which, although it may not be in the early stages, of so great development and so great importance, has, nevertheless, from the very start, an importance of its own which continually grows and continually widens, step by step, with the growth and development of the country; and in many cases comes to be, after a series of years, not only equal in volume to the foreign commerce of the country, but in certain particulars is of greater importance, and has a larger influence upon its development. Our returns and our statistics, unfortunately, give us but a very imperfect idea of the volume and extent, and the growth, year by year, of this stream of internal or domestic commerce, and what we do get is simply picked up here and there from sources which may be reliable of themselves, but which, being scattered, renders it difficult to generalise, from the information taken at various points, and difficult to come to a conclusion that can be relied upon to comprehend the full extent and full importance of our commerce. However, this much we may take as certain, that in 1867, at the time of the union of the Provinces, the domestic commerce and internal trade, as between the Provinces now forming the Confederation, was very small in extent, and, as I hope to be able to prove, it has been very rapid in its growth, until at present it has attained a development of the utmost importance to the country, and which deserves to be studied by all who would fairly appreciate our progress, and who would arrive at we right conclusions with reference to the effect of the policy have adopted. There were certain circumstances that made the exchange of internal commerce impossible to any large extent in 1867. In the first place, these Provinces which formed British North America, outside of Newfoundland, were scattered. Each had its own Government; each had its own commercial tariff; each had its hopes and aspirations bounded by its own limits; and the means of communication as between the different parts of each Province, and the means of communication between Province and Province, were of a quality and extent which were not to be compared to those that now exist, and their inferior extent must have been powerful in preventing any large internal exchange of products. Besides the hostile tariffs and the lack of communication, there was also a lack of mutual industries and of mutual knowledge. To build up internal commerce and to get the full benefits in unifying a country and in stimulating by the example of one part and the influence of one section, other sections to meet in point of trade the demand and the supply which are thus created,—in order to do that, there must be centres of industry in different sections of the country which become more or less the means of developing individual sectional resources and creating interprovincial demand and supply. By means of these centres an internal demand and supply is created which causes an interchange of products and builds up internal commerce. There should also be, besides these mutual industries, a mutual knowledge existing between the different parts of a country. Now, in 1867, that knowledge was at its minimum. The people of Nova Scotia may have had, in its different sections, a good idea of the Province of Nova Scotia as a whole. They knew a little of New Brunswick, but little in comparison to what they do now. Of Prince Edward Island and of Nova Scotia the same may be said, although these Provinces, lying more closely together and being more easily traversed, had a larger amount of mutual knowledge and mutual interests than existed between, say, the Maritime Provinces and the central part of the Dominion, or between the central part of the Dominion and the extreme western Provinces. So that, taking all these things into consideration, it is impossible that there should have been a very large stream of internal trade, and the

Mr. FOSTER.

growth that has taken place in that can be fairly appreciated by studying for a moment the growth of communications, the increase of lines of transport between Province and Province and between the different sections of each Province. Since that time, the whole of the Provinces have been placed under one central Government. Since that time, these have been joined together by lines of communication extending from the remotest part of the east to the Pacific coast, and branching out in hundreds of different directions to every section of the country, and all of these have means of communication, have had an influence, one cannot overrate, in developing sections through which they pass, as well as of rendering the general current of commerce and of communication more easy of constant flow. I believe, if we had the full statistics of internal commerce and domestic trade of this country, that to-day they would prove a revelation to our people, and we would place more store upon that increased domestic trade, instead of placing so much store by the whole stress of our investigation on our foreign trade, when we knew the extent of this current which is vivifying every part of Confederation in its internal progress. We may, however, get at something of this from different sources. Within the last few months, there has been sitting at various times and at various parts of the Dominion of Canada, a commission of labor appointed by this Government which has been examining into the condition of labor and the relations between it and capital in the various industries; and in the course of their investigations, a mass of most useful knowledge has been gathered, and is now compiled in their report, a study of which will help us to a better appreciation of many of these questions than we have hitherto been able to come at. I hold in my hand some gleanings prepared on the subject taken from the information gathered by that commission. Before taking up the items to which I have alluded, I find that the records of the Intercolonial Railway show that there is a steady improvement of trade which continues to develop between the Maritime and the Upper Provinces and the far west. Take last year's returns alone, and we find that the Maritime Provinces have sent to the Upper Provinces, coal, and fish, and refined sugar, and cottons, tackle and cordage and twine, hardware, woodenware, leather hats, cloths, woollens, chocolate, glue, dry goods, soaps, potatoes, oats, starch, manufactures of iron, cattle, machinery, boots and shoes, building stone, hay, fruit trees, plaster, lumber, grindstones, and numerous other articles of smaller volume. We find that the St. Lawrence provinces have sent manufactures of iron, flour and meal, coarse grains, oats, barley, corn, meats, agricultural implements, woodenwork, wire fencing, earthenware, paints and colors, hides, cheese, and numerous other articles. The Marysville Cotton Mill, a mill of very large capacity near Fredericton, reports sales in 1888 to the Upper Provinces over four times in advance of the previous year. We find the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co. of New Glasgow reports sales during the past five years of nearly one million of dollars, and they are making steady progress, and in tons their output for last year shows 35 per cent. increase over that of the previous year, and the sales for the Upper Provinces continue to increase. St. John Cotton Mills have sent between \$900,000 and \$1,000,000 worth of their products to the Upper Provinces the last four years, and their sales in 1888 to these Provinces were 70 per cent. more than those of 1886. We find the Moncton Cotton Mills report a steady increase in their sales to the upper Provinces. We find the Moncton Sugar Refinery reports sales to the Upper Provinces of 13,296,000 lbs. of their products. We find the Yarmouth Woollen Mills report 20 per cent. increase in their sales to the upper Provinces in 1888 over 1887. Coming now to the items of information in the Labor Report, I glean from the Royal Labor Commission report the following: Take the Province of New Brunswick. Mr. R. Butler, of St. John, says, "The demand for Canadian

stone is becoming greater." Mr. Sutherland, of the Frenchport Quarry, says, "We have been sending stone to Ottawa and Hamilton, and grindstones and box stone to Montreal." Epps, Dodd & Co., of the St. George's Granite Quarries, say, "Two-thirds of our goods go to Ontario." Mr. Broad, of the St. Stephen's Broad Axe and Edge Tool Manufactory, says, "We ship to British Columbia and Montreal, and our agents in Montreal send all over Quebec and Ontario." Mr. Coutts, of the St. George's Granite Quarries, says, "Our market is principally in the United States and Ontario." Mr. Fowler, edge tool manufacturer of St. John says, "I sell springs and axles in Montreal." Messrs. Allison of St. John, dry goods and shirt manufacturers, say, "We sell all the goods in Montreal and the Maritime Provinces." Mr. Brown, harness maker, says, "We use altogether Upper Province leather. North-West hides are the best." Mr. Burnham, furniture manufacturer, says, "Some woods for furniture we get in Canada. What furniture we do not make ourselves, we get from Ontario and Nova Scotia." Mr. McAvity, St. John, brass founder, says, "We sell most of our goods in Ontario." Mr. Connors, of the St. John Rope Works, says, "We send a great deal of bindery twine to Ontario and Manitoba." A carriage builder says, "Very few American carriages are imported into St. John. There used to be a number imported a few years ago." Mr. Edgcombe says, "We get carriages from Guelph and Montreal." Mr. Robinson, carriage builder, says, "There are very few American springs imported now. We get leather tops from the Upper Provinces, other parts of carriages from Galt and Guelph. We import from away up in Ontario." Mr. Shaw, carriage builder, says, "We sell our carriages all over the Maritime Provinces, and we have sent some as far as Ontario." Mr. DeWolfe, of St. Stephens, carriage builder, says, "There is a great improvement in Canadian colors, and I think they compare favorably with any colors made. This year we have used Canadian colors principally." Mr. Ganong, confectioner, says, "We consider Canadian sugar fully equal to American. The average price has been lower than in the States. We use mostly Canadian." Mr. Bell, cigar manufacturer of St. John, says, "We sell and ship goods to Quebec." Mr. A. Gibson, of Marysville, cotton manufacturer, says, "We find our market all over Canada—Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec." Mr. Hazelhurst, Excelsior manufacturer, says, "We have sent Excelsior to Montreal." Mr. Russel, spool manufacturer, says, "We ship our Excelsior to different parts of the Dominion, as far as Toronto." Mr. Macfarland, manufacturer of small hardware, says: "We send all over Canada, as far as British Columbia." Mr. Ketchum, Coldbrook Rolling Mills, says: "We sell most of our iron in the Maritime Provinces and Quebec." Mr. Leetch, paper bag maker, says: "We get stock for our bags and tags in Montreal. We find it to be cheaper and just as good as that imported." Mr. Moore, nail manufacturer, of St. John, says: "Our trade with the west is limited, but we have sent copper goods to Toronto and Montreal." Mr. Thompson, manufacturer of paints, says: "We find a market all over these Provinces and down in lower Quebec." Mr. Nelson, paper manufacturer, says: "We send west to Toronto." Mr. O'Neill, boots and shoes, says: "We get our leather from Ontario. I find a great improvement in Canadian goods." Mr. Henderson, mantels and grates, says: "We have a market in Ottawa and Montreal." Mr. Stevens, manufacturer of hosiery, says: "We buy a great deal of fine yarns from Quebec Province." Mr. Vroom, manufacturer of slippers and oil-tanned larrigans, says: "We sell our goods principally in Ontario and Quebec, and get some leather from Ontario." Mr. Young, nut and bolt works, says: "The rivets that we make are mostly sold in Montreal. We

are able to compete with Toronto and Montreal firms, and our business is steadily increasing." A few examples from Nova Scotia. Mr. Allison, of the J. P. Mott works, says: "The consumption of chocolate all over the Dominion has steadily increased for some years back." Mr. Boak, fish merchant of Halifax, says: "We ship of fresh fish between 200 and 250 tons in the season, most of it to the Upper Provinces." Mr. Oland, brewer, says: "We get about 500 bushels of malt a week from Ontario." Mr. O'Mullin, brewer, says: "We purchase our malt in Ontario." Mr. Smallwood, of the Acme Skate Factory, says: "We sell our skates all over the Dominion." Mr. Stairs, Dartmouth Rope Works, says: "We send cordage to Ontario and binder twine to Ontario, Manitoba and the North-West." Mr. Turnbull, of the Nova Scotia Sugar Refinery, says: "75 per cent. of our output goes into Canada, throughout the Dominion." Now, these are but some samples of what a more diligent and extended examination would show to be a large and increasing volume of trade which is taking place and continually growing between the outlying portions of this Dominion, and especially in this respect between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces, and conversely. If we take again, as an index of this trade, the statistics of the Intercolonial Railway, the great central line of communication between the Maritime Provinces and the west, we find a very instructive series of figures, some of which I have tabulated, and will read to the House. In 1876-77, the number of tons carried over the Intercolonial was 421,327. In 1887-88, the number was 1,275,995 tons, an increase of 202 per cent. In 1876-77, 254,710 barrels of flour were carried over the road, and in 1887-88, 845,750, an increase of 232 per cent. The grain carried in 1876-77, was 292,852 bushels, and in 1887-88, 1,211,540 bushels, an increase of 314 per cent. In 1876-77, there was carried 58,096,475 feet of lumber, and in 1887-88, 196,444,819 feet, an increase of 238 per cent. The number of live stock carried in 1876-77, was 37,414, and in 1887-88, 90,439, an increase of 141 per cent. The quantity of other goods carried in 1876-77, was 311,756 tons, and in 1887-88, 877,395, an increase of 181 per cent. The passengers carried in 1876-77, were 613,420, and in 1887-88, 996,194, an increase of 62 per cent. The earnings in 1876-77, were \$682,549, and in 1887-88, \$1,778,539, an increase of 160 per cent. The working expenses in 1876-77, were \$896,175, and in 1887-88, \$2,065,538, an increase of 130 per cent. Taking the tons of raw sugar shipped from Halifax and St. John, we find that in 1884, 21,538 tons were shipped, and in 1888, 23,742 tons, an increase of 10 per cent. The tons of refined sugar shipped from Halifax, Moncton and Dartmouth in 1884 were 20,796, and in 1888, 30,917, an increase of 49 per cent. The tons of coal shipped from Nova Scotia to the Chaudière Junction were in 1884, 112,898, and in 1888, 184,662, an increase of 64 per cent. I think, Sir, that no person can read this table of increase and percentages of increase, without being struck with the enormous development of the traffic on that the great central line of communication between the Maritime and the Upper Provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Minister passes from that subject I would like to enquire whether there are any conclusions or estimates as to the amount of our internal commerce last year, in dollars, as a whole?

Mr. FOSTER. None that I know of, it is impossible to get it. There are no statistics which will give it; we can only get bits of information and generalise as best we can from these. I have here a statement of the principal articles transported over the Intercolonial Railway from the Upper Provinces to stations in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick:

Articles.	Tons.
Iron and manufactured iron.....	1,372
Flour and meal.....	61,369
Bran, shorts and middlings.....	5,231
Oats.....	501
Barley.....	280
Corn, peas and beans.....	2,109
Butter, cheese and lard.....	421
Hay and straw.....	304
Meats.....	1,552
Leather and hides.....	404
Merchandise.....	19,525
Stone and slate.....	73
Salt.....	55
Machinery and agricultural implements.....	944
Woodwork, furniture, &c.....	665
Live stock.....	7
Wire and wire fencing.....	87
Earthenware.....	143
Oil, paint and tar.....	1,845
Canned goods.....	53
Lumber and building material.....	1,424
Fruit and vegetables.....	259
Cotton.....	998
Fish.....	22
Lime and cement.....	305

Passing from the indications which are given by the figures which I have read as to the amount of trade which is taking place in an increasing volume over the Intercolonial Railway, and between the Maritime and Upper Provinces, and conversely, let us enquire for a moment what is taking place on a different element and by a different mode of carrying power, as is shown in the coasting trade in the Dominion of Canada. I have here a table the results of which, I think, will be equally satisfactory to the Canadian who is proud of the progress of his country, as the figures which I have read of railway traffic over the Intercolonial Railway:

	1879.	1888.	Increase.	Per cent.
Canadian coasting trade.	\$12,066,683	\$18,789,279	\$6,722,596	56
Atlantic and Gulf do	5,683,447	10,863,329	5,179,882	91
Steam tonnage do	2,691,465	14,677,255	4,985,790	51
Sailing vessels do	2,375,218	4,112,024	1,736,806	73
Man power employed.....	804,305	876,954	272,649	45
do Atlantic and Gulf Point.....	278,251	528,306	250,055	90
Pacific coast coast'g trade	223,707	1,434,266	1,211,559	541
Man power do	15,685	58,991	43,306	276

In respect to the steamer tonnage, we find, as shown above, an increase of 50 per cent. during those two periods. Of sailing vessels, the increase was 73 per cent, showing that although there is a large increase in the steam tonnage of coasting vessels, the sailing vessel, for coasting purposes, still keeps its place ahead of steam. These figures and this progress, while gratifying to all Canadians—because now all Canadians take an interest in every section of this country—must be particularly gratifying to the representatives and the people of British Columbia, who are so proud of their beautiful Province and who have such confidence in its future development. Sir, we find that the development of the coal trade gives us another indication which may be relied upon, to a certain extent. Coal and iron, of course, are being stimulated in their production, output and manufacture. The coal product in Canada in 1868 amounted to 623,392 tons; the produce in 1888 was 2,449,793 tons, an immense increase mainly taking place in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and on the Pacific coast, although the coal areas, which are known to exist all over the North-West, are being profitably worked at several points, and the output is largely increasing in the great west, or the middle section of our country. Taking

Mr. FOSTER.

the Canadian Pacific Railway, the great line of communication which joins our central system with the Pacific coast, we find that the increase of interprovincial traffic is also satisfactory. The tons carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1885 were 1,996,355; in 1888 they were 2,508,600. Passengers carried in 1885 were 1,660,719; in 1888 the number was 2,239,800. The earnings of that road in 1885 were \$8,368,493; in 1888 the earnings were \$13,195,535. The inter-provincial tonnage carried east and west from Port Arthur during the 11 months of 1887-88 are as follows: In 1887, 176,421 tons; in 1888, 278,213 tons, an increase in the 11 months of 101,792 tons. The Asiatic freight also furnishes an indication of the stimulation of domestic industries carried out in exports to a foreign country, and I think it would not be uninteresting to the House, in this conjunction, to have the figures of actual proceeding. In 1887 the inward and outward Asiatic freight was 11,589 tons; 1888, 13,048 tons. In 1887 the quantity of tea carried was 13,805,022 lbs.; 1888, 13,444,269. In 1887 the silk carried was 466,687 lbs.; 1888, 475,014. In 1887, general merchandises, 2,388,158 lbs.; 1888, 2,056,787; In 1887, cotton goods, 5,798,173 lbs.; 1888, 8,826,772 lbs.; In 1887, machinery, 55,591 lbs.; 1888, 467,539 lbs. In 1887, general merchandise, 486,608; 1888, 298,037. In 1887, cotton goods from Canadian mills, 1,742,205 lbs.; 1888, 2,009,947 lbs. This bears out the assertion I made in the early part of my statement that there has been a decided increase in the exports of Canadian cotton mills to China and Japan. As showing the movement of grain in Manitoba and the North-West in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway it may be mentioned that in 1887 the grain moved by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Manitoba and the North-West reached 11,741,160 bushels, while the local grain movement in Manitoba was 1,248,219 bushels, making the total grain movement over the Canadian Pacific Railway that year 12,989,379 bushels. From these indications, which are after all but partial indications, I think we may be justified in believing that the development of the internal commerce of this country has marched apace, as it was natural it should do, with the opening up of new sections, with the establishment of industries and especially with the establishment of facilities for communication between outlying parts of the same Provinces and between the different Provinces forming the Dominion. I will weary the House no longer with my statement so far as that is concerned, believing however that the items gathered with a good deal of pains and trouble cannot but be interesting and instructive to the people of this country. And now, in conclusion, I will ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, while I call the attention of this House to an extract from a speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition at Oakville, in August, 1888, as it was published in the *Globe*. The hon. gentleman, speaking there made this, as I think, extraordinary statement. He said:

"It is now 21 years since Confederation was established. We started with the hope—is it not true?—we started with the hope, as it was told at that time, that we would link together the British Provinces on the continent of America, that we would bind them together with ties of affection and mutual pride and that we would make them a nation. Such was our dream, such was our hope often expressed, often repeated. Now, I ask every one in this audience, no matter what may have been in the past his political predilections, no matter whether he has been a Conservative or a Reformer—I ask every one in this audience, looking back over the time, how far have we advanced in the task we set ourselves to perform 21 years ago? Sir, the painful answer must be that we have not advanced one iota, one single jot."

The House and I think the country as well will understand why I denominated this an extraordinary utterance for a gentleman who has the political knowledge, and who I believe has at heart—I should like to believe at least that he has at heart—that patriotism which a Canadian statesman should possess. What are the assertions he makes? First, that what

we have set out to do was to link together the British Provinces on the continent of America. We have not advanced one single jot in that respect, says the hon. gentleman. Second, to bind together in bonds of mutual affection and pride the people of this country. We have not advanced a single iota in that direction, says the hon. gentleman. Third, to make of this country a nation. And there has been no advance in that regard. Sir, I think an hon. gentleman who could make an assertion like this in view of the 21 years of progress of this Confederation must have shut his eyes to every part of the record which was plainly written before him, if he could not see the progress made in every part of this country towards linking together these outlying Provinces. I think he must have closed his ears to the sounds of progress which would have greeted them if he had kept them open from every part of the country, showing with every fall of the hammer, with every turn of the wheel, the mutual interests which were being welded together, and which were being brought into play on the line of making these people interdependent on each other, of making them essential to each others wants, and especially linking them together in the bonds of commercial union and in the bonds of social and political union as well. Let me take up, if you please, Mr. Speaker, these items a little in detail. First, the hon. gentleman said we have not made a single step in advance towards linking the Provinces together. I think the visitor who approached these shores in 1867 and took a survey of the Canadian Provinces as they were then and the same visitor who returns to-day to our shores and takes a survey of Canada as it is to-day, cannot but be impressed with the sharp contrast presented in every line, and particularly in the condition of the country now as compared with the condition of the country then. At that time we had Provinces widely scattered, with hostile tariffs, with no lines of communication. The Maritime Provinces during seven months of the year had no way to reach the Upper Provinces except through foreign territory, and no way during the other months of the year except by a long circuitous route by the sea. The two Provinces in the centre of the country had no access to the great country of the North-West except through a foreign country part of the way and then to make an overland journey by river or by vehicle into some portions of the country in the North-West. The North-West itself was a *terra incognita*, it was unknown even to the few people who lived in some sections of it. It was as unknown as is the centre of Africa to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and to the mass of the people of the two centre Provinces as well. The mountains that run north and south between British Columbia and the North-West forbade all intercourse between that country and the Pacific Province. Now, what appears? The visitor who comes here to-day finds a very different state of things. He finds Nova Scotia intersected with railways running to almost every important part of the country. He finds New Brunswick intersected with railways, possessing a larger mileage in proportion to her population than probably any other country in the world. He sees long lines of splendid communication stretching from Halifax to Montreal, stretching from Montreal to the Pacific and joining with steamship lines east and west, thus forming a communication which unites the great east in Europe with the great east in Asia by the shortest and best route for much of the commerce and for the largest proportion of the passenger traffic between those great sections of the world. He found then, Sir, different Governments, he found then different tariffs, he found then the hopes and the thoughts of each Province bounded within itself, without any great future to look to; and no student of history either in the past or in the present will fail to see the vast effect, and the mighty developing influence that the hope of

an expanding future has upon the growth of a young country. Make it believe that there is nothing in the future in point of great development or of national status, that there is not a future of hope and promise and you have put one of the strongest limits to a country's developing powers. To-day we find Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers, Prince Edward Islanders, men from Ontario and Quebec, and every other Province, not feeling so much that they are bound by the limits of their own Province, but believing and feeling and working out that feeling and belief that they are now citizens of a larger country, that they are citizens of a country which, in extent and in resources, is greater than most countries of the world, and is inferior to but few. We live now under one Government; we have the uniting power which comes from a common political literature; we have all that uniting power which comes from a common commerce and intercourse which spreads from end to end of the country along well travelled lines, and it is simply astonishing to me that a man of intelligence and a man of patriotism can stand up in any portion of Canada in this year 1888, and can say that, as far as linking together the Provinces, there has not been a single step made in advance from 1867 to 1888. That hon. gentleman said, in the second place, that what was proposed was to bind the people together in ties of mutual respect and affection, and that in that direction no advance had been made. I take issue with my hon. friend on that point and take issue with him most strongly. I, as a New Brunswick man, plead guilty to ties of mutual respect and affection for my hon. friend, with his kindly manner, with his cultured intellect, and, Sir, I should never have known my hon. friend, in all probability, had it not been that these Provinces became united, and that in this gradual getting together of people from different parts of this country I became acquainted with him. What has taken place in this one particular is but a sample of what is taking place every day, for the people of one part of the country become acquainted with the people of another to whom they would have remained strangers for ever if it had not been that the Provinces were united into a one country, with a common Government a mutual commerce and a common political centre. It is hard to analyse and it is most difficult to estimate the real importance of what takes place in this silent and quiet way. Every visitor from the remote part of one Province or who goes from the older Provinces to the far west, has a power injected into his life which finds its way out into the associations of his whole after life, and which acting upon many units in the way in which it acts on the one does more than we can imagine to make us one people, and to combine together in ties of mutual affection and esteem the people of this common country, living as they do under one common government. The hon. gentleman said that what was proposed at the outset was to make of this country a nation; whatever he could have meant by that, whether it was meant that the country should take gradually upon itself the larger life, the more generous sentiments and the confidence and pride which comes from greatness continually in progress and continually in growth or whether my hon. friend meant Independence I do not know. I do know that whether it be one or the other, as far as all essential elements of growing nationality and greatness are concerned, there has been a power at work in this Dominion of Canada from 1868 to 1888 which has simply been marvellous in its width and its force, as well as in its resultant effects. What are the elements of national life whether you mean independent national life, or whether you mean the life of a great half continent like ours united in mutual bonds of affection of blood and of common nationality with other countries equally large in extent and greater in population all belonging to the one great Empire, what I ask are the elements of national life? They are great



resources, great industries, great traffic and consequent great development. Look at the resources of this country. Has there been no revelation from 1868 to 1888?

Mr. MILLS. None whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. None whatever, says my hon. friend. Well, there never will be so long as such a Bourbon as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a judge of what has been a revelation. Has there been no revelation of the great resources of this country to the people of Canada from 1868 to the present time?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The national debt.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been no revelation of the immense resources in lands which belong to the country and of the productive soil power which at the time of Confederation was not dreamed of by the inhabitants of the country; has there been no revelation of our great resources of mines and mineral wealth. My hon. friend who sits opposite to me (Mr. Charlton) has been for the last few months a worthy member of a Mining Commission which has gone east and west and north and south. I have read speeches by that hon. gentleman, and I have read reports of the investigations of that commission, and I believe I am perfectly right in saying that within six months a revelation had been made to my hon. friend himself of the resources and variety and value of the mining riches of this country. In the North-West and in parts of the older Provinces these resources are gradually coming to light, until to-day, in the Dominion of Canada, resources which are of immense extent and which in the future will become immense sources of wealth to this country have become apparent to all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, if we can get them developed.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir, has there not been an increase in great industries since 1868 till to-day? That question has been so often discussed on the floor of this House, and has a literature which is so well known to the people of this country, that it would be bold in me to attempt to take up the time of this House for a single moment in trying to establish the fact that from 1868 to 1888 there has been an immense stride forward in the establishment of industrial life and of industrial centres in this country. Has there been no great and growing traffic in this country? Why, Sir, our export trade, judged by values alone, has increased from 1868 to 1888 60 per cent., and our total trade 50 per cent; and if the difference in value were taken into account, the trade in volume would be found to have increased in those twenty years more I believe than twice its amount. To-day the Dominion of Canada, in the 21st year of its existence, has a foreign commerce, in addition to its internal trade, amounting in value to \$41.40 *per capita* of its population, while the United States has a *per capita* foreign trade of but \$:3. Now let me ask this House to listen to some few statements which will show by the strongest kind of argument, the immense development which has taken place in the manufactures of this country. I have before me a table of the averages and percentages of raw material imported into Canada for home consumption, the items of which show an immense development of industrial life, and consequently of trade life of the country. In order to make this statement as fair as I possibly could, instead of taking single years and comparing them, I have taken two years at the beginning and two years at the end, and compared the average of the two years together in each case. These figures I will hand to the reporter, so that they may be spread upon the records:—

AVERAGE and percentage of raw material imported in Canada for home consumption.

		Wool.	Cotton.	Sugar.	Hides, Horns and Pelts.	Gutta Percha.	Lumber and Timber.	Grease for soap.	Veneers.	Junk and Oakum.	Cork Wood and Cork Bark.	Broom Corn.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Average	1869-70	3,210,785	1,418,671	29,018,875	1,038,861	119,338	227,071	55,374	9,741	61,017	5,521	112,001
do	1887-88	7,008,012	33,388,766	188,693,004	1,805,293	515,168	830,858	108,724	62,025	54,096	52,324	129,500
do	1869-88	5,230,039	17,397,742	104,025,300	1,263,310	338,745	516,213	93,612	34,576	54,341	30,265	100,984
Increase	1887-88 over av. 1869-70.	118 p.c.	2,253 p.c.	550 p.c.	74 p.c.	331 p.c.	266 p.c.	96 p.c.	537 p.c.	— 11 p.c.	848 p.c.	16 p.c.
do	1887-88 do 1869-88.	34 p.c.	92 p.c.	81 p.c.	43 p.c.	52 p.c.	61 p.c.	16 p.c.	79 p.c.	1/10 of 1 p.c.	73 p.c.	28 p.c.

  

		Fibres.	Hemp.	Rattans and Reeds.	Jute and Jute B.	Cotton and Woolen Rags.	Bristles.	Hair.	Furs and Skins.	Average, 1880-81.....	
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	7,020	
Average	1869-70	47,227		9,192		31,195	24,054	12,315	143,485	do 1887-88.....	
do	1887-88	72,519		19,412		271,789	73,662	36,375	471,029	do 1880-88.....	
do	1869-88	51,525		14,775		138,686	49,204	23,872	310,715	Increase, av. 1887-88 over av. 1880-81.....	
Increase	1887-88 over 1869-70.	53 p.c.		111 p.c.		771 p.c.	206 p.c.	195 p.c.	228 p.c.	2,206 p.c.	
do	1887-88 over 1869-88.	41 p.c.		31 p.c.		96 p.c.	49 p.c.	54 p.c.	52 p.c.	Increase, av. 1887-88 over av. 1880-88.....	
										Silk, raw.	Sausage Casings.
Average	1879-80		261,231		2,408					Average, 1877-78	3,140
do	1887-88		740,342		27,665					do 1887-88	25,375
do	1879-88		622,052		17,981					do 1877-88	18,653
Increase	1887-88 over av. 1879-80		183 p.c.		1,049 p.c.					Increase, av. 1887-88 over av. 1877-78	537 p.c.
do	1887-88 over av. 1879-88		19 p.c.		54 p.c.					Increase, av. 1887-88 over av. 1877-88	70 p.c.

Mr. FOSTER.

This table, Sir, shows the immense progress which has been made in the importation of raw materials which go into the industrial establishments of this country, and which are worked up by the labor and industry of the country, showing, in the first place, a development of industrial life

and product of the country, and in the second place, what is a corollary of that, an increase in the internal commerce of the country. In the exports from Canada the same development is shown :

STATEMENT respecting Exports from Canada from 1868 to 1888.

	Fisheries.	Mines.	Forests.	Agricultural products.	Animals and products.	Cattle.	Apples.	Cheese.	Manufactures.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Exports in 1868 ....	3,357,510	1,446,857	18,262,170	12,871,055	6,893,167	(1874) 751,269	80,135	617,354	1,572,548
Exports in 1888 .....	7,793,183	4,110,937	21,302,814	15,436,360	24,719,297	5,012,713 (1874 to 1888)	857,995	8,928,242	4,161,282
Total from 1868 to 1888.	127,212,229	72,560,927	462,190,606	363,521,686	349,619,410	49,364,094	6,708,251	89,880,952	64,901,498
Average .....	6,057,725	3,455,282	22,009,076	17,310,556	16,648,543	3,290,939	322,297	4,280,000	3,090,547
Percentage of increase, 1888, over average.....	28·64	18·97	3·21	10·82	48·48	52 p.c. (over 1874)	166 p.c.	169	34 p.c.
Percentage of increase, 1888, over 1868.....	132·11	184·12	16·65	19·89	258·60	567 p.c.	971 p.c.	1,345	164 p.c.

If we look also at the increase in the direction indicated by the next table and which shows more particularly the large development of the business of the country, we find the same gratifying progress :

	1868.	1888.	Increase or Decrease.	Per cent. of Increase.
Discounts, Chartered Banks .....	\$ 50,500,316	173,185,812	122,685,496	243
Overdue Notes and Debts in Chartered Banks on each \$100 borrowed (decrease) .....	P. c. (1873) 2·07	1·54	—·53	Decrease 25½
Bank Notes in circulation .....	\$ 8,307,079	30,444,845	22,137,766	266½
Deposits in Chartered Banks .....	" 32,808,104	112,860,700	80,052,596	244
" Savings Branches, Building Societies and Loan Companies .....	" 959,051	18,251,423	17,292,372	1803
" Savings Banks .....	" 4,360,692	51,861,984	47,501,292	1089½
Money Orders issued .....	" 3,352,881	10,918,818	7,565,937	225½
Letters and Post Cards sent .....	No. 18,100,000	96,786,000	78,686,000	435
Miles of Railway Built .....	" 2,532	13,292	9,770	387½
Passengers carried .....	(1875) 5,190,416	(1887) 10,685,509	5,495,092	106
Receipts from Passengers carried .....	(1876) 6,254,861	(1887) 11,807,591	5,552,730	89·7½
Freight carried .....	Tons. (1876) 6,331,767	(1887) 16,367,917	10,036,150	158½
Receipts from Freight carried .....	\$ (1876) 12,211,156	(1887) 24,581,047	12,369,891	101·7½
Seagoing and Inland Lakes, Shipping Employed, not including Coasting Vessels .....	T. reg. 12,982,526	15,217,308	2,234,782	17½
Tonnage of Shipping, with Cargo and in Ballast (seagoing), entered, inwards .....	Tons. 2,104,009	4,623,506	2,519,497	119·7½
Tonnage of Shipping, with Cargo and in Ballast and cleared, outwards .....	" 2,215,312	4,574,297	2,358,985	106½
External Commerce (water-borne), tons, Merchandise, brought in .....	" 1,898,510	2,683,005	784,495	41·7½
" " " and carried out .....	" 4,284,637	5,599,933	1,315,296	30·7½
Merchandise carried to and from Canada in Seagoing Vessels. Inwards, tons, weight .....	" (1876) 703,087	1,063,780	360,693	51·7½
Merchandise carried to and from Canada in Seagoing Vessels. Inwards, tons, measure .....	" (1876) 126,876	247,283	120,407	95
Merchandise carried to and from Canada in Seagoing Vessels. Outwards, tons, weight .....	" (1876) 1,016,915	1,820,750	803,835	79
Merchandise carried to and from Canada in Seagoing Vessels. Outwards, tons, measure (decrease) .....	" (1876) 2,218,955	2,107,470	—111,485	Decrease 05
Total Production of Coal .....	" 623,392	2,449,793	1,826,401	293
Total Consumption of Coal .....	" 714,693	5,226,967	4,512,074	631
Fire Insurance in Canada .....	\$ 188,319,809	633,523,697	445,163,888	236·7½
" " British Companies .....	" 115,222,003	423,070,624	307,848,621	267
" " Canadian .....	" 59,340,916	154,185,902	94,824,986	159½
" " United States .....	" 13,796,890	56,287,171	42,490,281	307·7½

From this it will be seen that the discounts in charter banks show an increase since Confederation of 243 per cent. The total production of coal shows an increase of 293 per cent.; the total consumption of coal shows an increase of 631 per cent.; the total average of fire insurance at risk in Canada, shows an increase of 263·7½ per cent. All these goes to prove the immense development which has taken place in the country as regards its industries, as regards its moneyed institutions, as regards the savings of the

people, and as regards the general indications and the general business prosperity of the country. In the face of all this knitting together, in the face of this better acquaintance and of consequent better appreciation, which has been so powerful an agent in our progress, during the twenty-one years of Confederation—in the face of all these evidences of great material development, I think the statement of my hon. friend was an extraordinary statement—an untrue statement—an unfortunate statement and one which had far better re-

mained unsaid, that from 1868 until to-day, we have made no step forward in linking together the different Provinces, in making the ties of mutual respect and affection stronger between the various parts, or in building up these elements which go to make a nation. In concluding the statement which, by the kind indulgence of this House I have been permitted to make and which, I must say, has been listened to with such kind attention by hon. gentlemen on both sides, allow me to add that I believe Canada now, having attained her majority of twenty-one years, has, as I said at the opening of my remarks, a record which can be regarded with just pride and admiration. Looking back upon her progress during the past 21 years, we can be filled with the fullness of hope for her progress in the untrodden future, confident in the vastness of her resources, in the intelligence and commercial fibre of her people, in the enterprise of her business men, and in the great facilities for commerce, which, thanks to the generous expenditure of this people and the Government are found in those great lines of communication which permeate all parts of the country—resting upon these and their certain influences and effects, I believe that Canada, to-day, can look forward to a future full of peace, of plenty, and of continued prosperity. So far as I am concerned, as a citizen, and I hope not an unobservant citizen, of this country and of the course of her past history, and as a lover of my country, wishful for her peace and prosperity, for her best and safest political status, I believe that we have every reason to be fond of and to look with pride on Canada. Whether we be Frenchmen or Englishmen or Scotchmen or Irishmen or Swedes or Icelanders or Mennonites, the welding progress is at work, and every day we are becoming more truly Canadians in heart and sentiment, attached to our country, confident in its resources, and hopeful of its future. In moving that you do now leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Supply, I beg to state that although a great many representations have been made to myself as Finance Minister and to my colleague the Minister of Customs, with reference to changes and re-adjustments of the tariff,—many of which have had some merit in themselves and others of which seem to have had little merit, so far as commending themselves to our attention for change or re-adjustment was concerned,—I have made the statement which I made to-day upon the basis of the present tariff arrangements, feeling certain that if upon fuller consideration of some few points which yet remain to be decided, any re-adjustment or change may take place, it will not be of a character and importance to materially alter the statement which I have made or change the basis to any large extent of what we may hope to receive from the different revenues of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In much that has been said, I am glad to say I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance; and as no doubt it will promote the harmony of this evening, that I should do so, I will first enumerate the points on which I agree with him, before it becomes my unpleasant duty to insinuate certain doubts which exist in my mind as to the perfect accuracy of his statement in other respects. First of all I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman in saying that if you dwarf the aspirations of a young and growing people like ours, you are sure, as the hon. gentleman has rightly said, to do it an infinite injury; and I append to that the rider that you will do exceedingly great injury if you refuse to a young and rising people, the right, under proper conditions, to make its own treaties and to appoint its own negotiators. I agree also with the hon. gentleman to the fullest extent that it would be most desirable that we should link together the various sister Provinces of this Confederation in the closest bonds of

Mr. FOSTER.

union. No man can feel that more intensely than I, but I beg leave to doubt whether the facts disclosed in our own records, to which I took occasion to call the attention of this House and the country some few months ago, such facts as that by the last census we possess persons natives of Ontario there were settled in the Maritime Provinces only 748 while on the other hand, twenty-five years ago there were 7,600 natives of the Maritime Provinces to be found in Ontario alone and in 1881 the number had been reduced to 7,200—I beg leave to doubt if facts like these are altogether indicative of that close and cordial and intimate union, which I, as well as the hon. the Minister of Finance, so much desire to see. I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman that the value of every financial statement depends to a very great degree on the accuracy of the estimate which the Minister of Finance, for the time being, shall be able to make of the expenses of the year to come, and I propose a little later on to give this House some very remarkable illustrations of the marvellous accuracy that has been attained during the last few years by the hon. gentleman's predecessors in that particular. I will add that another most valuable index of the value of a financial statement consists in the honesty with which the public accounts for years past have been prepared and the accuracy with which the items properly chargeable to income are charged to that account and not to capital. With respect to the volume of trade, I am entirely in accord with the hon. gentleman that you must consider value as well as quantity. But the hon. gentleman, not being as old a member of the House as some of the rest of us, is not aware that I spent tedious hours in endeavoring to teach the hon. gentlemen beside him that elementary truth eleven years ago; but I preached to deaf ears, and could not convince those hon. gentlemen, (though the proof was clear and incontestable) of that simple elementary fact, the truth of which the hon. gentleman has now discovered, that you must take value as well as quantity into account in estimating that. I advise him to extend the educational process, he has begun, and try to convince the hon. gentleman on his right, and the hon. gentleman on his left, of that truth, of which I was not able to convince them. So I agree with him that it is quite fair, in discussing deficits, to consider that the large amount which is put to sinking fund may be fairly reckoned as a matter of offset but when I expounded that doctrine in 1877-78, I was met by the colleagues of the hon. gentleman with shouts of derision; and again I urge upon the hon. gentleman the expediency of instructing his colleagues on the right and on the left in that elementary principle of finance. We all admit on this side of the House, and we all agree, not merely in principle, but in practice, and when we were in power, we put our principles into practice; that it is most grossly unfair that a poor man should pay more taxes than a rich man, in proportion to his means. Why, that is the fundamental principle of our opposition to the hon. gentleman's protective tariff. Every specific duty which he lays on, *pro tanto*, is an injury and an injustice, and does inflict a heavier tax on the poor man than on the rich man. When I look around the House, and see that probably my hon. friend himself, probably myself and probably my hon. friends around me are wearing garments which came into this country at a tax of 20 per cent., whereas our poorer neighbors have to pay 30, 40, 50 and even 60 per cent. for their garments under the present tariff, I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is most grossly unfair that poor men should be compelled to pay twice and even three times as much as rich men pay, as they do under the present tariff. I agree again with the hon. gentleman that all over the world the rate of interest has fallen, immensely within the last few years, and also in the fact, which he did not state so clearly, though no doubt a gentleman of his intelligence saw it, that it is therefore that to-day

loans can be made on better terms than they could a few years ago. That likewise is an elementary truth which I am glad to see he perceives, but which it was very difficult to convince his hon. colleagues of in discussing the transactions which have taken place in the last few years. And here I will take the opportunity to say—though I shall refer to it at greater length later on if time permit—that, on the whole, I am glad to bear my testimony to the fact that, as far as I can judge, the last 3 per cent. loan was a good loan, was well made, and the time well chosen. Further, I am agreed with the hon. gentleman, that it is most desirable that we should have larger trade with other countries, that there is a great and increasing sentiment all over this country, in favor of an enlarged trade with other countries; and I advise him, and I advise the Government and the people of Canada, to seek that trade where it can be found a hundred times better in quantity, and twenty times more profitably to us—next to us, at our doors, within half a day's journey of us—than to go ten thousand miles away, and ransack the Antipodes for a trade which, when we get it, will not be worth one hundredth part of that which I am afraid the hon. gentleman is disposed to turn his back upon. I also agree with the Minister of Finance—and I am delighted to find that there are so many points of agreement between us—"that our manufacturers could meet competition as Canadians can meet it, and ought to meet it. That is our doctrine also, and I believe the best manufacturers in Canada will endorse that doctrine. They do not want, as I believe, a hot-bed protection; and, if the facts are true as stated by the hon. gentleman, if the time has come when Canadian cotton manufacturers are able to undersell English goods in neutral markets, does not the hon. gentleman perceive that the obvious inference is that our manufacturers must be able to manufacture as cheaply as English manufacturers, and that therefore they do not need any more protection? I am therefore surprised that the hon. gentleman does not propose to reduce the duties on cotton manufactures, because I cannot possibly imagine that he means that it is to the public advantage that Canadian manufacturers should sell their goods below cost in foreign markets, and so tax the Canadian consumer doubly for the benefit of the heathen Chinese. If that be not the case, and I cannot for a moment suppose that that is the view of the hon. gentleman, if the Canadian manufacturer is now able to compete in equal markets, on equal terms, with English and American manufacturers, what does he need of further protection at our hands? I am delighted also to agree with the hon. gentleman that prices fluctuate from causes which no Government can control.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). "Flies on the wheel."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Prices fluctuate from causes which no Government can control, and the rider I put to that is that it is most dishonest for politicians who know better to state that a Government can keep up the prices of articles—notably the price of farm produce, for example. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is in every sense the true policy of Canada to extend a steady, courteous treatment to its neighbors, and not on the Thursday to repeal a statutory declaration which they had assented to years ago, and on the Monday to restore it to the Statute-book; nor to attempt to evade solemn obligations by such little petty devices as putting taxes on the packages which contain articles which they agreed were to enter free. Lastly, I agree with the hon. gentleman on the whole in the proposition on which he laid so much stress, that, if trade continues to increase, if all things go well, if the North-West fills up rapidly, if no new demands arise and no naughty No. 8 should come into existence to disturb the repose of the Finance Minister, if, in short, we have smooth seas and fair winds, all will go well enough. It is not altogether the

first time that we have heard these prophecies from the predecessor of the hon. gentleman—not the hon. gentleman who occupies a place on the floor this evening, and whom I am glad to see here, but another predecessor of the hon. gentleman, the Elijah, whose mantle appears to have fallen on the hon. gentleman himself, and who, in smooth and dulcet tones, was wont to prophesy smooth things to us, not one of which, I am sorry to say, has as yet come to pass, though I hope my hon. friend opposite may be more fortunate in that respect than his predecessor. Having thus briefly indicated the points of agreement between the hon. gentleman and myself, into which I will enter at more detail further on, I may now venture to indicate certain points of difference. For example, though I agree perfectly with him that it is not quite fair to measure the incidence of taxation in a country by the mere *per capita* rate, I cannot agree with him that the incidence of taxation in Canada on the poor man is less than it is in Great Britain. I think he labors under a great delusion there; and, Sir, as I, for all the hon. gentleman may say to the contrary, am a great admirer of the British system of taxation, as I think it far superior to our own system of taxation, if the hon. gentleman wants to know, I will call his attention to certain facts which I suppose must be well known to a man of his reading and intelligence, which will show him that he labored under a very great delusion indeed when he said that the poor man in Canada was less subject to taxation than the poor man in England. He is quite right in saying that so far as regards excise taxation, that is purely voluntary. No man need smoke, and no man need drink, as the hon. gentleman told us, unless of his own free will.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nor shave.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which, no doubt, is a source of expense, though not as yet of taxation; I do not know what may be in store for us, though. Now, Sir, in England taxes are raised, as he rightly said, in these several ways; first, by excise, which is voluntary in his sense of the word; second by stamps, which does not touch the poor man in England to any appreciable extent; thirdly, by the land tax; fourthly, the customs; and fifthly, the house tax, and by the income and property tax. Of all these forms of taxation in England none necessarily touch the poor man except a certain part of the customs. Now, Sir, England raises 20 million pounds sterling by her customs duties, and how does she raise it? 9½ millions from tobacco, which is a voluntary tax, 4 millions from rum, brandy and other spirits; and one million and a quarter from wine; so that, in other words, of all the taxes in England the only tax a poor man need pay is his proportion of the balance of 5 million pounds sterling of customs duties. What does that amount to? We know that the population of England is close upon 36 millions, and taking for this occasion the *per capita* argument, the English artisan, if he chooses, can escape with an average tax per head for himself and his family of 66 cents per annum, as against \$4 per head paid by every artisan and his family here. Our tax on the poor man is 600 per cent.—as the hon. gentleman likes that way of calculating it—greater than the taxation of his fellow in England. I differ with the hon. gentleman—and I will give him, if he likes, in the amplest detail, my reasons for differing, though not at the present moment—in the wisdom of comparing the taxation in Canada and the taxation in the United States during the last twenty-one years. We will work that problem out as long, and as often, and as fully as the hon. gentleman can desire, but for the present let him and the House be content with this simple statement, which he can verify at his leisure from the records of both countries: Twenty-one years ago the average necessary taxation per head of the people of Canada was 33 per cent. of that then borne by the people of the United States; to-day the necessary taxation of the people

of Canada is 50 per cent. greater than the average necessary taxation of the people of the United States, if you deduct a hundred millions, or thereabouts, that they use for reducing their debt. Then, Sir, I take leave to differ with the hon. gentleman as to the truth of that remarkable statement which he made, that every cent of taxation raised in Canada has not been wasted, but has been properly spent, not in bribery or corrupt practices, but in productive public works, of which, as I shall presently show the House, the Intercolonial Railway affords a most notable and remarkable specimen. Likewise I have my doubts whether the history of the world will show that increased taxation is the only path of national development, though it may be the only short cut by which a number of Government supporters in a poor country can bloom suddenly into millionaires. Sir, I have my doubts of the correctness of the hon. gentleman in intimating that we showed profound wisdom in assuming the debts of the Provinces, and that the United States were guilty of great folly in refusing to do likewise. I also doubt extremely whether the hon. gentleman was well advised in the comparison which he proposed to institute with Australasia and the Australian colonies, and at a later date I will lay before the House certain reasons which I think will convince the hon. gentleman that he spoke unadvisedly with his lips when he challenged a comparison with Australasia, without going a little more thoroughly into the subject, or, to use his own words, without looking a little more deeply below the surface than he did. When the hon. gentleman stated, as I understood him to do, that he expected that we would have an export of twenty million bushels of grain this year from the North-West, I would be delighted to believe he was correct, but I would like exceedingly to know on what grounds he made these statements. I would like to know what amount has yet been exported from the Province of Manitoba, and the North-West, what amount may be in the elevators, what likelihood there is of his figures being reached; and if the hon. gentleman wishes, I will give him the floor to state his reasons for making that statement, which is an important one, and valuable if true, and one which I would be very glad to see confirmed. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman made another statement in regard to which I have some difficulty in understanding him. As I took him down—and I am open to correction if I am wrong—the hon. gentleman stated that we had got fifty-one million dollars worth more public works than the additional debt represented.

Mr. FOSTER. Capital expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I would like to know where that came from. Now, I happen to know, on the authority of the hon. gentleman's own returns, that the total surplusses we accumulated in the last twenty-one years amount exactly to thirteen millions, as I understand it. That is all the surplus over our debt that we had to invest in public works, or in anything else, and where he gets his fifty-one millions is a thing that—I won't say that no fellow understands, because, I suppose, the hon. gentleman understands it—but I humbly profess my entire inability to comprehend it without further details which, I dare say, the hon. gentleman will give at a convenient season. Then, I have my doubts—and I see here several influential and notable representatives of the farmers of Ontario who can speak on this point—whether he is quite correct in saying that the farmers of Ontario pay no duty on their food. The farmers of Ontario, if I understand the case, use a good deal of sugar, and a good deal of rice, a good deal of dried fruits, and not a little spices and various other condiments with their food. Are these not taxed, and highly taxed too? Nor, would I put out of sight the question whether there may not be, some of them, so far lost, to—what shall I say? so far lost to wisdom and self-restraint as to take a little beer with their dinner too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Therefore, I think that the farmers of Ontario do pay some duty on a portion, at any rate, of their food. Then as to the trifling duty on their farm implements, which the hon. gentleman thought, and told my hon friend behind me, was such an infinitesimal thing. I think if the hon. gentleman had only spent six months on a farm in the North-West Territories, he would come to the conclusion that the duty on farm machinery was an extremely onerous burden on the farmers who are doing their best to develop that noble country. One little thing I did notice. The hon. Minister of Finance spoke very highly of his predecessors, not even excepting myself. Then he proceeded to observe that there were a number of stock assertions which he intimated those who formerly held the position of Finance Minister entirely failed to answer, but which the Finance Minister now incumbent of the office would remove forever. I fear that the hon. gentleman has not taken sufficient stock of the obstinacy of Bourbons like my hon. friend from Bothwell; I fear he will find that these same assertions have deep roots, far-reaching roots and that not even his great talents, not even his most lucid explanations, will entirely avail to remove from the popular mind those delusions which his talented predecessors, on his own showing, have hitherto failed to eradicate. I have now a word or two to say as to the general position. I repeat that I agree with the Finance Minister that the value of the financial side of his statement depends almost entirely on these two things: First, on the accuracy of the Estimates submitted to Parliament at the time of making the financial statement; and second, on the accuracy of the accounts of last year's expenses which are furnished to us. Now, it may interest the House to know—as we cannot tell for a period of two years or thereabouts, how accurate the hon. gentleman has been, and I was glad to observe that he took occasion to correct his earlier estimate by adding \$1,250,000 to the modest sum of \$35,440,000 with which he started—I repeat it may interest the House to know what has been the actual result of our experiments for the last four years. I find that in 1885 an original estimate was brought down of \$29,811,639; but when the year closed we found the total expenditure was \$35,037,060, being an excess in expenditure over the original Estimate of \$6,225,421. Of this it is only fair to point out that \$1,697,851 were due to unforeseen causes—if they can be said to be unforeseen, that is to say, that abominable misgovernment produced a revolt in the North-West, and the disproportion between the original estimates submitted in 1885 and the expenditure may therefore be reduced to \$4,527,570. In 1886, we were called to consider the financial condition of this country on an estimated expenditure of \$31,757,032, which swelled finally to an actual expenditure of \$39,011,612, being an excess of \$7,254,580 over the expenditure, from which on the same principle I would deduct \$3,177,220 for war expenditures, making an excess for that year of \$4,077,360. We find in 1887 an estimated expenditure of \$33,124,000 and an actual admitted expenditure of \$35,637,000, being an excess of \$2,533,130, to which in all conscience ought to be added \$456,000 most improperly charged to capital account, making a total excess over estimated expense of \$3,000,000 odd. In a similar manner in 1888 we had, when the statement was made to us, an estimated expense of \$35,041,855, which has resulted in an actual expense of \$36,718,000, being an excess of \$1,676,000, to which ought to be added \$674,000 for items improperly charged to capital account. The result of all this is, that in the last four years the original estimates on which the financial statements were based have been exceeded on an average by \$3,000,000 or more. I do not say, no body can as yet say, how the hon. gentleman's estimates may fare; but I submit, with the evidence of those four years before us, it is hardly unreasonable on our part to express some doubts as to whether the hon. gentleman's estimates will be verified, and the surplus on

which he has calculated is likely to be realised. Independently of that, I have another thing to say to the hon. gentleman. I had hoped that when the hon. gentleman assumed the office he now holds he would have had the manliness and sound sense to depart from the evil ways into which the department had fallen, and he would have returned to the honest mode of stating public accounts practiced under Mr. McLelan and under Sir Leonard Tilley. I have to say now, that I regard the statement of the Public Accounts for the years 1887 and 1888 as open to very grave exception indeed. In my opinion those accounts have been cooked; I will not say those accounts are fraudulent because things are done under political exigency and the necessities of state which are supposed to be spoken of in a different fashion from the way in which we would treat such transactions if they occurred in ordinary bookkeeping. But when you take the Public Accounts you will see that prior to 1887 the capital received for lands was not credited as revenue—and you will find that this rule had been formally agreed to in this House—so long as any portion of the charges for surveying the lands were put to capital account. We find this in 1887 reversed. We find that the whole revenue from lands is taken and credited as ordinary income, amounting to \$191,000; but we find \$162,391 for expenses of these Dominion lands charged to capital contrary to the practice of Mr. McLelan and Sir Leonard Tilley with respect to this account. Then as to money spent for expenses of the rebellion we have \$293,917 charged to capital account, although nothing of that kind had been done with the very large sum expended in 1885 or 1886, the result being, without taking into account for the moment the vexed question of improper charges in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, that contrary to the deliberately settled policy agreed upon by this House and carried out for several years by two successive Finance Ministers, a surplus of \$96,832 was forced for 1887, whereas there was a real deficit of at least \$363,000. We find, I am sorry to say, that the present Finance Minister has gone on in the same evil way. He has admitted a deficit of \$810,031. By some hocus pocus with respect to the Post Office, although those accounts in my hands show there is an actual deficit for 1888 in the Post Office service of \$729,978, that is reduced in the hon. gentleman's statement to \$567,000 by some mode of reckoning five quarters' revenue within the one year. It may be that the department has collected from the postmasters money held back by them, although until an explanation of a fuller character be given by the hon. gentleman—and he did not allude to this matter at all—all I can do is to point out that according to the mode of computation which prevailed in 1887, the deficit would have been, \$972,978 instead of \$810,000. But as to the charge of \$135,047 on account of Dominion lands charged against capital account, while the hon. gentleman took credit for every penny of \$217,000 received from these lands as ordinary revenue, I say that is simply fraudulent book-keeping, and the same remark applies to the charge of \$539,929 for North-West rebellion losses. I cannot for one moment admit that there is any ground whatever for treating that as an asset or as a thing for which we have received any return or which ought to appear in any way in the capital account of this country. I may say that this practice of keeping two accounts, one an ordinary account and one a capital account, is being grossly abused and is likely to be grossly abused in order to blind the eyes of the people of this country to the real actual extravagance of these hon. gentlemen. Looking over the Intercolonial Railway accounts, in my judgment, although that I admit it to be a question in dispute, I believe that \$408,385 ought to be added to our ordinary expenditure, and I further state that even on the hon. gentleman's own showing, even only taking the lines laid down by his predecessors, Mr. McLelan and Sir Leonard Tilley, our true deficit for 1888 is not \$810,000, but the true deficit is as nearly as possible \$1,500,000,

and if you add the sums improperly charged to the Intercolonial account, and the item of the Post Office, the genuine deficit would be over \$2,000,000, or as nearly as might be \$2,056,000. With respect to two of these items every man can see for himself if he turns to the Public Accounts that what I have stated is absolutely and exactly correct. He will see (at page 50, table 7) that for a period of four years and more, not one penny of these Dominion land receipts was credited to income, by Mr. McLelan or Sir Leonard Tilley. During the time that they made charges on that score to capital account, they carefully abstained, to their credit be it said, from violating the agreement come to between this House and the Premier, that no charges should be made on the one side without giving credit at the same time on the other. As regards the rebellion losses I commend the hon. gentleman again to the example of Mr. McLelan, who had the courage and the manliness to charge six million dollars to ordinary expenditure in the two years of 1885 and 1886, while for the purpose of making a false balance we find in 1887 and 1888 these comparatively trifling sums of \$293,000 and \$547,000 charged to capital account. Of course the reason for this is obvious. Hon. gentlemen do not like to have four successive deficits staring them in the face, and so they deliberately turn round on their own predecessors, and alter their whole method of book-keeping to suit this present exigency. I am glad to hear that we are not likely to have any more of these rebellion losses to pay, but I enter my protest once for all against this most vicious practice of crediting the whole receipts received from our Dominion lands and charging part of the expenses to the ordinary income and part to capital account. I ask what confidence the Minister expects us to place in his statement, what confidence can he expect us to place in all those calculations which he is good enough to submit, when we find in matters absolutely under his own control that he cannot resist the temptation of making things appear a few hundred thousand dollars better than they really are, although by so doing he flies directly in the face of his own predecessors in office? Now, Sir, I come to a matter which bears a good deal on much of what the hon. gentleman has said, a matter which bears very largely on the extent to which we have succeeded in creating a genuine self-sustaining traffic between the various Provinces of this Dominion, and also on the extent to which his statement can be relied upon that we have spent no portion of our taxation except on "productive public works." I have here the statement of the revenue we received from the Intercolonial Railway in the year 1888. It amounted to, all told, \$2,912,783. Our expenditure for working the Intercolonial Railway during that year amounted to \$3,276,441. To that I add \$408,485 for items of rolling stock and for matters of that kind which, in my judgment, are improperly charged to capital account and which ought to have gone to the ordinary expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for that year, I add also interest on the cost which I find recorded in our Public Accounts, interest on \$47,178,000 at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., which is the rate the hon. gentleman will find that sum stands us in. That amount to \$2,110,000, so that we are to-day working the Intercolonial Railway at an expense to the people of Canada of \$5,744,836 for expenses, for interest and for items improperly charged to capital account. We get back from it \$2,912,783, so that for every dollar of revenue we receive from the Intercolonial Railway \$2 are to-day paid out of the Treasury of Canada, as a proof of the value of that road in producing a genuine self-sustaining commerce and in uniting our scattered Provinces together, and of conveying coal from the Springhill mines to the consumers in Montreal and elsewhere at rates far below actual cost of carriage. Now this is an illustration which this House will do well to ponder on. There you have the result of having a road built for political purposes and the result of having a road run for political

purposes. I say that the management of that Intercolonial Railway is not honest or these results would never be produced. When you find that after that road has been opened for thirteen or fourteen years, after you had all possible opportunities for developing its traffic, when you find that year after year a million or more than a million is demanded for so-called capital account, when you find with all this that that railway is not only not able to produce one single cent in return of interest but that you have to charge on your own showing \$363,000 a year dead loss, I say, Sir, that speaks louder than any man can speak as to the value of political roads and of the value to the country of running them for political purposes. As if to make the matter worse the hon. gentleman alluded to-night, and other gentlemen have alluded elsewhere to the wisdom, the good policy and the sagacity the Government are displaying—while the Intercolonial Railway is a dead loss on our hands to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars—in having taken hundreds of thousands of other dollars out of the public chest to construct a short line to compete with the Intercolonial Railway, and to cut the Intercolonial Railway's throat and to add still more to the burdens of the taxpayers—the people of Canada. Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke, and I dare say correctly enough, of what may be called our ascertained liabilities, for railroad subsidies, for canals, for public works of various kinds; but the hon. gentleman did not dwell on the chance of our having made upon us a heavy demand for further railway subsidies. Now, Sir, I have never wavered or flinched from saying that although in certain individual instances good might come from this system of railway subsidies, the thing is vicious and wrong in itself, unless they be granted for purposes of the clearest general utility to the entire Dominion; but I tell the hon. gentleman this: let him not deceive himself, let him not deceive this House, by imagining that he and his colleagues can, at their own supreme will and pleasure, give subsidies for railways to this supporter or that supporter, and then turn around and say to the people of Canada: Now that we have glutted our own supporters, now that we have paid these men for the assistance they have given us, we are going to shut down, and you other constituencies and other Provinces and other portions of this Dominion who could not be bought or whom it was not worth our while to buy, shall have nothing because we do not see fit to continue the system any longer. Sir, that cannot be. There may be good reasons for putting a stop to the system, but it does not lie in the hon. gentleman to say that they can put a stop to it without a good deal better reason than they have yet given. We have heard nothing of another question, which is the subject of an arbitration that may involve many millions, between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government of this country, and in connection with which, if I am informed aright, judging from the proportions the lawyers' bills have assumed, a very heavy bill may have to be paid sooner or later. Nor did the hon. gentleman allude to the fact, which cannot be lost sight of in a financial statement, that we have given a guarantee to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that we may have to pay the interest on some \$15,000,000 for fifty years. Nor did he allude to the fact that almost every Province of this Dominion has claims on the general treasury as yet unsettled. Sir, I shall have something to say on that subject before I close; but meanwhile, let me point out that for all these things, be they right or wrong, wise or foolish, the policy of these hon. gentlemen is responsible. If there be a difficulty or a danger or a heavy contingent liability, it is to their policy and that alone that the people of Canada owe it that besides our heavy ascertained liabilities there are immense contingent liabilities which no man can wisely overlook in estimating the future. And now, Sir, I have a word or two further to say. I am for a moment going to pass from the financial side of the question,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to consider the mode in which the money we have to spend is got from the people, and I have to say this—and now is the time to say it, because now, if ever, should the grievances of the people be stated in no unhesitating sound: I say there is one feature of this protective tariff which is daily and hourly growing into more odious prominence, and that is the complete subjection of this Government to certain combines in this country, to certain manufacturing establishments in this country, and certain friends of theirs who, on emergency, can come down with their cheques for \$5,000 or \$10,000 or it may be \$20,000, whenever the money can do most good to their friends, the Government. Now, Sir, is it not enough that these same combines should be able to exact 35 per cent., as most of them can, from the people of this country? Is it not enough that they have the legal means of exaction, but are we to permit that the Minister of Customs, or, for aught I know, a mere understrapper of the Minister of Customs, shall arbitrarily and tyrannically add half as much more to the taxes the people have to pay? Sir, this is a growing abuse. I have cases now in my mind, in which distinguished manufacturers in this country have gone to the agents of a combine, and have said to them: We will give you the price of this article in cash in the United States, and add to it the cost of the freight, add the whole Canadian duty, besides if you will give us goods at these rates; and they have been refused; and they have then brought the goods in from the United States, paid the cash price in the United States, paid the freight and have been prepared to pay the honest duty or the duty the Government ought to have levied; and yet at the instance of these identical combines the Government of Canada, or the Customs Department of the Government, arbitrarily and tyrannically added 50 per cent. to the true valuation of those articles, and compelled those men to pay 50 per cent. more than the law intended they should. Sir, we shall have something to say on this matter, please heaven, before the House rises, and, therefore, I shall confine my present remarks regarding it to a very few words. But I say that the thing to which I allude is one of the most monstrous features of the Customs Act as it now exists. We gave the Minister of Customs this power to be used in extreme emergencies to prevent fraud, and that power is now being used to commit fraud. If there were nothing more to condemn this system, the judgment recently pronounced in a certain well known case, by the highest tribunal in the land, the tendency it exhibits to encourage a system of blackmail and partiality to political supporters, and to foster the greatest political corruption besides, ought to be enough to condemn this feature of the protective tariff in the eyes of an honest man. It is the natural and inevitable fruit of a high protective system, and it does this threefold wrong. First of all it wrongs the revenue, because its effect is to force people into subjection to the combines, and the Government gets no duty on what would otherwise be imported; secondly, it is an injury to the manufacturers of the best class; and thirdly, as the manufactures pass the charge on to the consumers, the whole body of the consumers likewise suffer from this infamous wrong. For that wrong there is no genuine redress save taking away the power these men have abused. Sir, there was one good point in the hon. gentleman's statement. For the first time for many years, the Minister of Finance declares that he is not going to add a fresh batch of oppressive taxes to the burthens of the people of this country. Well, Sir, we will wait until this House rises before we rejoice too much in that announcement; but in the meantime, as the hon. gentleman was good enough to give us a list of the taxes which wealthy men pay in this country, I will give him a list of the taxes which poor men pay on articles of daily and hourly use which are necessary to all of them. In the first place, Sir,

I find that we imported into Canada last year \$449,446 worth of coal oil, on which \$351,886 of duty was collected, being a rate of 80 per cent. on the necessary article of light most largely used by the poor of this country. We imported \$5,154,000 worth of sugar, on which a duty was paid of \$3,433,324, being at the rate of 67 per cent. on an article which goes very largely into the consumption of the poorer classes; and that is very far indeed from representing the real tax, because probably an equal sum or nearly an equal sum, under our present scheme of taxation, finds its way into the pockets of the rich refiners. On the articles of coarse woollens and the like, while most of us in this House can obtain the goods we wear at an average rate of 20 per cent. our poorer brethren are obliged to pay 40, 50, 60 and 70 per cent. on the materials they think it convenient to use as clothing. Now this tariff, amongst its other injustices, continues to perpetrate one very gross injustice, to which I believe the attention of the Government was called lately, in the case of the millers of Canada. Where else would there be found a system, called a protective system, in which the Canadian miller is absolutely discriminated against in favor of the American miller. That is protection reversed. You injure your own manufacturer for the benefit of the foreign manufacturer, and when the former points out that such is the case, on the clearest evidence, you cannot venture to redress the wrong you have done. I observe that the hon. gentleman, particularly in the closing part of his speech, indulged in a very great deal of assumption which I cannot characterise as at all well founded. He and his friends behind him would, forsooth, cram down the minds of the people of this country and the throats of gentlemen of this House that all the progress that has been made in Canada for the last twenty-one years is due, forsooth, to those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I have not time, it would probably require several hours, to review in minute detail all the statements the hon. gentleman submitted. They will be reviewed, Sir, before the vote is taken on the question submitted to you. Do not be afraid; there are plenty of able, zealous, intelligent gentlemen beside and around me who will not leave one sophistry, one false statement unanswered, but human strength has its limits and I cannot undertake to go over the whole work to-night. I will, in my reply, confine myself simply to chalking out the outlines, and no doubt the picture will be amply filled in by my hon. friends. What do the statements of the hon. gentleman prove? They prove, it is true, that in spite of bad policy, in spite of misgovernment, an advance, aye, and a considerable advance, has been made in some directions. That nobody here has ever denied. I have never denied it, and I have never heard one of my hon. friends deny it. But what we do say is this, that in many other directions we have not advanced. We say that a good deal of what is claimed as advancement is not, in the proper sense of the term, really an advancement, but that it is rather a case in which what one man gains another man is pretty sure to lose. When hon. gentlemen talk of the leaps and bounds and the progress which Canada has recently made, they appear to forget one important consideration. Within the last seven or eight years what between the sums borrowed and spent by the Government, what between the sums borrowed and spent by great corporations like the Canadian Pacific Railway and others, probably not far short of \$200,000,000 of borrowed capital has been spent in Canada. That is coming to an end. The hon. gentleman has told us so, and we all know it is so, and in making his calculations for the future, I recommend the hon. Minister of Finance to bear in mind that this huge capital expenditure is now coming to an end to all intents and purposes, at any rate the greater part of it, but that both in our case and the case of the corporations to which I

allude, one thing remains,—the interest remains a charge on the earnings of the people of Canada to be paid for all time to come. Now, it appears to me the hon. the Minister of Finance has omitted in his *résumé* certain vital points. I think that if he will take the trouble to examine the works of those writers who most deserve respect, and to confer with those men whose opinions on this subject best deserve respect, he will find that they will be disposed to agree with me, at any rate thus far, in saying that in a country like Canada, that in a country of the age of Canada, that in a country in the state of settlement of Canada, the real, true indices of prosperity are these: First of all, and to this I specially call the attention of the House, the rapidity of the increase of population in Canada; next, and we will have more to say on this presently, the rapidity of the increase of the total volume of trade; and next, and here I fear I take issue with the hon. gentleman, the importance of the debt decreasing, both absolutely and relatively, and the importance of our taxation decreasing, both absolutely and relatively; again, the rapid progress of settlement in such new countries as we may be fortunate enough to acquire; the growth of new cities and towns, the capacity to attract and to retain such emigrants as come to this country; and, last but not least, the wise, just and equitable distribution of property among the masses of the people. Those I say are the true signs of prosperity in a country like Canada. On the other hand, I say that the true signs of an arrested development in a country like Canada are these: When you find population, particularly in the rural districts, either stationary or retrograde; when you find the volume of trade either stationary or retrograde; when you fail and fail egregiously in settling and filling up new territory; when you are not able to point to new towns or villages springing up in any number; when you find a decrease in the selling value of agricultural lands in the country; when you find a rapid increase of the debt and of the taxes and a rapid efflux of people from the country, whether they be emigrants coming to this country or whether they be your own people who seek to improve their position by removing to another land. Now, I ask this House which sets of conditions on the whole exists in Canada to-day? Let us review these in detail. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a very few days ago I put the question to the Minister of Agriculture as to the population which he estimated to exist in this country, and I asked him on what his estimate was founded, and to divide it among the several Provinces. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to send over to me his memo., and I found, as indeed I had expected, that this elaborate statement of 4,946,497 souls was simply the purest guesswork, that there was not one particle of foundation for the statement so formally submitted, other than this, that if—if, Mr. Speaker—the population during these seven or eight years had increased in the same ratio as it did in Canada between 1871 and 1881, then these results would follow. I have also the hon. gentleman's own statement, as recorded in the books of his department, of the immigrants who settled in Canada during 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886 and 1887; and I call the attention of the House to certain remarkable results which flow from these two separate statements of the Government beyond possible contradiction. I find that in the years I have named we received in Canada 630,744 immigrants, who, according to the statement of the Department of Agriculture, are expressly declared to have settled in Canada, besides the large number who passed through and went away. I find that our population in 1881 was 4,432,481. Adding to these the 630,744 above-named, it is clear that we would have, without any natural increase at all, 4,955,554, and therefore that, on the showing of the Minister of Agriculture himself, on the evidence formally laid on the Table of this House in the books of his depart-



ment, during the last seven years there has been a dead loss of 9,000, besides the whole natural increase of the people of Canada, which, in seven years, at 2½ per cent., on their own showing, would be 700,000 souls. So, if the Department of Agriculture be correct, 630,744 immigrants came here, and in that case 700,000 Canadians have been extruded from this country to make room for them. I will give five or ten minutes of my time to the Minister of Agriculture—oh, I see he is not present—or to any of his colleagues to point out any inaccuracies in my statement. If the statements of the Department of Agriculture are correct, it inevitably follows that we have lost more than 700,000 people from 1880 up to the month of April, 1888. That is their own statement. That is the result which must inevitably be deduced from their own declaration. I am going to come to the rescue. I do not think the case is half as bad as these hon. gentlemen have depicted it. In the first place I do not believe that the statements of the Department of Agriculture are worth the paper they are written on, I do not believe they are worth one cent of the \$3,500,000 which we have spent during those seven years in order to bring immigrants here; nor do I believe that their elaborate logarithmical calculations are worth anything. I doubt extremely whether there is in Canada at present a population of 4,946,000. We know that the Ontario statistics are the only reliable ones we have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Probably those hon. gentlemen have not paid much attention to these matters, but, if they wait until I get through, they can contradict me if they are able. I say that these Ontario statistics are the only reliable ones we have. I do not say that they are absolutely reliable, but that they are the only ones which approach to reliability. During the decade from 1871 to 1881, they showed very accurately the increase of population which took place then, and I think that it is more than probable that they will show accurately what increase has taken place since. They show an increase of 180,000 in those seven years. I believe it will be found that the actual increase in the Dominion is a little more than double that—perhaps about 400,000—but I do not believe that, of the 630,000 immigrants, there are more than one-sixth and perhaps not one-tenth part remaining in Canada. We have been bringing these men here and paying their passages to enable them to drift to the southward, and indeed to act as anti-immigration agents to the detriment of the people of Canada. Let me remind the House of two things. We had numerous disputes three or four years ago as to the population of the North-West Territories and Manitoba. In 1885 and 1886 censuses were taken of those territories, and the result was to show, without any possibility of contradiction, that the Opposition were right in all points but one. They had estimated the population of Manitoba and the North-West too highly. They had gone beyond the mark in their fear to err, while the reports of the Department of Agriculture gave this most remarkable result: They showed by most positive statements for the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886, that 166,803 settlers had gone to Manitoba and the North-West, though, when the census was taken, there were only 118,000 whites found in all that country. According to the census of 1881, and allowing for natural increase, we should have had 74,000 in 1886 without one single immigrant. Deduct that from 118,000, and you have this remarkable result: The department asserted that 166,803 had settled in that country in seven years, and they gave the figures: 1881, 22,001; 1882, 53,751; 1883, 42,772; 1884, 24,240; 1885, 7,240; 1886, 11,599; total, 166,803. Well, of these 166,803 who they said had gone there, who they stated in public documents were there, we find only 41,095, and the remaining 122,708 had vanished into thinnest air, and in this way was con-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

firmed the remarkable accuracy of the statements of hon. gentlemen on this side. Then, again, when hon. gentlemen opposite took upon them to contradict men who had carefully studied the questions relating to the population of this country, I challenged them, as I challenge them now, to go to the Catholic clergy in the Province of Quebec, who possess good statistics in regard to the movement of the Catholic population there, and to ask them as to the exodus of their people, and to judge by that how far the statements which I and others have made are correct. That challenge was thrown out three years ago. I repeat it now, and I ask the hon. gentlemen, if they venture to dispute my statements, to take the means which present themselves readily and naturally to find out the truth, so that we may discover who is right and who is wrong in regard to this most important question as to the rate at which the population of Canada is increasing. In the meantime, however, I call attention to this fact that, on the authority of the statement made by hon. gentlemen on the floor of Parliament and of those made in the returns of the Department of Agriculture, there has been an exodus of 700,000 of the people of Canada in the last seven years. Now, a word or two as to the question of the volume of trade. The hon. gentleman was not able to deny the fact that, whereas, with a population of three millions and three-quarters in 1874, we had a volume of trade of \$217,000,000, we have now, with a population which he calls five millions, a volume of trade of \$193,000,000, taking goods entered for consumption; and that amounted, in round numbers, to \$58 per head in 1874 and to \$40 a head in 1888. It is true that it is right, as he said, to estimate value as well as quantity. He was right in saying that no one knew better than I did that there were often great fluctuations in value. I pointed that out time and again in this House ten and eleven years ago, but it is not fair to say that in a country which should be growing and advancing as Canada should be, we should be content, forsooth, with such a showing, even if the hon. gentleman could establish what he did not establish at all, that there has been a considerable droop in the value of our exports and imports. He referred to the droop which had taken place in the value of exports and imports into England, but it does not follow that the value of our imports and exports should droop in the same ratio. I believe myself that there has been a droop. I believe that prices are considerably lower to-day than they were in the time when we were in office, and I call the attention of the House, and of the hon. gentleman, and of my friends here to the fact that, when the Mackenzie Government was in power, the prices of farmers' produce were far better than they are under the National Policy, and further, though we did not promise to make prices good, or to keep prices up to abnormal rates, the hon. gentleman and his friends got into office by the most audacious and impudent declarations that they, under the National Policy, had power to make markets for the farmers, had power to raise the prices of all the things the farmers had to sell. The hon. gentleman likes to compare Canada and Australia. Well, Sir, I will give him a comparison which will do him, perhaps, some good. I find that in 1874 New South Wales, which has, by-the-by, something very like a revenue tariff and a free trade system, had a total volume of exports and imports of 90 millions. Now the prices of their productions were much higher in 1874, as I suppose he knows, than in 1887; but in 1887 New South Wales had a volume of exports and imports of 175 millions, that is, it has grown from 90 to 175 millions, nearly doubled; while Canada has crept down from 217 to 200 millions. I suppose that he will admit that the same causes were at work in New South Wales, lowering or altering the prices of exports and imports, as in Canada, and if he does not know it, proof can easily be advanced. But my contention is that we ought to go on, we are a young country, we are a growing country, we are increasing in population, even under

all disadvantages, faster than old countries like England, or many countries in Europe, and be the alteration in value what he pleases, it is a proof, I repeat, of arrested development, that the volume of trade to-day in Canada is nearly \$20,000,000 a year less than it was fifteen years ago. Now there was another note I gave, that was the failure to settle the new territory we had acquired. Sir, this also, is a matter of notoriety. Here we have their own census returns, showing the most lamentable failure, showing, if they are to be believed at all, that such was the result of policy of the Government that of 166,000 settlers who went to the North-West and settled there with the intention of remaining, only 44,000 were found by actual count five or six years thereafter. Now, Sir, very recently, for four or five hours together, this House rang with declarations from hon. gentlemen representing that country, setting forth the unexampled fertility, setting forth the unexampled excellence, setting forth the beauties of that country in terms so glowing that I came to the conclusion that really and truly the earthly paradise was situated north of latitude 49, and that Regina was only another name for Eden—if only Mr. Commissioner Herchmer were removed. Sir, cannot these gentlemen see that every word that was said then, every word that is said now, (and much of it may be said truly) in praise of the fertility, in praise of the excellence, in praise of the resources, in praise of the chances of development of that country, are the severest possible condemnation of the Government opposite, who have squandered 100 millions of the people's money in pretending to promote colonisations, and have only this beggarly and miserable account of settlement to exhibit for it to-day? Sir, I come to another point which may fairly be said to be in dispute, where again I give a challenge to these hon. gentlemen. When talking about the proofs of the decrease in the value of property in Canada, I say that to my certain knowledge, to the certain knowledge of scores of friends whom I see here, in the great Province of Ontario more particularly, there has been, in the last 8 or 10 years, a great and notable depreciation in the value of farm lands. I believe that if proper investigation were had, if these hon. gentlemen would do as I asked them, if they would appoint a proper committee of members of this House, with power to investigate this matter thoroughly, then we would have had, and I am very sorry for it, the most unanswerable proof that over the greater portion of the Province of Ontario, over the greater portion of the 20 millions acres of farm land which it contains, there has been a very great reduction in the actual selling value, amounting, in all probability, to something like 8 or 10 dollars per acre for every one of these 20 million acres. That is the statement which I make, that is a statement which I know, from friends who are very largely interested in forming correct conclusions on this subject, represents probably less than the entire reduction in the selling value; and if you want to frame a true national balance sheet, you have got to set such a reduction as that in the selling value of the farm lands in Ontario—of the other Provinces I do not venture to speak—as an offset against your little petty addition to the savings bank deposits, and the deposits in the other banks, and a score of these other indices of prosperity on which the hon. gentleman so much relied. Now as to the increase of the debt, the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that all this sophistry, all this petty quibbling evasion, will not avail to alter the fact that Canada entered Confederation with a debt of 75 millions, whereas to-day, on the first of March, the net debt is 236 millions, with very doubtful assets for part of the remainder—will not avail to alter the fact that 21 years ago the total taxation of Canada was about 11 millions, and to-day, on his own showing, the total taxation of Canada is 31 millions, or he expects it to be—it won't avail to alter these things, nor is it in the slightest use

for him to waste the time of the House, or to waste his own time, in innumerable calculations as to the development of certain minor industries here and there, or the question whether our taxation per head is a few cents more or a few cents less than that of the United States. Now as to immigration, here again I present to the hon. gentleman his own statements. If these statements have one scintilla of truth, if the estimated population be correct, if the statements in the hon. gentleman's other returns and statistics are correct, it is only too clear that there has been a monstrous loss of the people of Canada. If indeed those immigrants whom the hon. gentleman says came here, have come and settled here, then three-quarters of a million of the best of our people have gone from us. That is the inevitable result, and to that I again call the attention of the hon. gentleman. Sir, it is known to everybody that all through the rural districts of Ontario there is scarcely a single county where the rural population is gaining to-day; there may be gains in a few towns, there may be gains in a few cities, but the rural population is stationary, is in a position of arrested development, and one of the main causes of that is the unjust and oppressive incidence of taxation, particularly on the agricultural portion of this community.

Mr. HESSON. The farmers in Ontario have been enlarging their farms, where they had fifty acres, they now have 100, where they had 100 they now have 200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the others have gone, and they who owned the fifty acres and the 100 acres have departed. Gentlemen, like my hon. friend have been laying field to field and buying up farms, and the bold yeomanry who used to send him here, have departed to the other side of the line. Why, Sir, within a few miles of my hon. friend's residence there stands the little town of Brussels, which I formerly had the honor of representing, and from it I was sent the other day—not for the purpose of using it here, it was a mere matter of investigation on the part of an enterprising newspaper proprietor—I was sent an account of the number of men—not women and children—who had gone from the little town of Brussels, with a total population of 1,200 souls, within the last ten years. How many would the hon. gentleman suppose there were? Twelve hundred souls would represent about 250 adults, males, I suppose, and seventy of them were found to be now residents in the United States. Their names were given, their residences were given. From the little town of Brussels alone seventy men, representing probably seventy families, had gone to the United States. I hope and trust that is an extreme instance, but I am afraid it is only a fair illustration of what is taking place, not in Ontario alone, but in Nova Scotia, in Prince Edward Island, in New Brunswick, and everywhere throughout this Dominion, and I am afraid that until it got its present Government in Manitoba as well.

Mr. HESSON. Brussels is improving every year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have great regard for Brussels, but that does not alter the fact that 70 men formerly resident in Brussels are now residents in the United States. As the Minister of Finance was seized with the spirit of prophecy, and as I hold it is rather dangerous to prophesy until you know, I may be permitted to call his attention to what befell a certain predecessor who likewise prophesied a few years ago. In 1882 I had a little controversy with Sir Leonard Tilley on subjects very closely akin to those I am discussing to-night. That hon. gentleman undertook to tell the House where we would find ourselves in 1890. We have nine or ten months to go upon, but here is Sir Leonard's statement, to which I call the attention of the House, delivered in the full spirit of prophecy as to where we would be in 1890. Sir Leonard declared:

"But between this and 1890 the amount that is to be paid into the sinking fund, and which forms part of our annual charges upon the consolidated revenue, will average \$1,500,000 a year for the next nine years. That will give for the deduction of the debt \$13,500,000. Then the surplus for the nine years—

"An hon. MEMBER (Sir Richard Cartwright). Oh!

"Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An hon. member says "oh," but when we have \$4,500,000 assured for this year, when there is no doubt, after the reduction which we propose to make, that there will be a surplus of \$3,000,000 for the next year, it is not, I think, asking too much for the hon. gentleman to accept as reasonable a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year for the remaining seven years of the nine commencing on the 1st July last, that would make \$14,500,000, and would, with the sinking fund, reduce the net debt to \$175,897,680. But if we estimate the increase of population at but 18 per cent. only during the ten years—the increase of the last decade—the result will be then, taking the population at that period, and the debt as stated, the net debt will be \$34.27 per head. Then if we have any extraordinary increase of our population (which I think it is but right to expect we will, but which I have not estimated for here) it will be ample to meet, at any rate, any extraordinary expenditure that may be chargeable to the debt which we are not anticipating at the present moment. But, more than that, if the 150,000,000 acres of arable land that will be the property of the Government after handing over to the syndicate 35,000,000 acres, and which is now established as fit for the settlement, yields but one dollar an acre for half of it (the other half being offered as a free gift to settlers) it will meet the whole expenditure of the Government on the Pacific Railway and in the North-West down to 1890. If that be the case, then our debt, which certainly is not alarming, provided we realise from these lands the sum that I have stated, would only be about \$100,000,000 instead of \$175,000,000, or less than \$20 per head."

I say nothing about the \$75,000,000, for it is a sore subject I know. But here was a calculation made by a gentleman of great experience, an eminent predecessor of the hon. gentleman, by whom we were assured as a basis for our future action that at worst the debt would be only \$175,000,000, in 1890 when Monday's *Gazette* shows that the net debt is \$236,000,000; and, therefore, I respectfully suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be well for him bearing that in mind to be cautious a little as to any prophecies in which he may indulge. I may remind him that a greater man even than the apostle of temperance, even the Premier himself announced to us, first, that we would have in 1890 \$71,000,000 cash in hand from land sales, but, on having the statement revised and making deductions for the expenses of management, it was then calculated that \$58,300,000 would positively be paid to us by the year 1890; and not to be behind hand Sir Charles Tupper asserted not that there would be 20,000,000 bushels sent from Manitoba by 1890 but that 640,000,000 bushels of wheat were to be shipped from the North-West, and the hon. gentleman was seriously exercised as to how we would get enough railways in to carry the grain away. It is not without a feeling of pleasure I recall that whereas the two first named authorities only promised us tens of millions, Sir Charles Tupper was much more generous and went into hundreds of millions, and all three of them were positive, I remember, that if Parliament would only allow them to have reciprocity of tariffs we would have reciprocity of trade with the United States rapidly, one named within two years, I think, to the people of the Maritime Provinces. Likewise they declared that every cent of the whole cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be repaid in full within the shortest possible space of time to the people of this country, and the North-West would fill up and blossom as the rose in such a manner as we have never dreamed of seeing. It may interest the House to know what that destroyer of such promises, the Public Accounts, shows on this question. Whereas we ought to have \$58,000,000 at our credit at the latest on 1st January, 1891, I regret to say that up to the present time our total receipts amount to \$4,250,000 and the expenditure to \$5,500,000, so that we are \$1,250,000 on the wrong side of the account. In all this there are to my mind just two redeeming points, always accepting the promise that we are not going to be taxed much more heavily. I think, and I give the hon. gentleman the benefit of my opinion, Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that, so far as I am able to judge, the drain of population from Canada is at last showing signs of diminishing. I think that is the case, I hope it is the case, I trust further investigation will confirm it, and I believe also that having at last got rid of the railway monopoly there is a fair chance of Manitoba filling up under the present Provincial Government and of redeeming to some extent the extravagant promises heretofore made on her account. But what are the replies to these facts which I have stated? In part a judicious silence has been observed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have shown discretion in not contradicting certain of the statements made, but in part I must say hon. gentlemen have taken refuge in pure evasion and in part in very audacious denial of well known facts. As to a great deal of what I have said, denial is perfectly hopeless. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny the increase of debt, although they may adduce excuses for it; they cannot deny the increase of taxation, and they cannot deny the enormous proportions of the fixed charges under which we labor, and which is a very serious point indeed. They cannot deny that up to the present time the settlement of the North-West has resulted in egregious failure, largely due to the trade policy, to the land policy and to the railway monopoly policy of the present Government. They cannot deny that the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway show that for every dollar received Canada is charged two dollars per annum. As to other statement, hon. gentlemen opposite find it easy when assertions are made to make counter-assertions and then refuse investigation, acting to some extent after the examples set by the Minister of Finance on a recent occasion when that hon. gentleman voted that he was in favor of granting prohibition when it was clear the people of Canada were ready for it, and then refused point blank to take measures to ascertain in the only way in which it could possibly be done what the wishes of the people of Canada were on the subject of prohibition. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of drawing a red herring across the scent; and they do that notably in the case of the National Policy. Now, Sir, what did it amount to all that the hon. gentleman said at the close of his speech and through his speech? It amounted to this: Those hon. gentlemen are prepared to claim that every single solitary result of every new invention that has been made for the last ten years, that every reduction in the price of raw material, that even a fall in the rate of interest all the world over is a new triumph for the National Policy. Should wool become cheaper—I do not know what my hon. friend from the rural district would say to that—but if wool should become cheaper, if iron becomes cheaper, if beet root is grown more largely, these hon. gentlemen claim it is a fresh triumph of the National Policy that articles made from those materials are cheaper than before. Was there anything more clear after the speech of the Minister of Finance, than that the real, and only, and true, and legitimate way to make goods cheaper is to tax them. That is the latest, greatest, grandest triumph of economic science as expounded by the hon. gentleman. Why should he stop there, why did he not go further? If the Government by putting taxes on goods can make them cheaper, why not extend their beneficent providence a little further. They might as well, and they could just as easily enact that water should run up hill, and that would be found very convenient for a variety of mechanical purposes. But are the prices of farm produce lower than they used to be? Are the prices of land throughout Ontario, Quebec and the other Provinces lower than they used to be? Have wages become less than they used to be? Does the population of our rural districts become fewer? Do our people leave us, to this the answer is, these things are the result of are causes over which no government have any control. This kind of argument scarcely deserves an

answer, and for such arguments as this, I have simply to say that when I hear them gravely stated I hardly know for whom to feel the most contempt—for the individuals who lie and profit by their lies or for the dupes who believe and bleed. In all this one thing only does not vary, and that is the steady growth of taxation. The value of farms may fluctuate; prices may go up and prices may go down, but the number and the weight of our taxes goes on, and on, and on for ever. It was the fashion many years ago to speak of "the ignorant impatience of taxation" I think that Lord Castleragh was the author of that phrase. Well, *nous avons changé tout cela*, and in these days the true statesmen in considering the position of things here would deplore ten times more the "ignorant patience" with taxation which our people manifest. It is easier to cajole than it is to oppress, and I say that one of the worst consequences of the false theory which hon. gentlemen have developed, that it is possible to enrich a people by increasing its taxes is this, that they have thereby done away with almost the only efficient check and curb to extravagance. I have noticed this for the last eight or ten years, in fact ever since this doctrine took root in the public mind in Canada, and if I had not noticed it the growth of public expenditure would proclaim it to men who chose to open their eyes and see. But now, Sir, I hear that a reign of economy is to set in. Mr. Speaker, what new villainy is afloat? What dark mystery of iniquity is being hatched now? I must say that when I hear these gentlemen talking of economy my utmost suspicions are aroused. Can the leopard change his spots; can the Ethiopian change his skin; can we expect grapes from thorns and figs from thistles? Is it not bad enough to cook our accounts; is it not bad enough to pay \$82,929 for law costs and keep a Minister of Justice, and a Deputy Minister of Justice, and a staff and contingents besides? Is it not bad enough to pay \$327,000 for bribing newspapers as we see by these Public Accounts, without counting the cost of printing for the Immigration Department and for matters connected with legislation? Is it not bad enough to pay five or six hundred thousand dollars for putting in types and plant and new printing machinery. Is it not bad enough to see \$400,000 voted for a Franchise Bill for the express purpose of disrating many of the electors of this country? Is it not bad enough to see \$175,000 spent in 18 months for the purchase and work on one experimental farm at Ottawa, which, though it be a desirable thing, could bring us all the good that is ever likely to come from it for an expenditure of one quarter the amount? Is it not bad enough to see \$700 a year paid for each convict in the prison at Manitoba? Is it not bad enough to see \$287,000 spent for the lighting, and the heating, and the furniture, and the taking care of the grounds here and at Rideau Hall? Why, Sir, this is more than some of our most important Provinces get as their *per capita* subsidy. We absolutely spend on these trifles, on our gas bill, our water bill and outlay for keeping the grounds in order here and at Major's Hill Park and at Rideau Hall \$287,000 a year and yet the Government talks to us about economy. All over this country we find in little villages of seven or eight hundred, aye, even of three or four hundred souls, public works erected at a cost of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars as bribes to these constituencies and buildings erected which incur an expenditure of over \$1,200 a year, including interest and maintenance, for the purpose of providing shelter or a post office which does not give us a revenue of more than \$400 a year. Could this condition of things exist in England or the United States? Were I able to stand on the floor of the House of Commons or on the floor of Congress and to point to items in the Public Accounts showing that in England five or six hundred thousand pounds sterling went to subsidise the *Times*, and any other paper, which stood ready to stab some public man under the fifth rib, if in

the United States I could point to a subsidy of four millions a year paid for the purpose of retaining United States papers in the service of the Government, would that Government in the United States, or would that Government in England last for one single day? No, Sir, they would be hurled from the places that they had misused; yet in our Auditor General's Report year after year we find that two or three hundred thousand dollars are deliberately expended for no other purpose than to bribe, from one end of this Dominion to the other, some particular newspapers which it may be convenient for the Ministers to subsidise out of the public pockets. These men talk of economy! Why, look at their expenditure on public lands. The total income in 1887 was \$191,781. What was the total expenditure? To collect \$191,000 we expended \$461,474. In 1888 we did better; we collected \$217,000, and it only cost us \$426,820 to do it; and I dare say that next year we will collect \$220,000 and only spend \$420,000. Now, in that sum for the collection of revenue I include the sum charged to capital account, the sum spent in the department, the Minister's salary and contingencies, and I get this grand result which I present to these advocates of economy: in two years we have succeeded spending \$888,296 for the purpose of collecting \$488,864, in towards the bill of \$58,000,000 due on the 1st January, 1891. Sir, I won't repeat what I have said of the management of the Intercolonial Railway further than this, that when you spend \$5,750,000, counting interest, to collect \$2,980,000, it is time indeed for economy in the management of our public affairs. I will take the whole record of hon. gentlemen, during the last twenty-one years. They began in 1867, with an expenditure of \$13,500,000, when I came into office in 1874, I found bills awaiting me of \$24,250,000, though I only spent \$23,300,000; when I left office in 1878 my expenditure was \$23,500,000. You heard to-day that our expenditure for 1888, not including sums improperly charged to capital expenditure, was now \$46,713,000. There, Sir, is a record of these hon. gentlemen's past economy in two lines. I will not say anything, because really I have not time to discuss it, of that notable stroke of business of borrowing money at 3½ per cent. and lending it at 1½ per cent.; but when I look at the records of the savings banks, and when I see that the Government of Canada deem it prudent and economical to borrow thirty or forty millions at 30 per cent. above the current market rates, I must observe that it is a kind of economy which does not particularly recommend itself to my judgment, at any rate. Our position is remarkable in another respect, that, unfortunately for us, we have a very large nominal income; I say unfortunately, because when you have an apparent income of \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000, a great many expenses, which are really very large for our means, appear to worthy people to be very small. It hardly strikes them as of the real importance it is when we talk of an expenditure of \$200,000 or \$300,000 as being important against a total income of \$36,750,000. But when we come to analyse the facts, what do we find? We find a nominal income of \$36,000,000, but after deducting the expenses of collection of the revenue and fixed charges, we find a real income of \$9,750,000, which, if you deduct the sums improperly charged to capital account, would be reduced to \$9,250,000. That is the true position of the affairs of Canada to-day; that is to say, that 75 per cent. of our whole income, in one form or other, is mortgaged. I will give the hon. gentleman the totals from his own estimates:

Interest on sinking fund .....	\$12,107,725
Subsidies .....	4,100,000
Charges for collection of revenue .....	8,774,000
Charges for Indians .....	1,078,000
Total .....	\$26,060,000

Which represent to all intents and purposes fixed charges against a nominal income of \$36,000,000. Now,

Sir, out of that comparatively small income of about \$10,000,000 what do we find? We find charges like these: Civil government, \$1,316,000; charges for keeping these buildings and Rideau Hall in order, lighting and warming and repairing them, \$300,000; law costs and newspapers, \$100,000; pensions and superannuation, \$326,000. That is the way that our money goes on an effective income of about \$10,000,000 a year all told. Now, I desire to say this: In my mind, looking at the real condition of our affairs, it would not be true, I have never pretended that it was true, to say that Canada had made no progress at all, or even that Canada had not made considerable progress in certain directions. In twenty-one years, or even in ten years or seven years, Canada, being such as she is, and inhabited by a people such as ours, could not fail to make some progress in some directions, no matter how bad the system of government almost, or how bad the fiscal system under which it was administered. But what I do say is, that the progress made has been partial and one-sided. It has been far below par, far less than our natural resources warranted us in expecting; and I say that whether you take as the standard of comparison, our own progress in former years, or the progress of sister colonies, such as New South Wales or any of the other Australian colonies, or if you prefer it, the progress of the United States when their population was the same as ours, or its progress at the present moment. A great deal of the progress which hon. gentlemen opposite claim is purely and simply displacement; what one man has gained has been in too many cases another man's loss. Why, Sir, but the other day the Legislature of Ontario was compelled to pass a law to prevent one town taking manufactories from another, that is, to prevent it bonusing a manufacturer engaged in business in another town to induce him to remove his factory to them, and so injuring its neighbors for its own special profit. Now, it is perfectly true, that certain towns and cities have grown, some of them considerably; and I for one do not grudge them any growth that is fairly made or due to the natural advantages of their position. I am willing to join hon. gentlemen opposite in congratulating the country on the remarkable progress made by such cities as Toronto, in Ontario, or Montreal in Quebec. But is the growth of those cities to be taken as a fair indication of the growth of the population generally? What has been the growth in the good city of Quebec or the good cities of Halifax, St. John or Charlottetown? True, some places have benefited, though quite as much, I believe, from the natural advantages of their position as from anything in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I say that while it is very doubtful if the progress that has been made would not have been quite as great if these artificial stimuli had been withdrawn, what there can be no possibility of doubt about is this, that under the false pretext of advancing a few interests we have enormously increased our debts and our taxes, we have suffered a frightful loss of people, and we have failed to settle the new territory on which so much depends. Briefly, I say, that the policy of the Government has resulted in this: It has made a few score, peradventure a few hundreds, of men much richer than they ought honestly to have been, and has made several millions of people, from one end of the country to the other, very much poorer than they ought to be to-day. Now I am not so young a politician as not to know that for purposes of political support, and notably in Canada to-day, the rich few are able, to a very great extent, to outweigh the many. I know perfectly well that they are exceedingly useful for the purpose of supplying those necessary funds which are required to manipulate refractory constituencies. I know that they understand, and understand well, how to control the public press, aye, and how to hoodwink a

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

very considerable number of people at whose expense they are growing rich. The hon. gentleman was wise enough not to say much about another point, for I have noticed in these discussions that his friends in the House and his friends outside want to talk a great deal of the notable victory which the protective policy lately obtained in the United States, when Free Trade and Cleveland received a popular majority of 100,000 in the whole of the United States. They are very fond of pointing to the number of the seats they hold in this House as conclusive and absolute proof of their superior sagacity and wisdom. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I know myself of twelve seats in the Province of Ontario, enough to have completely reversed their position in Ontario and most completely reversed their position in the House, if they had been transferred to where they belonged—I know of twelve seats in Ontario which were carried by a collective majority, for the whole twelve, of 383 votes. Why, I myself, my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland)—could have polled, if we had chosen to exert ourselves, an additional Liberal majority in those three constituencies, ten times greater than the whole collective majority of 383 in the twelve counties I have referred to. And that majority of 383 was obtained by bribery, by virtue of the Gerrymander Act, by virtue of Franchise Bills, by virtue of Indian votes, by virtue of public buildings, erected in places 500 or 600 strong, and by every other known means of corruption of which I have heard or read. I now come to a still more important question, and that is: What possible remedies for these evils, which have grown to such a height, can we suggest? In my opinion the remedies are two. First of all—and as to this I do not blame the hon. the Minister of Finance so much, because he is but a young member of the Cabinet, and, though he is constitutionally responsible for the sins of the Government, still he is not responsible, morally, for all of them, fortunately for himself. He would have a heavy burden to carry out into the wilderness if he were to be made the scapegoat. Now these hon. gentlemen, for their own reasons, for their own objects, have chosen deliberately to destroy the whole financial basis on which our Confederation rested, and I say there is but one remedy for that. We have now come to a point when, if we wish to establish sound relations among the Provinces of the Dominion, we must put a check on the one hand to this unfair and vexatious interference on the part of the Dominion Government with provincial rights; and, on the other hand, to the constant demand by the Provinces on the Treasury of the Dominion. I say that our present system is as bad as bad can be; I say that it is faulty in every possible respect; I say that it is unsound, both in principle and practice, and is contrary to every constitutional doctrine by which representative countries have ever been governed. What does it mean? It means that one body of men are to spend the money and another to find it. Could you devise a system which does more mischief, which gives of necessity more encouragement to bribery, which offers a more direct premium to extravagance than the policy the hon. gentlemen opposite have initiated. They were not to blame perhaps for the introduction of the system of subsidies in the first instance, because it is probable Confederation could not have been brought about otherwise; but they are to blame, and they have been to blame, after Confederation was once brought about, for destroying the financial basis on which Confederation rested. The remedy I offer is revision of the constitution. We may have to pay handsomely for past folly, but almost at any cost it is better that we should establish matters once for all on a firm and stable basis, that the Provinces should go their way and manage their own affairs, and the Dominion Parliament for the future go its way and manage

its own affairs. The second remedy is the one indicated by me and my friends here in our places last year. That remedy is to seek for trade relations where alone really valuable enlarged trade relations can be found. It is to seek for them within our reach and at our door, not 10,000 miles away—not in the Antipodes, not to go to South America for what we can get ten times better in North America and at one-twentieth of the cost and trouble; but let me say that if ever official returns spoke in trumpet tones in confirmation of the policy advocated on this side and of the line we took last year, they are the identical trade returns I have in my hand. What are the facts? I have mentioned them before, but they will bear reciting again. What do these returns tell us? They tell us that last year, out of a total trade of \$193,050,000, we had a trade with the United States alone of \$91,053,913; they tell us that out of a total volume of exports of our own produce of \$81,382,000, not mentioning goods we do not produce, the United States has bought from us \$40,407,483 worth, Great Britain, \$33,648,000, and the whole of the rest of the world, excepting the United States, \$40,974,060—just \$500,000 worth more than the United States did; and yet we are to turn our back on the United States and are to go 10,000 miles away to see if somebody will buy a few dollars worth of goods from us. Now, is it not a thing which he that runs may read, a thing which ought to open, if anything can open, the eyes of gentlemen opposite, that at the very moment when they were occupied in this House belittling our trade with the United States last year—they are learning more wisdom now, I am happy to say—talking grandiloquently of how well Canada could do without the trade of the United States, the United States trade with us was growing by leaps and bounds. Could there be a better proof of the immense possibilities that that trade would afford to us, under proper development, than the fact that, fettered and handcuffed as it is, with all the impediments that two hostile tariffs can throw in its way, nevertheless last year, while we were deliberately refusing to consider the question, that trade increased by well nigh \$10,000,000; and those returns hardly indicate the true extent of that trade. In the first place, it is well known that our exports to the United States are systematically under-valued. It is well known that what are called short returns are probably a good deal too small. I have here the United States returns for 1887, and likewise our own returns for 1887, and I call the attention of the House to a few notable facts. According to the United States returns, in 1887 we sent to the United States, paying duty, 58,071 cattle. Our own returns only showed 45,981. We sent to the United States, by their returns, 20,695 horses; our returns only showed 18,527. We sent to the United States 477,753 sheep, according to their returns, while our returns only showed 363,000, besides a large number of all these kinds of animals entered as not paying duty. I cannot say how much may be involved in that item, but it does appear to me that a very considerable amount ought to be added on both sides, exports and imports, to the volume of our trade with the United States, and the more so as it is known to me, and I dare say to the Minister of Customs, that in spite of all the restrictions which he has placed on that trade, and in spite of all the vigilance of his officers, a great many goods do find their way into Canada without the formality of going through the Custom house.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you call that a formality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not say that going through the Custom house is often a mere formality, but I will say without paying tribute to our Canadian Cæsar. I am not going at this hour to repeat many of the arguments which I used last year. Those arguments, have not yet been met or answered, and therefore I will refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the speech which I then

delivered for the further arguments I could very easily advance in regard to this matter. I have no doubt that, if any hon. gentlemen on that side desire to take up our challenge, they will find many of my hon. friends here ready to make our views plain to their understanding, if they are not now. What is wanted just now is rather to understand exactly the obstacles which are in our way, and I contend that the chief obstacle to the carrying out of the well understood and well ascertained wishes of the people of Canada is the conduct and the past attitude of the Government of Canada. Their fault in that respect is very much the same as their fault in the matter of the fisheries. They have managed, in some way or other, to convince the people of the United States, and to convince the Government of the United States, that the Government of Canada, whatever the people of Canada may be, are not at all desirous of cultivating friendly relations with the United States. I cannot stop to discuss how much of that feeling may be due to the downright stupidity of the Government, as shown in the case of the export duty on sawlogs, how much of it may be due to mere selfishness, how much may be due to a desire on their part to promote their own interests and the interests of the combines and manufacturers which they represent, but there is too much reason to fear that these men are to-day the secret opponents of the wishes of the people of Canada. They hardly dare openly to avow the hostility to the United States which they manifested last year, because they had several lessons which must have opened their eyes to the fact that a very large number of the people of Canada desire full and free and unrestricted trade with the United States; but there is danger that privately they will do everything they can to make a fair treaty impossible. It cannot well be otherwise. Reciprocity between the United States and Canada means wealth and freedom to a very large proportion of our people—freedom particularly from unjust taxation, and from the power which is put in the hands of the monopolists who are grinding the people of Canada to pieces to-day. Therefore, the Government to-day cannot earnestly seek to promote reciprocity, though it may be in their interests to so pretend. Unless the people of Canada convince them that it is at their peril if they push their negligence any further they will conduct these negotiations in such a way as to lead to foreseen and predestined failure. I do not think they will dare to provoke the United States, but I believe they will privately interpose obstacles between what we desire and its accomplishment. This is a case in which you must judge these men not by their words but by their acts, and it is by their acts in the past that we have to judge them; it is by noting such paltry quibbles as that in regard to packages of fruit, it is by such mistakes as that in regard to the export duty on logs, it is by such acts as these that I judge that, if they dared, they would be openly hostile to the United States. I have shown what I believed, and I have given reasons for my belief, to be in the true interest of this country at present. I am very far from saying that the position in which we now find ourselves was the inevitable result of Confederation. I believe, on the contrary, that with reasonable prudence, our position might be very much better than it is. But it is idle to discuss that now. We are not concerned with what might have been, but with what is at this day and this hour. I contend that our position is one of arrested development, and I say that, all things considered, this is the best way out of it. I say that not only is the project we advocate eminently calculated to benefit us materially, but I claim for it this great benefit, this indirect result, that, if it were carried out, it would necessarily curb the extravagance we deplore, and would, to a great extent, though perhaps not altogether, because that mainly depends on the people themselves, ensure honest government in this country. The moment is op-

porture. Almost the last act of the House of Representatives in the United States was to pass unanimously a resolution which may not perhaps indicate the precise mode or the precise way in which commercial relations between the two countries can best be settled, but which I take and which the Government should take, as holding out the olive branch to us, which is more than we deserve or than the Government deserves on the part of the United States. It is a declaration that they are prepared to treat with us for freer trade relations, and it is an answer to the absurd statement which has been made that the United States had not any desire for free and fair trade on free and fair terms with the people of Canada. More than that, it is a triumphant vindication of the position which we have always taken on this subject. Let us do our duty. Let us show to the United States that we are truly desirous of freedom of trade and friendly relations with them, and I am perfectly certain that, when the time comes and the United States are fairly approached, they will be willing to meet us in the same spirit. In order that there may be no mistake, and that the Government may understand that we are determined to fight this question out on the same lines that we have always fought it, I beg to move in amendment that you do not now leave the Chair, but that all the words after "that" be struck out, and that it be resolved :

In the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

Mr. TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Riopel.)

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE—SURVEY.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether Mr. McLea Walbank has completed the survey of the Indian Reserve of Caughnawaga in the county of Laprairie? Whether he has furnished to the Government a report of his operations? What sums have been paid, up to this date, to Mr. Walbank, or to others, for making the said survey, and how much remains due to him?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The work of the survey of the above reserve commenced in the fall of 1882, and was only completed last season. It proved to be a very complicated matter, owing to the very irregular manner in which the Indians had taken up locations on the reserve—the outlines of which had to be surveyed with a view to ascertain what were the improvements made by each claimant and the value of the same. The reserve contains 12,327½ acres, and the cost of the survey of the same, when completed, will be about \$—,000—Mr. Walbank has reported to the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

## NATURAL GAS IN WESTERN ONTARIO—MR. COSTE'S REPORT.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) asked, Has Mr. Coste reported upon the result of his investigations during the past season on the subject of natural gas in western Ontario?

Mr. DEWDNEY. On reference to the last annual report of the Interior Department, at page 30 will be found Mr. Coste's report on his investigation during the past season on the subject of natural gas in western Ontario.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) asked, Is Mr. Coste still on the staff of the Geological Survey; if not, when did he resign?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Coste is still in the service of the Geological Survey.

## QUEBEC MONEY ORDER OFFICES.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to make the post offices of all the county towns in the Province of Quebec offices at which money orders are issued and paid?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not the intention of the Government to make the post offices of all the county towns in the Province of Quebec offices at which money orders are issued and paid.

## THE POSTMASTER OF CHESTER, P.Q.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, Has the Government received any complaint against the postmaster of Chester, county of Arthabaska, and if so, has any action been taken against such complaint?

Mr. HAGGART. A complaint was made by Mr. Oct. Gaudet, but subsequently withdrawn. A complaint was also made by the mail carrier, Mr. D. Coté, respecting the alleged refusal of the postmaster to give him the mail. This was referred to the Post Office Inspector to arrange.

## DAILY MAIL BETWEEN MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a daily mail between Murray Harbor South and Montague?

Mr. HAGGART. An application for a daily mail between Murray Harbor South and Montague, has been received and sent to the Post Office Inspector for report.

Mr. WELSH (for Mr. DAVIES, P.E.I.) asked, Was any survey held on the breakwater at New London, P.E.I., during the summer of 1888? If so, by whom? Was a report of the condition of the breakwater made to the department, and is it the intention of the Minister to cause the breakwater to be repaired and extended during the coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed by the chief engineer of my department that there was no survey, and, therefore, I am not able to answer the second part of the question. My attention being called to it, I will see what can be done.

## THE SHIPPING OF SEAMEN.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What instructions (if any) have been given to the shipping master in St. John, N.B., as to the shipping of seamen in United States vessels? Has the Government received any official notice or been otherwise informed of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to the Secretary of State

upon the subject, in which he states:—"And should the Canadian Government approve of the action of the shipping master at St. John, I shall deem it my duty to instruct the officers of this department to require all shipments of seamen upon British vessels in American ports to be made before the United States Commissioners, and not before foreign Consular Officers."

Mr. TUPPER. The only instructions given to the shipping master at the port of St. John have been to the effect that the provisions of the Act relating to the shipping of seamen should be carried out. The Government has not received the information to which the hon. gentleman alludes.

#### A LOST DREDGE.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide funds for the purchase or construction of a dredge to replace the dredge which was lost in the Straits of Northumberland during a gale in the fall of 1887?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government does not intend during this Session to ask money for a new dredge.

#### FISHING IN RIVER MATANE.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether the right of fishing in River Matane has been leased or farmed only? If so, to whom, for how many years, and at what price, and on what conditions has the same been leased?

Mr. TUPPER. The right of angling in this river is leased to Sir Alexander Galt by an indenture dated the 1st of January, 1887. The lease expires in nine years from that date. The consideration of the lease is \$100 a year.

#### CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend "The Customs Act" and the Act amending the same, and to provide: (a) That the bringing of goods into Canada by land conveyance other than railway cars shall be prohibited during the night and on statutory holidays, except under permit and supervision; (b) That the Board of Customs and Dominion appraisers shall be authorised to review the valuations of port appraisers; (c) That in every case the value for duty shall include the charges of transportation and shipment, and shall be that of the quantity imported; (d) That such value shall include any royalty, rent or charge in respect of exclusive rights or territorial limits; (e) That goods entered for warehouse shall be placed therein without delay; (f) That information shall be exigible as to goods in transit through Canada for statistical and other purposes; (g) That the manner of ascertaining the time of exportation from any place out of Canada shall be defined; (h) That moneys deposited in lieu of articles smuggled, and subject to seizure, shall be treated in like manner as if such articles had been seized.

Motion agreed to.

#### INSPECTION, ETC., OF TIMBER AND LUMBER.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to assimilate and amend the laws in force in the several Provinces in relation to the inspection, culling and measuring of timber and lumber, and to provide that the Governor in Council may authorise the payment of a sum not exceeding ten dollars a day for each day's actual service, and not exceeding in the whole three hundred dollars in any one year to each examiner of inspectors of timber, and of an annual salary not exceeding two thousand dollars to each chief inspector of timber; that every manufacturer of timber or lumber shall pay to the Crown an annual registration fee of two dollars, if his annual output is less than one million feet, board measure, and of ten dollars when such output is greater, and in addition one-fifth of one cent for each thousand feet, board measure, of timber manufactured by him, except square timber, and one-tenth of one cent for each ton of forty cubic feet of square timber manufactured by him; and that as respects the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, out of the sum so paid, and any moneys granted by Parliament, the Governor in Council may grant annuities, not exceeding two hundred dollars in each case, to such

cullers as are now in receipt of like annuities, or who are not appointed inspectors and whose services are dispensed with.

Motion agreed to.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (for Sir JOHN MACDONALD) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that a pension made be paid to any member of the North-West Mounted Police Force, other than a commissioned officer, for life, if such member joined the force subsequent to the 23rd day of May, 1873, and completed twenty-five years' service, or if, having completed fifteen years' service, he retires in consequence of bodily or mental infirmity, subject to an obligation in the latter case to return to duty if the incapacity ceases; and that the scale on which such pensions shall be calculated shall be as follows:—If the member has completed fifteen but less than twenty-one years' service, one-fiftieth of the annual pay for each completed year of service; twenty-one and less than twenty-five years' service, twenty-fiftieths, and in addition two-fiftieths for every completed year of service over twenty; twenty-five years, thirty-fiftieths, and in addition one-fiftieth for every completed year over twenty-five, not to exceed, however, two-thirds of his annual pay at retirement; and further, that the annual pay shall be deemed to be the average annual pay, exclusive of extra pay or allowances, during the three years preceding retirement; and also that if the infirmity causing the retirement is caused by the default or evil habits of the member retiring, a less amount may be fixed by the Governor in Council as his pension.

Motion agreed to.

#### POST OFFICE ACT.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the sum payable for registration of a letter, unquestionably containing valuable matter, by an official of the Post Office, in default of its being presented for registration, shall be fixed in like manner as other registration charges; that the postage on local or drop letters shall be two cents per ounce; on periodicals issued less frequently than at intervals of seven days, from office of publication, and on specimen newspapers, one cent per pound; that no periodical may be carried free of postage under the 26th section of "The Post Office Act" if it is published at intervals of more than seven days; that the postage on other printed matter, and on packages of seeds and matters of a cognate description, shall be one cent for each four ounces, and on printer's manuscript and proof, maps, lithographs, photographs, documents partly printed and partly written (not being letters), such as deeds and policies of insurance, and on miscellaneous mailable matter, one cent for each two ounces.

Motion agreed to.

#### REQUEST FOR A MAP.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the permission of the House to have a map of Canada suspended on the wall for the purposes of illustration during the Budget debate. I think it is very likely that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as other speakers, may wish to refer to it in discussing the question before the House. I presume there will be no objection to this.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Showing the New England States.

Mr. FOSTER. Canada as it is to be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not suppose there is any objection to the request of the hon. gentleman, if the House wishes a map to be there. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman wants a map while he is speaking?

Mr. CHARLTON. While any member is speaking in this debate, in order to illustrate the geographical relations of the two countries. The map could be hung on the wall just below the Speaker's gallery.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not require a map, but after he is through, if the hon. gentleman wishes a map it can be hung up for his speech.



Mr. CHARLTON. I should like it to be hung up now, though, if it should be any detriment to the Minister of Marine in speaking, it might be hung afterwards; but I would like the question settled now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume that when an hon. gentleman asks for such a simple thing as that a map should be placed on the wall for the illustration of his speech, there can be no possible objection to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There does not seem to be any objection, but if the hon. gentleman would allow the matter to stand until the recess at six o'clock, a map might be put up during the two hours we are away.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would answer very well, unless some gentleman should require it for purposes of illustration before six o'clock.

#### ORDER FOR PAPERS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the House proceeds with the Orders of the Day, I would like to call attention to another matter. At the first meeting for business of the Public Accounts Committee, held ten days ago, an order was made that the Militia Department should produce before the committee certain documents and vouchers. These papers are, no doubt, pretty voluminous, and it has been the custom, heretofore, to have them placed in the hands of the clerk of the committee for the inspection of those interested in them, prior to the meeting of the committee. It is ten days since that order was made by the Public Accounts Committee, and the committee has not yet been called together, and, up to the meeting of the House this afternoon, the order has not been complied with by the Militia Department, although it has been complied with by the Auditor General. If the Public Accounts Committee is at all to discharge its duties satisfactorily in examining into the expenditure of the \$36,000,000 spent last year, its orders should be complied with. I may say further, that the fact of the first meeting of the Public Accounts Committee being held in the fifth week after the opening of Parliament, is hardly a proper compliance with the spirit of the House in establishing a Public Accounts Committee for the purpose of auditing the Public Accounts. If this information is withheld, or only given at a time when it is useless, then, I would submit whether there is any necessity for continuing the committee at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The order of the Public Accounts Committee was communicated to my department the same day or the day after. I gave immediate instructions to have the papers prepared. The hon. gentleman says they have not yet been furnished. I will enquire into the matter and see the cause of the delay, but, so far as my instructions are concerned, I gave orders to have the papers prepared forthwith. The work is voluminous, and possibly the clerks may be at work yet, but I shall enquire and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member was present at the meeting when the order was made, and, therefore, it did not take until the succeeding day for him to know that such an order had issued; nor do I think the excuse of taking time to copy the papers is a valid one. I want the originals, and the order of the committee was for the originals.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw attention to the fact that although we are now in the fifth week of the Session and a great many orders have been granted for returns, only seven returns have been brought down. If hon. members are to discharge their duties intelligently, they must be put in  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

possession of these returns in fair time. I hope the Government will see that they are brought down without further delay. We have had a great many brought down which are either statutory returns or returns ordered last year. It appears to have become the habit to bring down returns the Session following the one when the orders were given. This system should be stopped, if hon. gentlemen are to discharge their duties properly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed that not only the returns ordered by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) have not been brought down, but that quite a number of other returns moved for by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) and ordered by the Public Accounts Committee to be prepared, have not yet been brought down. It is quite true that the Public Accounts Committee have only had two meetings, one of which was for organisation, but we have now been five weeks in Session, and if the Government cannot bring down papers ordered, it will make the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee a perfect farce.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE, &c.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I call the attention of the House to item No. 9, respecting bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes. I intend moving the House into Committee on this Bill on Tuesday next.

#### SPEEDY TRIAL OF INDICTABLE OFFENCES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 17) to make further provision respecting the speedy trial of certain indictable offences.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was thought better to re-enact the Statute than merely to amend it, and it has been altered in such a way as to be applicable to the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The provisions relating to indictable offences will be administered in those Provinces by the county court judges, and I have several amendments which I will place before the chairman for the purpose of simplifying some of the provisions of the Bill as originally drafted. As regards the subject of jurisdiction, in order to remove all doubt and difficulty, I propose that the Bill shall not come into force, in the Provinces mentioned, until concurrent legislation be adopted by their Legislatures. Communication has been had with the Province of Nova Scotia, during recess, and I believe an enactment will be passed in the Nova Scotia Legislature to confer the jurisdiction on county court judges there. It may be that this Parliament has the power to do so, but I think it inexpedient, even if we had the power, to exercise it without the concurrence of the authority which has constituted the court. I intend, therefore, to ask for an amendment which will bring the Bill into force only by proclamation.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out subsection *b* and sub-sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 in that clause, and to substitute other provisions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By the British North America Act, the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction are under the provincial Legislatures. Is not the hon. gentleman undertaking to interfere with that jurisdiction of the provincial Legislatures? You are not creating a court for the better administration of the laws of Canada, but you are stating what is the jurisdiction, or in what court a criminal shall be tried for the offence of which he is charged.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Irrespective of any question as to our right to confer or impose jurisdiction, I am endeavoring to deal with the subject as in the line of procedure altogether. I think, if the hon. gentleman will give his attention to the suggestion that I endeavored to explain a few moments ago, he will find that we will accomplish that result. If we come to the view the hon. gentleman has just expressed, that it is not in our power at all to create a tribunal—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought that was one of the hon. gentleman's objections.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I stated that we have expressly conferred upon us the power to create courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada. But we are not doing that. We are undertaking to confer jurisdiction upon a provincial court, and to state in what court the criminal shall be tried. Now, what I am calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to is, that by the British North America Act, so far as provincial courts are concerned, it is for the provincial Legislatures to say what shall be the jurisdiction of each court, and it is for them to say in what court the criminal offence shall be tried.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman has no difficulty about the right to create a criminal court, I think there can be no objection to the Bill at all. It is true that these courts, as now created, are constituted by the provincial authority; but the committee will remember that we have the power, under the British North America Act, to impose our jurisdiction and our business upon the provincial courts as established by the provincial authority. That, I think, is clear. It is on that principle that legislation has proceeded all along. But we intend, in principle, to avoid any conflict of that kind by the amendment, as I explained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the case the hon. gentleman refers to, I think the decision of the Privy Council goes to show that we created a new court. It became a court created by the Parliament of Canada, and it was only a mode of designating those who were to be the judges in that court—if my recollection of the decision be correct. But this is a wholly different matter, and I do not see how the hon. gentleman can make a jurisdiction expressly given to the court to try a particular case, a matter of procedure. It is something altogether apart from procedure. If you were to lay down that rule in every case, you would simply take power to determine what the procedure should be and to determine where a criminal should be tried, and then this provision of subsection 14 of section 92 would be inoperative—the administration of justice in the Province, and the maintenance and organisation of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction. Now, if the provincial Legislature were to say—and I think this would be a fair test of the question of jurisdiction—that a criminal shall be tried in a particular court that it names, and not elsewhere, could the hon. gentleman or could the House, by the Bill of the hon. gentleman, give jurisdiction to one of these courts in this way? I do not think so. It seems to me clear that we cannot do so. It would be, in effect, rendering nugatory this provision of the constitution concerning criminal jurisdiction, including procedure in civil matters in those courts. The hon. gentleman goes much beyond that, and designates the court in which the crime shall be tried.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it makes the slightest difference by what name we call the method we adopt. This Parliament has power to regulate the mode of trying controverted elections, and it took the Superior

Courts of the Provinces and imposed upon them—without any provincial enactment whatever, those courts having been created and organised by provincial enactment—the jurisdiction to try controverted elections. It was held that that was *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada. It was one of two things—it seems to me to be a matter of perfect indifference which it was—either we were creating a new tribunal for the purpose of wielding a jurisdiction which we had power to create, and the procedure of which we had power to regulate, or we were imposing that jurisdiction upon a court already created by another authority. It was declared that we had power to do that, and that is expressly what I propose to do by this Bill. I think it is immaterial whether we are, in effect, creating a new tribunal for the purpose of dealing with criminal procedure, or whether we are imposing the new procedure upon an existing tribunal created by the Province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, in the case the hon. gentleman refers to, and the decision in that case, there is this point made by the Judicial Committee. They state that the jurisdiction conferred upon the court was not an ordinary civil jurisdiction, but it was one that belonged to Parliament, and was specially vested in Parliament; and that Parliament, in designating a particular tribunal for the purpose of trying controverted elections, was simply conferring upon that tribunal a part of its own authority which it exercised itself for a special purpose, and that in doing so, while it stated that the judges of certain courts should be constituted a tribunal for this trial, it was creating a tribunal for that special purpose. That did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the Provinces in creating the courts; it did not deal with the civil or criminal law at all, it dealt with the law of Parliament. It was creating a special tribunal outside these functions that were mentioned as belonging to the Local Legislature under the head of civil and criminal jurisdiction; it was the institution of a court by a special Act, the members of which are designated in a particular way; and I do not see that that has any bearing at all upon the case that is now before us. Here we are dealing with a matter that is specially within the powers of the Local Legislatures. It is not a law of Parliament, such as the matter dealt with in that Act and decided by the Judicial Committee. This is a power within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, or the Local Legislatures of the respective Provinces, and the Act says that it includes "the administration of justice in the Provinces, including the constitution, maintenance and organisation of provincial courts." Now, how is the court constituted? Not simply by saying that it shall be composed of four or five judges, but by stating, in addition to the number of judges that shall constitute the court, what their jurisdiction is to be. If you create what you call a court, and do not confer upon it any jurisdiction, why, it would not be a judicial tribunal; the Act itself would be a mockery. You designate the power which the court is to possess. Now, the powers that the Local Legislatures may designate a court to possess, are everything relating to the criminal and civil law of the Dominion as well as everything relating to the civil law, both of the Dominion and of the Legislature. If you are not satisfied with the manner in which that power is exercised, there is a special power conferred upon you to create courts of your own. You cannot, by creating these courts, take away the jurisdiction belonging to the provincial courts. If you introduce a Bill to declare that all the laws of Canada shall be administered by special courts, while you may confer concurrent jurisdiction on those courts, you cannot take away from the provincial courts the power already conferred upon them. The present Bill goes beyond the question of procedure and deals with the constitution of the court: it states in what court the trial should be had, and in so doing

it is interfering with the powers belonging to the provincial Legislatures.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am unable to see any distinction between the question involved in this Bill and that which has been previously rescinded, for the reason that in dealing with any subject over which we have power we could take a provincial court and confer jurisdiction on it. It matters not whether the result of that was simply to add that jurisdiction to the provincial court, or really to turn the provincial court into a Dominion court. It is proposed, however, that the Act shall be suspended until the Legislatures of the Provinces shall have an opportunity of conferring the jurisdiction in question.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The proposed court will be constituted by the Dominion Government, and, in my opinion, this question is more in the nature of procedure, and the power has been already exercised. No doubt election courts stand on different footing, but under the Winding-up Act and the Insolvent Act power was given to a single judge to exercise similar powers to those proposed.

On schedule A,

Mr. DAWSON. There are two new temporary judicial districts, the districts of Manitoulin and Rainy River, which I would suggest should be included in the first section of this Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think they are only magisterial divisions as yet.

Mr. DAWSON. There are no judges yet appointed, only stipendiary magistrates; but judges may be appointed at any time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. But before judges may be appointed, there must be legislation by the Ontario Legislature erecting them into judicial districts. I understand that a Bill is to be passed at the present Session of the Ontario Legislature for that purpose, and after that it will be competent to amend this Act to include them. But I think it would be unwise to include them until a county judge is appointed.

Committee rose and reported.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion few Ministers occupying the very important position of Finance Minister of the Administration of the day have had the great satisfaction which was enjoyed by the present occupant of that position a few evenings ago, when, by an extraordinary array of statistics, by his careful and exhaustive review of the twenty-one years of our national existence, he was able to force from the financial critic of the Treasury benches a confession of that hon. gentleman's utter inability to meet him, or to challenge any of the very strong positions which he took up at the outset of the debate. That hon. gentleman did, for a moment, go through the form of meeting some of the hon. Minister's propositions, with the statement that he was happy to agree with him in reference to those propositions. But he invariably misconstrued the proposition so as to suit his own case, and after preliminary observations of that kind, dived into his desk and took out the arguments that he has handled Session after Session, year after year. Over and over again he would wheel round, in his favorite, warlike position, place his back to the enemy, and en-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

deavor to rally his forces. Like the celebrated general in the oft-told story, he himself was unable to do anything, but he pointed out to his followers the enemy on the field of battle, and said he knew there were men on those back benches who would face the position taken up by the Finance Minister, and after repeating his old speech and his old indictment, he started for home. I say that was a gratifying position for the Minister of Finance. And what was really the whole sum and substance of the criticism of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? He went over his old brief, he gave us the old arguments, cooked accounts and all, that had been made and refuted over and over again, and then, fearing that he had omitted any of those wonderful calculations and theories, so familiar to us all, he said: For the rest, I refer hon. gentlemen to *Hansard*. Well, I could, with satisfaction, perhaps, to the House, simply refer hon. members to the replies to be found in *Hansard*, which were made to the hon. gentleman's speeches; but I have a more satisfactory refutation than that as to every charge almost which he made in this debate against the honor of the Government and against the position and the policy stated by the Minister of Finance. I need not refer him to *Hansard*, but after *Hansard* had been well studied, after everyone of his indictments and elaborate financial criticisms had been spread broadcast throughout the country, I can refer him to the elections of 1882 and 1887. The answer to his specious and ingenious criticisms can be found there. But I would call the attention of the House to the extraordinary charge made by a gentleman occupying the important position the hon. gentleman does—the oft-reiterated charge that the Government (if he meant the words in the sense in which he used them) have cooked accounts. That is no new charge. Did the hon. gentleman really believe that he was bringing it for the first time to the attention of the House and the country? There is nothing in the statement he made, or in the facts to which he alluded, that will bear out, in the slightest degree, that very serious charge made against the Minister of the day, and his predecessors. The hon. gentleman made that charge on the floor of the House last year, and there, one gentleman, Mr. McLellan, to whom he alluded in this debate, and to whom he gave a certificate of character on that score, explained to this House the principle upon which those accounts were made out, and the reasons for in some years charging to capital account what in others was charged to revenue. I will not weary the House by going over the explanation which that hon. gentleman made, but will adopt the hon. gentleman's style of argument, and refer to *Hansard* (*vide Hansard*, vol. 2, 1888, page 1096). There will be found the answer to the hon. gentleman's charge, and in that same volume will be found the answer to every criticism the hon. gentleman has made. But with reference to the criticisms in which he endeavored to assail the Finance Department, I have reason to believe the Minister of Finance will take an early opportunity before this subject is disposed of, to give the hon. gentleman what further information there is to be given on that score. When we reflect that that hon. gentleman dared to use, in this House, such language in reference to his opponents, as to describe them as knaves, and the majority of the people as dupes, because the people have expressed their confidence in the Administration of the day, it is high time to remind him, not only of the position he occupies in the counsels of this country, but of the fact that his past record is not of a character to entitle him to hurl those charges across the floor of the House. I wish to tell him that his extraordinary career, his extraordinary characteristics, financially and otherwise, are all known to the people of this country, who have had a very unhappy experience of his official life. The principles to which he has adhered are not only extraordinary, but, to a large extent, amusing. He has been engaged in making calculations

from the day he entered political life down to the present, and the manner in which he impressed the great organ of public opinion, the *Toronto Globe*, when he sat on this side of the House behind the leader of this Government, is worth recalling. His calculations, after careful revision, were then pronounced, by perhaps the ablest man that ever conducted that journal, amusing in the highest degree, and he was told to stick to the figuring business and keep up his amusing character. He has done so. He has sustained the character wonderfully well. What could be more amusing than his attitude in this debate? Fancy the hon. gentleman standing as a financial critic and attacking the Budget Speech in this particular, that there was no estimate made for a contingent liability, that the Government of the day had not come down to Parliament and said: We are fighting tooth and nail, a claim made against the Government for a large amount; we are disputing absolutely any liability before the arbitration, that matter is now *sub judice*; but so fearful, so faint-hearted are we in the action we have taken, that we ask Parliament to provide a sum of money to pay a claim we utterly repudiate and disavow. I repeat the hon. gentleman does not occupy a position which entitles him to hurl this unpleasant charge, to use a mild term, across the House. It will be necessary for me to remind the House that he has been all his life, a rather long political life, a man of two ideas, whether as Conservative or Reformer. I would point out to the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that as far back as 1865, when he just entered political life, he started out with those ideas, and to his credit, if consistency be a credit, he has maintained them down to the present day, with a slight exception, and that was when he was permitted to act as Finance Minister. During those short four or five years in that long career, those two ideas were suppressed, and they gave place to what I believe, in my own judgment, were much more creditable ideas to him and much better for the country. Those ideas were, and they will certainly be recognised by all who have followed him in his later day speeches:—Fear and the exodus. He began in 1865, to argue the necessity of Confederation in order to prevent a terrific exodus from the old Provinces of Canada, and to prevent the absorption of these Provinces into the American Union. These were the ideas which he propounded and by which he endeavored to terrify the people, so as to make them firm believers in Confederation. And what have you seen to-day, what have you noticed in years past, and, in fact, ever since that hon. gentleman, with many of his party, have been driven desperate by defeat after defeat? You find them using the same arguments, and referring to the same exodus, which they used at that time to frighten the people of Canada into the opposite course, now to frighten them into the American Union or into such close relations with that country as would break up Confederation, annihilate our national existence, and place us at the mercy of our neighbors. At Ingersoll, and even in this House, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to point out—though I am glad to know, or, at least, I believe, he had not much support from either side of this House—that England was unable to protect this country against the United States or any other foreign country that might assail us. He endeavored to place in the minds of the people the idea that we should make any bargain we could with the people of the American Union, in order to save us from absorption, as he put it. He went on again to argue as to this question of fear, and he used almost the same language as he did in 1865 on that subject, though then it was with the opposite view. If the House will permit me to make good the point I have taken, I will give a sample of the arguments the hon. gentleman used when he was holding the opposite opinions to those he now holds, and I advance them to show how true it is that he is a man of two ideas, and that he has made no change in the

style and method which he adopted in order to induce the people of Canada to agree with him. In 1865 he said:

"I must again revert to the condition in which we found ourselves during the last few years, and I ask every hon. member to answer for himself whether it was one which it gives him any pleasure to look back upon? Was it pleasant for us, Mr. Speaker, a young country without one penny of debt which has not been incurred for purposes of public utility—was it pleasant for us, I ask, to find our revenue yearly out-running our expenditure in the ratio of 20, 30 or even 40 per cent. per annum? Was it pleasant for us to know that some of our once busiest and most prosperous cities were being depopulated under the pressure of exorbitant taxation? Was it pleasant for us, inhabiting a country able to sustain ten times the present population, to find capital and immigrants alike fleeing from our shores, even if they had to take refuge in a land desolated by civil war? Was it pleasant for us, Sir, the old colony of England which has ever vindicated its attachment to the Empire in fair fight, to know that our apathy and negligence in taking steps for our own defence was fast making us the by-word to both friend and foe?"

That is the language the hon. gentleman now uses in order to induce the people of this country to take the very opposite step from that which they took after those arguments were addressed to them at that time. Not only in 1865, but in 1878, his arguments were almost altogether based on these two points—fear of the United States, and the exodus of the people of Canada. As I have said, he came into power for a short time, and in that time he used as much ingenuity as he now uses in the opposite direction, to show that the exodus was imaginary, and that it was not as great from Canada as it was from the Eastern States of the American Union. That is what he tried to convince the people of during that painful period of our country's history. When Parliament assembled in 1882, the great questions were those of free trade and protection, and these were the arguments he used at that time. So it was in 1888. After the year 1887, when he took the sharp and short turn in regard to the National Policy, you find that he used then, and he now again uses, the arguments which he previously used on the other side. In regard to the question of population, which exercises the hon. gentleman so much, I want to remind him, and to remind the House, that there is a great responsibility resting upon the shoulders of the Opposition for a large portion of the exodus. These hon. gentlemen have endeavored to convince the people in this country, as well as intending immigrants, not only that our land laws are hard and bad to live under in the North-West Territories, but, day after day, they make the fiercest possible assaults, not only upon our institutions, but upon the possibility of our being able to carve out for ourselves an independent commercial and national existence on this continent. Coming from a large Opposition with a large following in the country, these arguments from so many ingenious men, and many able men, must have their weight and must affect the amount of immigration. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was able to remind my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that, in his constituency, where he had a considerable amount of influence, seventy men had left within a few months. I believe that all those who accept the hon. gentleman's arguments must necessarily leave the country. I shall not give my own words as to the other side of this question, but I quote from an American review an article written by a man of whom the Maritime Provinces have reason to be proud, Prof. Schurmann, a man who has given his attention not only to matters educational, but who takes a live interest in his country's welfare. In that article he met the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford and went into the question, and in a very able review, he cited the statistics of the two countries to show that, a century ago, the population of Canada was one-twentieth that of the United States, that fifty years ago it was one-eleventh of that population, and he estimated that, in 1890, in spite of their enormous gains in immigration, our population will be one-thirteenth of theirs; and he contended that, as the best

American lands are already taken up, while ours, which are also richer, are still unoccupied, it is manifest destiny that Canada is now to become the home of foreign settlers on this continent. That is the firm conviction of the people of this country. These gentlemen may enjoy for a time their little triumph in having retarded the settlement of that great country in the North-West, but the time must come, whether there be a good Government or a bad Government in power, when that country will be the only good territory for the occupation for this vast flood of immigrants to enter and settle upon. Before the right hon. gentleman carries out his promise and appeals to the people of this country, we may be able to force the member for South Oxford, by additional statistics, to admit our success in that direction, as he was forced to admit that the statistics which were cited by the hon. the Minister of Finance proved the point he made in the debate, that Canada had made substantial growth, and had prospered since 1868. The hon. gentleman once left his old friends, and the old spirit apparently has not died out of him, because, on a most important point taken by the Finance Minister he left his new friends. The Finance Minister, attacked the position which was taken by the leader of the Opposition at Oakville, when he contended that there had been a decline in the value of Canadian trade. He pointed out that that was apparently a misrepresentation, and that it was an unfair point to take against the country to omit to state the volume of trade and simply allude to the value, and that, in taking that point which was against the progress of the country, he had done an indefensible thing. That important point was taken, and the hon. member for South Oxford for a moment deserted his present leader as he deserted his past leader, in order to have the pleasure and opportunity of stating that that had been his position all along, and that, when he was Finance Minister, he contended that it was unfair to take the value of our imports and exports simply, but that the volume and value of our trade should be taken together. For the purpose of making that point he went back, not only upon his present leader, but a little later on, against the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who, during the speech of the Minister of Finance, had interjected the remark that we had not advanced one jot since 1868. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was forced, by the array of figures and the array of facts which the Minister of Finance brought forward, to admit that we had made substantial progress. But we do not depend upon his admissions, we do not ask his admissions. Voluntary admissions are made day after day by members of that party who are not desperately driven, by those who are in office in the Province of Ontario, who are not in the same condition as hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches in this House; time and again, in recent months, they have declared their conviction that this country has made substantial growth, nay, imposing progress since Confederation. Mr. Mowat and Mr. Ross have made most eloquent speeches upon that subject, and those speeches have done good throughout the country, because they serve to offset these hon. gentlemen, who are not so careful in their statements as to the progress of this country, and who, perhaps, have a reason for their desperation not known to those who are in office in the Province of Ontario. In regard to the volume and value of trade, it is important in this connection to consider the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford, during the time that he was Minister of Finance, year after year, as he well knows, and as he himself stated in this debate, when there was a regular and a persistent decline, not only in the volume but in the value of our trade, when, for instance, in 1874, when the aggregate trade was 217 millions, it steadily declined, year after year, down to 153 millions in 1879—that hon. gentleman pleaded to this House and to the country, that it was

Mr. TUPPER.

not so bad as it really appeared; he said that though the values were declining, and though the volume was declining, the decline in the volume was not alarming. Why, Mr. Speaker, he went further, and his argument then is of special importance now, when we see but a temporary decline, when we have not reached the low point of 1879. We find that in 1879 the aggregate trade, in round numbers, was \$159,000,000, whereas to-day it is \$201,000,000. In this connection it is important to recollect another argument of that hon. gentleman when he was Minister of Finance. He turned to the United States, that country that now elicits his warmest admiration, the very fiscal policy of which country has assumed in his eyes entirely new proportions of late; he turned to that country, and stated that during the most prosperous period in its history, when all went well with the American States, there was a steady decline in the value and volume of their foreign trade for 15 years, and he gave us the years. He said that in 1832 the imports amounted to \$100,000,000, and they rose in 1836 to \$189,000,000. But he stated that 15 years elapsed after 1836 before those imports again reached the figure of 189 millions, and this, said the hon. gentleman, in a period of great prosperity, and with a population growing from 15 to 25 millions. That was all very well in the United States. That was a first-rate argument when he was Minister of Finance, but, forsooth, to-day, while he admitted the force of the Minister of Finance's argument, he endeavored to make a point out of the fact that our trade, large as it was, fabulous, even, if the hon. gentleman's theory in regard to population be correct, was not steadily increasing. He endeavored to make that point a little later on, when he turned to the trade of New South Wales. I have not the figures for the last year, but I notice that this country, that is bounding on in prosperity, the trade of which colony is said to be steadily growing, and I hope it is, and must be steadily growing if the hon. gentleman's argument be true, I notice in regard to it that 15 years may elapse and the foreign trade be at a standstill, and yet a country may prosper and grow rich. I find in the Statesman's Year Book, from which I take the figures, that, speaking in round numbers, the trade, including bullion and specie, was £21,000,000 in 1882, and was £15,000,000 in 1886. I have not the figures for 1887-88, but they matter not in connection with the point with which I am dealing. The hon. gentleman devoted a great deal of time to the protective policy, but he is certainly not an authority on that. When resisting the movement in this country for a protective tariff, he staked his financial reputation upon a prophecy and upon a calculation that if you raised the tariff about 17½ per cent. in this country you would have no imports, you would have no means of raising your revenue, and you would have to resort to direct taxation of a most serious kind. He finds to-day, even in his complaint, that the imports of this country are not so large as he claims they should be, that they have risen from 93 millions in 1878, under a 17½ tariff, to 110 millions in 1888, under a protective tariff, and with a decline in values. I will give a few figures to show that the importance and expansion of our commerce is indeed wonderful, as the Minister of Finance has claimed. We find, according to Mr. Giffin, an eminent authority on that question, quoted in Canada a few days ago, that the price of Scotch pig iron has declined from 127s. in 1873, down to 41s. 11d., in 1888; coals, from 30s. in 1873, to 17s. 6d., in 1888; copper, from £91 to £73; wool, per pack, from £23 to £11; and sugar, per cwt., from 21s. 6d. to 13s. 3d. When we find that these are the facts, and then consider that, notwithstanding the decline in values, we have an increase in the value of our import trade, I say, again, that the expansion of our commerce is established at once. We know, also, that we have been supplying ourselves with an immense amount of goods, and an immense amount of manufactures, that we formerly imported, and for which we were

dependent upon other countries; we know that as we become self-sustaining, a large number of dutiable articles go off the list, articles upon which we collected a revenue. But there takes place something else, as is shown by the history of all countries having a protective tariff, that a certain line of articles manufactured by the poor and underpaid labor of foreign countries, does not come into this country to such an extent as before, in competition with our own fairly paid labor. Then we find, Mr. Speaker, that the consuming power of the people, growing rich under a protective policy, becomes so great and grows so quickly that other articles, such as luxuries, upon which a revenue tariff is placed, are increased in quantity, and the exchequer feels the effect. So that in reference to that calculation, a calculation of a most important character, the hon. gentleman was, at least, unhappy. But I must hurry on, as my intention is to occupy as brief a period as possible in this important debate. Now, the hon. gentleman attacked a protective tariff at one part of his speech, though he wound up by a resolution which virtually proposes to double the rate of protection which exists to-day. But, inconsistent as that gentleman nearly always is, he attacked the policy of protection. While, on the one hand, he asks us to join a country which is enjoying the greatest protection almost of any country in the world, while he asks us to adopt the American tariff, on the other hand, at another period, he said he took pride in stating that he preferred the British system. He has not the courage of his convictions, and the people know it. He is in love with direct taxation, but he dare not avow it openly. However, he has endeavored to get the thin edge of the wedge inserted. He tried on the people at one time, the effect of direct taxation, and he certainly found it not very popular, and, like his old leader, whose presence I am glad to greet in the House to-day, when he came face to face with the steady, thinking people of the country, with the laboring people, he took back his free trade theories and went down on his knees to a protective tariff. But he attacks a protective tariff to-day, although he may take as sudden a change as he did before, at the time of the next general election. He attacks our position on this ground: He says, Why should you seek a foreign market, when you believe in protection; of what value are foreign markets to this country? Is the hon. gentleman playing with the question? Does he not know that his allies in the United States, Messrs. Butterworth and Hitt, are great protectionists, and they are straining every nerve to get possession of this market, and to slaughter their goods here, and to make us hewers of wood and drawers of water, as of old. The hon. gentleman knows it quite well. And, moreover, he knows that the American people have just elected an extreme protectionist party to power in the United States; he knows, too, that no free trade party can get a foothold there, and he knows well the immense efforts they make, by granting subsidies and otherwise, to obtain admission into foreign markets. And more than that, he knows right well how they have succeeded. In the Australian colonies, notwithstanding the mother country's free trade tariff and its lower-price labor, they have gained a foothold there. He knows that British consuls report that in colony after colony of the Empire, American goods are found competing with British goods, and not only American, but German goods also. The hon. gentleman should study the arguments of his opponents and learn, if he is ignorant now as not to know it, that it is the policy of all countries enjoying a protective tariff to secure as much foreign trade as possible as is consistent with their own manufacturing interests and their own labor interests, and they succeed. And so he will find out, if he consults his allies to whom I have already alluded, that you may be a protectionist and yet make an effort to obtain increased foreign trade, and even succeed in obtain-

ing a considerable share of foreign trade. We know well that American and foreign goods have been slaughtered in our market. The hon. gentleman himself admits—I have the reference to his speech here, if he has forgotten it—that during his *regime* goods from American factories were slaughtered in this market. This fact goes to show that this condition of things can occur in a country even though it is enjoying for the time a protective tariff. Protective countries require foreign markets just as the United States, require our market. The manufacturers will sell their goods there at cheaper prices, they will slaughter them there, in order that they may keep their hands employed and be able to await the arrival of better times in their own country. It is too late, either in Canada or on this continent, to go back to first principles and discuss free trade and protection, when there is not a single member in this House, on either side of it, who would stand up and say that he would put his free trade principles into practice.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would.

Mr. TUPPER. And no one would dare to go to the people and say that he intended to raise the revenue of the country in any other way than by indirect taxation. No man yet has had the courage to express such convictions, if they have been convictions. The home market is of great importance. It is not dear to the manufacturer alone, but to the farmer as well. The hon. gentleman has attempted to place in conflict the two great interests of this country, the manufacturing interest and the farming interest. If he has read the doctrines of free traders, he will remember surely that when Mr. Cobden was arguing in favor of free trade in England, and his opponents were arraying those two classes there against each other, his statement was—and we have found it to be true, as the elections have shown in this country—that you cannot help the manufacturer without helping the farmer, since the manufacturer is the farmer's best customer. The home market is more valuable always. Commercial history teaches us that fact in every country. While we desire to secure the foreign market as well, we require a stable home market to enable our manufacturers to furnish employment to their hands, and it is necessary to the success of the farmer as well,—and the farmers understand it thoroughly well. The hon. gentleman affects a love for the British system. If the House will permit me, I will quote a sentence from a recent speech by Mr. Goschen, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer. He is as great a free trader as there is in English politics to-day, and, standing before an audience in Birmingham on Dec. 7th, he told the people there exactly what the income tax was under the British system which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) loves so well. He was proposing to reduce that tax, and, naturally, he desired to show that his measure was deserving of sympathy and support:

"The relief of the income tax was not a relief simply or mainly for the rich. The income tax is a tax that bears with terrible weight on the struggling tradesman, on the professional man, on the clerk who has £300 or £400 a year, on the small farmer who can scarcely make both ends meet. These are the men who are deserving of sympathy, and I protest, not only as Chancellor of the Exchequer, but I protest as a citizen, that it is not this class on which, in the mere impossibility of finding other resources, you should always place the burden of taxation whenever more money is wanted. I thought that the income-taxpayer had a fair claim to be relieved, and that relief has been given, and the income tax, which stood at 8d. in the pound has been reduced to 6d."

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us to-day that he likes the British system, that he desires to again have the opportunity of imposing direct taxation on the people, of imposing it on struggling tradesmen and small farmers, who, he says, are already suffering from so many burdens. He knows not only that the British system has led to poorly-paid labor to such an extent as has been described, but an examination shows that under the "sweating" system goods are produced at

very cheap rates in the mother country, and at whose cost? For that reason, from every labor district in Canada, I believe, and from every Province representatives are to be found sitting on this side of the House; the labor interests are totally adverse to the hon. gentleman's financial doctrine; the labor organisations, whether in Great Britain, the United States, or this country, are protective, every one of them, and the policy of this country is essentially framed in the interests of labor. That is one reason of its success, and it is for this reason that hon. gentlemen opposite have a slim chance and little opportunity of ousting this Government from power. The hon. gentleman contended that the Finance Minister had denied that the farmers paid any taxes, and that they paid taxes upon machinery, or that in any respect they were affected by the tariff. The Finance Minister made no such statement. An hon. member who is always interjecting, apparently for the purpose of interjecting, and nothing else, called out "Nails" when my hon. friend was discussing the farmer's purchases and the articles which the farmer chiefly used. My hon. friend spoke not of machinery; as to whether the articles are dearer on that account or not, I am not now going to discuss. Time after time this question has been fully discussed in this House, and it has been shown that, even if the people do pay a little more for their goods, it is something to have a tariff policy that enables them to obtain money wherewith to buy them. Make the goods as cheap as you like, they say, let them be slaughtered in this country! We have had that experience, and our experience is this, that when these goods become so cheap, the inability of the intending consumer is often absolutely taken away, so that the people understand that. Take, for instance, the question of coal, upon which hon. gentlemen from the west now and then excite themselves. The cry was all through Ontario that the price of coal was increased to the consumers in consequence of the tax of 60 cents per ton. The hon. gentlemen know that experience has illustrated the entire fallacy of that argument in this respect, that since that tariff was removed the price of coal has increased, and that the hard coal supply of Ontario is now practically in the hands of an American monopoly. That has been the experience in that regard—and so it is not true in most of the cases, though in some it may be—that the price of an article is slightly increased by a moderate protective tariff such as ours. Then, another point is sought to be made in regard to the farmers of Ontario. I was surprised to hear from the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), notwithstanding his fondness for extravagant remarks and extravagant speeches,—I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman endeavor to show before an intelligent audience in this House, that the value of farm lands was decreasing, especially in Ontario, and that the decrease was a result of the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman ought to have admitted, and, admitting it, then pointed his argument to some other direction, that whether it be in free trade England, or in the United States with the high protective tariff, or in Canada with a lower protective tariff, the value of farming property, all the world over, has decreased during the last few years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen say "no." I tell them that an eminent English authority, Mr. J. S. Jeans, has made a calculation of this, in a very interesting work which he has written lately. Mr. Jeans is a gentleman who has on many occasions lectured before some of the most intelligent audiences in England. He has made the calculation that both in America and in England the value of farming property has decreased in the last few years by something like 100 per cent. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when speaking in regard to the farms of Ontario, was not one-half or one-tenth so

Mr. TUPPER.

bad as that. I hesitate to give the House the statement, but since the hon. member for South Oxford challenged it, I will read it, as it is not long:

"In America, as in England, and indeed all over Europe, there has been a great fall in prices within the last two or three years, affecting nearly all agricultural products; in some cases those have been reduced in value 100 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would be left after taking off 100 per cent.? You would wipe it out altogether.

Mr. TUPPER. The statement is 100 per cent., and I do not intend to argue the question out as to whether the arithmetic is good or not, but I will refer the hon. member to the member for South Oxford, who said that the Canadian laboring men, or poorer classes, pay 600 per cent. more taxes than the corresponding class in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know so little of arithmetic as not to know that you may multiply ten thousand per cent., but that you cannot deduct it?

Mr. TUPPER. I think I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is ashamed of his own calculation, and cannot justify it. Now, as to the condition of the farmers; and I will call the attention of the House to a very valuable authority, the statement of a Reform journal in the Province of Nova Scotia. Let us see as to whether our farmers are to be in so much better a position when we are part and parcel of the American Union, as under the terms of this resolution we will be. In July last, after Unrestricted Reciprocity had been fully aired before the country, the *Morning Chronicle* stated: "That the farmers of the States, in every way favorably situated, had been declining in prosperity, farms had been mortgaged, and profits were vanishing away." Hon. gentlemen well know that the Province of Ontario, especially with its position to the Western States and the neighboring States of the American Union was magnificently portrayed to the credit of Ontario, last Session, by hon. gentlemen who are much better prepared to deal minutely with the question than I am, and those statements, up to this day, have not been answered. Now, if the condition of the farmers in the States be as described by this Reform journal, where is the advantage of this market of sixty millions of people to Canada? The American farmers enjoy that market, they are within the sacred confines of the American limits, and, notwithstanding those wonderful pictures drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite of what would follow if the customs lines were taken down, we find that the American farms are being heavily mortgaged, and that all their property is vanishing away. The hon. gentleman was not in good fighting trim the other night, for he candidly confessed that he could not attack the success of the late loan, yet, although he admitted that it was a good loan and that it was placed at the right time, he could not leave the subject without the sneering remark that money was very cheap all the world over, and that no credit was due to the Government for the success of the loan. I will not weary the House on that, further than to refer hon. members to a very able article in the *Globe* newspaper which gives a comparative statement, and which, in that comparative statement, supports the able and unanswerable arguments of the Minister of Finance, showing that not only was it a successful loan, made when money was cheap, but that, comparatively, it was the best loan ever negotiated by a colony, and its comparison with the credit of other countries, including the colonies, was such as to show that in itself it was a most extraordinarily successful financial transaction. However, we will take, though it was given ungracefully, his testimony to the acts of the Minister of Finance, though some, I fear, will feel a little dubious as to the loan being a success, because the hon. gentleman himself admitted it. The member for South Oxford could not resume his seat without, as he has often times done before, and without much success, showing his

unmistakable hostility to the interests of the Maritime Provinces. The member for South Oxford showed particular hostility to the Intercolonial Railway as well as to those works which chiefly concern us in the Maritime Provinces, namely, the Short Line Railway, subsidies to railway, subsidies to Provinces, and the assumption of provincial debts. Those have been burning questions with us in the Maritime Provinces, and both his friends and his foes in politics in those Provinces have been advocating them from Confederation up to the present time and they have been making oftentimes ingenious claims that their legitimate demands had not been satisfied. They find to day that the second in command of this ship on the Opposition side is their bitterest foe, that he is opposed to the benefits which they derive at the hands of the Conservative party, and that if he got into power he would drive them to his favorite system of direct taxation which he lauded so much, by cutting away their means of government. He went on to attack the Intercolonial Railway, and he laid down a principle by which I shall judge his own Government when he was in power. He stated that there was a loss in working that railway, and that this proved that it was run and built for political purposes. Does that follow as a necessary consequence, or is that one of the fanciful calculations of the ex-Minister of Finance. If it is a true test, then what must have been the political rascality of that hon. gentleman's Government, because the figures show that in the operation of that road, he, himself, is on record as stating that that railway would be run at a loss of, perhaps, \$600,000 annually. The figures show that the loss of operating that line was far greater under the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member than it is under the Government of the present day. The facts and figures established more than that: they established that while we are hauling more than twice the traffic, while the system has been more enlarged, not only the losses on this road, but those on the canals, which the hon. gentlemen did not attack, have been a benefit to the merchants and people of Ontario and Quebec, as well as to the people of the Maritime Provinces; and members from the Maritimes Provinces, both Liberal and Conservative, will join in resisting the attack on our vital interests now made and threatened by the hon. member for South Oxford. The facts are that, in 1878, Government railways, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway, consisted of 913 miles, whereas in 1888, they consisted of 1,185 miles. The facts show that the traffic carried in 1878, was 561,633 tons, while in 1888, owing to the expansion of our internal trade, as pointed out by the Finance Minister, it amounted to 1,348,426 tons. Now, I ask the House again to note that the principle enunciated by the hon. gentleman is that when there is a loss on working that road, it is due to political corruption. In 1878 the loss on working the smaller system and carrying a much smaller quantity of traffic, was \$716,083, whereas in 1887-88 the loss was only half, being \$363,043. The hon. gentleman has unwittingly given me an opportunity to testify to the marked success in the management of that road and the economy practised under the present Administration, as contrasted with its management under the Administration of which the hon. gentleman was a member. But one word on behalf of that road. I have said that it was of importance to the Maritime Provinces; but it is important to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. That railway, which the hon. member for South Oxford himself stated—and I could give him the speech, if he desired proof of the statement—would involve a loss of \$600,000 a year to operate it, was one of the bonds of the Union, was one of those features of the Union which he himself advocated in 1865—a road with regard to which George Brown said he would give five Intercolonial Railways for the sake of Confederation; and he was a friend of Confederation, no matter on which side of the House he sat,

and to his dying day, I believe, never enunciated the principles which his former friends are enunciating now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much was charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway in 1888?

Mr. TUPPER. We will go into the details later on. But at present I will tell the hon. gentleman that that subject was threshed out in this House last Session, and the discussion can be found in *Hansard*. Hon. gentlemen never have anything new; they tell the same old story to the House, and with the same success. Now, I wish to point out to the House the importance of that road. Along its route, where forests once stood, you find to-day thriving towns and villages, in which great manufacturing industries are springing up. In Springhill, in the county of Cumberland, there are 7,000 people where there were only two or three hundred a few years ago. The people engaged in the industry of coal mining not only pay enormous sums into the public revenue in the shape of duty, but, by sending their coal over the Intercolonial Railway, to the western Provinces, enable the Government to keep the other freights up to their present figures. These bodies of consumers, in turn, buy from the people of western Canada; and thus they benefit, not merely the locality in which they operate, but contribute to the public coffers, and promote the business interests of the people of this country; and he would be a bold man who would attempt to stop that road and carry on Confederation. But I do not think these hon. gentlemen are much in love with Confederation to-day. We find the hon. member violently attacking the Short Line Railway system. What is his position? He found himself in a miserable minority when he attacked it in this House at its inception. He found his whole party deserting him. He found members from the Maritime Provinces, on one side and on the other side, standing up and claiming that railway as a right; and the majority of the people of this country, represented as well by the members from the Province of Ontario, supported us in our claim to the extension of our great continental system to our Maritime Province ports. We found the votes in this House against him such as 39 to 107, 36 to 101 and 35 to 101; and yet he goes back to his enmity towards the Maritime Provinces who have supported this Government since Confederation, and continue to support it. The Chamber of Commerce of the city of Halifax has just passed a resolution demanding the extension of that line to that city. Are they dupes? Are they men who have been purchased? Will the hon. gentleman hurl his anathemas against them as men who are urging expenditures from corrupt motives? The hon. gentleman attacked railway subsidies, and yet he knows that the business men of this country, irrespective of politics, have urged the granting these subsidies. He knows, moreover, that every railway which has been subsidised by this Parliament has been subsidised on the ground that for the small expenditure involved, if you could secure the introduction of sufficient capital for the construction and working of the railway, this country would be recouped a hundred and a thousand times over by the business that would be promoted and the settlements that would spring up as results of that policy. That is a policy eminently popular and successful; and when the hon. gentleman says such expenditures are used for corrupt purposes, he knows more of his friends than of his enemies, and he must be speaking of his friends in Ontario and his friends in Nova Scotia, who are now for a short time in power. Now, I must go on to notice a very important feature in connection with this debate. The hon. Minister of Finance took a strong position on the justifiability of what he called our national debt, the net debt of this country, and he was able to show that we had more than enough public works, and useful public works, to justify the expenditure of every dollar that went into those works.



The hon. member for South Oxford was unable to do more than to use the old argument, rather weak, it seems to me, of merely saying that, whereas the debt was \$75,000,000 in 1867, it was \$236,000,000 in 1889. But I wish to call attention to the able argument of the hon. gentleman in justification of the expenditure of every dollar. I wish to recall to the hon. gentleman's memory his justification, at a time when he, as Finance Minister, stated to this House, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway would involve an expenditure of \$100,000,000, and it was difficult to say how much more a year to run and operate that road. I called the attention of the House to a statement made by the hon. gentleman as to the advisability of this debt. I am not alluding to the familiar statement made by that hon. gentleman in England to the money lenders, when he told them that all the debt which had been incurred by his predecessors, and which he had denounced in this House as extravagant, had been incurred for general purposes of public utility, but I want to remind the hon. gentleman that at one time when he was of opinion we would have to spend a hundred million dollars in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it would cost us something like \$8,000,000 a year to run it, according to the calculations of some engineers. In 1875, he came down to the House and, as Finance Minister, told us why we should incur this expenditure. He said:

"We have completed the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, and are, therefore, free to turn our undivided energies and attention to the task of enlarging and improving our canals and constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway."

And these are the purposes for which our debt has been incurred. He went on to say:

"One thing we may fairly say to our people, that the sacrifices which we are called upon to make are not being undertaken for any selfish local object, but, in the largest sense, in the future interest of the whole of the Provinces of the Dominion. We have chosen to take upon ourselves a truly Imperial task—a greater task than was ever undertaken by any nation of our age and resources—that of colonising and developing a most enormous extent of country, not so much for our own benefit as that of generations yet to come."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In which you have infamously failed.

Mr. TUPPER:

"That such an enterprise is one which will require our utmost energies I do not for one moment deny, but although I admit this, and admit also that while engaged in its prosecution, we must be willing to forego other works of much greater immediate advantage, yet I hold it is far better we should do so than even seem to fail in meeting the obligations to which I have referred. I believe that every man who has paid any serious attention to the future of Canada, knows right well that with us this matter is a struggle for the possibility of carrying out a distinct national existence. This, at any rate, is an object for which we may well call upon our people for any reasonable sacrifice, and it will be at once the desire and the interest of the Government to take care that such sacrifices, as may be inevitable, shall yet be restrained within due bounds. Perhaps, after all, it is as well that we, like other people, should be compelled to test our strength and nerve."

I call particular attention to this:

"Better, indeed, in this respect, since we may thus undergo in peaceful fashion the ordeal to which all countries which have ever achieved any real greatness have had sooner or later to submit, though, for the most part, it has come in the shape of wasting and desolating war."

If there was any justification required for the progressive, the bold, the plucky, the Canadian policy of this Government, we have it from the man who, while believing in all that, dared not put it to the touch. We have it from the man who was virtually turned out of office, because, in reference to trade questions, as in reference to national public works, he had not the courage of his convictions. Now, I had intended to say more, but I see it is within ten minutes of six, and I wish to keep my promise, notwithstanding great temptation, of occupying the House no longer than six o'clock. But let me turn for a moment to the resolution of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has been, and his party has been—and I say this meaning it in good faith—driven back to this desperate and foolish course. I say

Mr. TUPPER.

they were ashamed, in the beginning of this Session, after the defeat of the Democratic party, to whose coat-tails they had tied themselves, to knock again at the door of the American Republic, but, having been taunted, after their attacks in piecemeal fashion on the tariff, they have been driven, for better or worse, to make anew the foul attack they made last year on the policy of this country. But no matter how they may endeavor to confuse the public mind, the people understand that the Liberal-Conservative party, as a whole, are still ready to make a fair trade arrangement with the United States, whenever the United States are prepared to enter into such an arrangement. We have said, time and time again, to the Government at Washington; we have said it in all the official correspondence, as these gentlemen themselves admit, and our plenipotentiaries have said it; and, true to that policy, we are not taking an attitude unworthy of Canadians, we are not taking a cringing attitude. I believe we will yet succeed in making a fair arrangement with the Republican Government lately installed at Washington, and we will do it as men and as Canadians, just as independent in Canada in reference to our future and our present as the Americans, to their credit, are independent in the United States. We have by our policy won the admiration of one of the leading men of the present Cabinet, and with the indulgence of the House I will quote from an important speech made by Mr. Blaine in reference to our Government and its policy. Mr. Blaine is able to speak now with great authority, and his remarks will show how the policy of our Government is regarded in the United States. Attempts have been made, time and again, to convince the Government and the people of the United States that we desire to irritate and annoy them, and to place us in such a position as to make it impossible for the party in power here to treat at Washington. But Mr. Blaine understood those petty political attempts, and thus speaks:

"I have nothing whatever to say against the Dominion of Canada as a Government or against its inhabitants. The Dominion of Canada is an energetic and able Government. There are able and clever men at the head of it. They have done a wonderful work and they have made wonderful progress, and I don't believe there is a citizen of the United States, from one end of the country to the other, that envies the people of the Dominion all the prosperity they may attain."

Then he goes on to claim that while we cannot have what this hon. gentleman desires we should now petition for. The hon. gentleman wants the people of Canada, after having gone to Washington time and again, now to throw ourselves at the feet of the men who he says are holding out the olive branch. They are holding out offers like the spider to the fly. The olive branch of Mr. Hitt means nothing else than the policy the hon. gentleman himself deprecated on the floor of the House last year. He was told then, as plainly as one man could be told by another, that while the people of the United States were ready for commercial union, and while Mr. Hitt will permit us to go into their country and be controlled and managed at their own sweet will, yet unrestricted reciprocity was impossible. The hon. gentleman is hard to convince, but, if he will read the speech of Mr. Blaine, he will see that while we may yet make a fair and proper arrangement with reference to trade and otherwise with the American Government, we do not injure our interests by respecting ourselves, and while we are anxious to extend our trade relations consistent with the interests of this country, consistent with our laboring, our farming and manufacturing interests, whether with the United States or any other country, it will be a sorry day when both parties in Canada take up the position assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite, a position they denounced time and time again, a position which has been denounced by their veteran leader, and a policy which certainly does not inspire respect in the Dominion of Canada. So I say that the people of this country are not of a cringing kind, they have shown that they are

able to grapple with these great works to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) alluded, their nerve has been tested, and we stand to day in a position in which we are able to make out such a magnificent case as that which was made by the exponent of the National Policy, of the policy of this Government, while the hon. gentleman opposite had time and again attempted to arraign that policy and endeavored to destroy it, though he showed his utter inability to meet that statement to any extent. In conclusion, I believe that, as in the past, we are able, so long as we remain a portion of the Empire, not merely to govern ourselves, and prove ourselves worthy of responsible Government, but, as has been shown, to maintain the interests of this country, either in regard to commerce in general or in regard to the fisheries; and, while we are willing to make any fair compromise, or any fair settlement of these subjects, we are not ready to surrender the commercial interests of this country to the United States any more than we are to surrender our fisheries interests, which have been so much discussed of late.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see absent from their places to-night the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whose remarks I wish to direct a few words before proceeding with the more important part of the discussion. If the Finance Minister were present, I would compliment him upon the creditable manner in which he made his maiden financial statement, a statement which was, I am sure, satisfactory to his friends upon that side of the House, and one which, on the whole, reflected credit upon him. I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to redeem the promises that he has made to the country with reference to preventing an increase in the public debt, keeping down the expenditure, and engaging in a career of economy that has not characterized the Government's financial history for a few years past. I must warn that hon. gentleman, however, that many influences will be brought to bear to thwart his laudable purposes in that respect. The party with which he is connected and for whom he acts as Finance Minister, has for many years engaged in the expenditure of money in a lavish manner, and I fear that reformation in that respect is scarcely to be hoped for. I only hope that he may be correct in his anticipations, and may be able to give us an administration of public affairs such as he has promised in his Budget speech the other afternoon. With regard to some of his statements I shall have occasion to refer to them in the course of the few remarks which I shall make to-night. I wish, also, to refer briefly to a few statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) who spoke this afternoon. He is a worthy son of a worthy sire, and to use a common expression which has more force than elegance, he is "a chip of the old block." His father, I recollect, some years ago, promised us that about this time we would be having 640 million bushels of wheat annually from the North-West. We have not had the wheat yet, but the son this afternoon did as much as he possibly could to give us the chaff. The hon. gentleman dealt rather severely with my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think, however, it scarcely needs any trouble on my part to attempt a defence of that hon. gentleman, whose record itself is a sufficient defence, and who is amply capable of defending himself. The hon. gentleman seemed to suppose that because the arguments produced on this side of the House to the country had not carried the elections of 1882 and in 1887, that, perforce, we were wrong. Now, majorities are not always right, minorities are not always wrong. You may advance truth

that will not convince the public, that is more often the case than otherwise. But, Sir, there were other reasons that might be cited to account for the result of those elections, than the arguments presented to the country. We had, for instance, the Gerrymander Act of 1882, by which, in the Province of Ontario, 200,000 Conservatives were enabled to exercise as much power in the elections as 300,000 Reformers, and which, at least, gave to the present Government 12 or 14 seats. We had in 1887 the Franchise Bill, and we had called to the aid of the Government, the revising barrister, and this one Act in 1882, and this other Act in 1887, were sufficient to account for the results of those elections; and I feel certain but that for the revising barrister's kindly intervention in behalf of the Government in 1886, the Reform party would have carried the elections in this country in 1887. Then the hon. gentleman makes a feeble attempt to defend the Finance Department from the charge of cooking the accounts. Now, Sir, this is useless. It is beyond all controversy that the accounts are cooked, that the book-keeping is of a character that would not bear the investigation of an accountant, that the expenses chargeable to the administration of Dominion lands in the North-West are charged to capital account, and the receipts are credited to consolidated fund; and in this way and in other ways of that kind, the public accounts are made to represent a result which the facts do not warrant. We have his reference to the fact that my hon. friend, as he asserts, had said that in case of war with the United States, we would not be able to secure very great assistance from England. Now, Sir, unfortunately, that is the case. In case of war with the United States, England would be utterly unable to place an armed force upon the frontier between these two countries, adequate to the defence of Canada. The United States, with no greater exertion than was put forth in the rebellion of 1861 to 1864, could place in the field an army of 3,000,000 men, and it is folly to talk of England being able to cope with such a force, in British North America, so far from her base of operations. It is true that, so far as land operations are concerned, England would be unable to afford to us adequate assistance and protection. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the exodus, and he charges upon us responsibility for the exodus from this country. As well charge upon the physician responsibility for the occurrence of the disease because he had given a diagnosis of the case; as well charge the physician with responsibility for the result of a disease whose treatment had been repudiated and not adopted. The Liberal party merely pointed out the causes that led to the exodus. They urged the Government that these causes should be removed, and they have, in their places in this House, and in their efforts in the country, from time to time, striven to remove the causes that produced this lamentable state of affairs. But so far from responsibility resting upon their shoulders, they merely have labored to the best of their ability to avert the evil results, which unfortunately, have fallen upon us in this regard. Then the hon. gentleman accused my hon. friend, at my right, of attacking protection, and then moving a resolution in this House by which he proposed to double our protection. The hon. gentleman is evidently unable to dissociate in his mind the nature of the resolutions demanding unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. It is not commercial union that is advocated by my hon. friend it is not commercial union that is asked for by this resolution, but unrestricted reciprocity, and unrestricted reciprocity would leave in our hands the entire control of our own tariff, except in so far as relating to imports and exports between this country and the United States. He says that Mr. Hitt and Mr. Butterworth are protectionists, that they want possession of this market, that they desire to reduce the people of this country to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water. Mr. Hitt and Mr.

Butterworth, it is true, are protectionists, but they desire to see the scope of free intercourse upon this continent enlarged; they desire to see a policy adopted that will be mutually beneficial and advantageous to their own country and to the Dominion of Canada. They are truly patriotic in their efforts to promote the interests, not only of the United States, but the interests of all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon the continent of North America. He next refers to the income tax, and endeavors to create the impression that my hon. friend, in his reference some time ago to the income tax, had advocated a tax that would press with great severity upon all classes of people in this country, upon the artisan, upon the wage-earner, and upon every class of individuals who have any income at all. That depends entirely upon the character of the income tax; it depends entirely upon the limits to which that income tax comes down. It may be a tax upon incomes of a thousand dollars and upwards, upon two thousand and upwards—the limit of the taxable income may be so large as to affect the rich man only—and it was in that sense, as I distinctly remember, that my hon. friend referred to this question. Then we have paraded before us the old stock arguments about a home market. Protection to the industries of the country for the benefit of the farmer, forsooth! Why, what is the condition of the farmer in this country to-day? Living, Sir, in a country which is one of the dearest in the world to purchase in, and one of the cheapest in the world to sell in, so far as the products of his labor are concerned, selling the products of the soil for very much less than they were sold for during the *régime* of my hon. friend at my right, struggling with difficulties created by this very party which taxes everything that he produces and reduces the purchasing power of the natural customer to whom he sells his productions, not only increases the cost of what he purchases but diminishes the price of what he sells. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the Intercolonial Railway, and he tells us that this road has been an immense benefit. Well, in a sense it has. It has been a great benefit to certain coal mine owners; it has been an enormous benefit to the owners of the Springhill mines, and to-day this road is carrying coal for less than the bare cost of transportation, and is charging other classes of freight much higher in proportion than it charges for the transportation of coal; and in this way it is an immense benefit to the owners of the coal mines, and it discriminates in favor of those men and against the farmers and producers and other business classes of this country. It is said that the road was not built for political reasons. I combat that and I assert it was. It has cost up to this time over \$50,000,000, which is an annual incubus on the country. We lose every cent of interest on that sum, amounting to not less than \$1,500,000 a year.

Mr. MITCHELL. That arises from bad management.

Mr. CHARLTON. And in addition it costs \$300,000 or \$400,000 yearly, even with the accounts cooked and sums charged to capital that should be charged to running expenses of the road, in excess of earnings. The hon. Minister of Marine has told us that the loss in running the road in 1888 was only one-half what it was in 1878. There was a difference in the mode of keeping the accounts. In 1878 what was charged to running expenses came properly under that head, while in 1888 every dollar which by any excuse could be charged against capital account was charged there, in order to reduce nominally the cost of operating the road. Then the hon. gentleman told us that the Liberal party in this House were ashamed, at the beginning of the Session, to speak of unrestricted reciprocity. I am sure my hon. friends to my right and my left will laugh at such an assertion, because the party pledged itself to that issue last year, the party has stood by that issue every day since, and upon that issue

Mr. CHARLTON.

it stands to-day and on that issue it will stand to-morrow, and it will fight this question out on this line to the bitter end, it will go to the country on this question, and it will carry the country on it. No, we were not ashamed of this issue at the beginning of the Session, we are not ashamed of this issue now. My hon. friend has placed this resolution before the House in accordance with a decision the party arrived at within two or three days of the time we came to Ottawa. The hon. Minister informed the House that they, the Conservative party, the Government party, were still willing to make a fair and liberal treaty with the United States? Are still ready? When have they been willing to make a fair and reasonable treaty? When have they shown a disposition to meet the United States on fair, liberal and equitable terms? When have they offered any treaty on any other lines than the Treaty of 1854, which the Americans disavowed and abrogated in 1866, and which they have told us year after year ever since they never would renew on those conditions. And with the assertion staring us in the face that another treaty would not be given us on those conditions, it is little short of an insult to the common sense of hon. members to tell us that the Government party are ready to make a fair and liberal treaty and are using their utmost efforts to negotiate one. The hon. gentleman quoted from the present Secretary of State of the United States, who has repeated the statement that a treaty with Canada upon the lines of the old treaty was entirely inadmissible and was not to be thought of.

So much for the position taken by the Minister of Marine, and I pass now to the consideration of the question which comes up directly in connection with the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a question of great importance, it is a question of greater importance than any other question that is now before the people of this country, and it is a question of greater importance than any other question which has been before this country for ten years past at least. The Minister of Finance referred to the necessity of securing wider markets, he referred to the necessity of extending our trade. And how does he propose to do it? Why, he cannot think of sacrificing the interests of that small circle of individuals who are benefited by the National Policy; he cannot think of sacrificing the interests of men who are useful in election contests, because they are directly interested in maintaining the Government in power, and are ready to pay for that interest. He must maintain the interests of those men, even if he does so at the sacrifice of the interests of nineteen-twentieths of the people of Canada. And he proposes, not to take the great market lying at our very doors, not to take the natural market with 60,000,000 of customers lying alongside of us, but he proposes to hunt up new markets, to subsidise steamship lines, to construct more railways, to reach China, Japan, India, to go to South America, to open up trade with the Argentine Republic, with Patagonia, with the West Indies, to commence trade with Samoa, with Tahiti, to open up trade with Uganda, with the Upper Congo, and other places far distant from us. Yes, that is the panacea of the hon. gentleman for the commercial distress of this country—to open up those far distant markets which it is almost impossible to reach and which are worthless when reached, and to leave the great market at our very doors, by refusing to enter into an arrangement with 60,000,000 people whereby we could secure commercial advantages which would lift this country from the condition of depression in which it at present remains. It reminds me of the story of a sea captain who, when his ship was lying at the mouth of the Amazon, and, although out of sight of land, was in the midst of an ocean of fresh water, hailed a passing vessel and asked for a supply of water. The captain said: "Throw a bucket overboard; why, you are in the midst of an ocean of fresh water." So the hon. gentleman is in the midst of an ocean

of trade if he will only avail himself of the opportunity, and he does not need to go to Patagonia, Samoa, Tahiti, the Congo and other distant lands. Let him turn his attention to the country lying at our very doors.

The condition of civilised states, and especially the Anglo-Saxon communities, has been for many generations past a condition of development and progress. The evolution in the case of Anglo-Saxon states has been rapid and continuous. They are continually advancing to a higher social and potential plane. If we contrast the condition of England, for instance, in 1700, with its population of five and a half millions, with but one considerable city, with a commerce infinitesimal in its proportions to that of the commerce of to-day, with small provincial towns, with a rude husbandry in the interior, without social development, without manufacturing development, without commercial development—if we compare that country with the England of to-day, the transition is a wonderful one. If we compare Canada in 1759, with its 60,000 people clustering along the banks of the St. Lawrence, with Canada of 1869, with its railway lines extending across the continent, with its development in manufactures, commerce and agriculture, with its population of 5,000,000, here again is a wonderful transition. If we compare the United States in 1776, with their 3,000,000 of people, a country which in 1790 had but four cities of over 10,000 inhabitants, which possessed only 75 post offices, 1,800 miles of postal route, which paid only \$22,000 a year for the transportation of the mails—if we compare that country with the United States of to-day with 62,000,000 people, with its vast development in commerce, manufactures and agriculture, this is a wonderful transition. And the condition of these countries is constantly changing and the circumstances surrounding these countries are changing. They are impelled forward by forces from within and by forces from without, and we need to note these changing conditions; we need to govern ourselves by these changing conditions, and to let the circumstances of our case adapt themselves to these conditions. In 1776 these thirteen colonies and Canada went different roads. They had lived together under one Government, subject to the same king, for seventeen years, and when the thirteen colonies revolted, Canada had not been associated with those colonies long enough to follow their example. The circumstances of the case were entirely different and they took different ways, and the result of those experiments we may see to-day: in the one case in the creation of a great nation with its own history, with its own national life and with the world looking to it as one of the great powers of the earth, while in the other case we see as the result of the experiment the creation of a great colony, without a history of its own, challenging the attention of the world, and shining, not in its own light, but in the borrowed light of another luminary. For many years, there was not much in the conditions surrounding us to make intercourse between the two countries so desirable as it is to-day. From 1776 to 1842, the colonies were protected by the English corn laws; differential duties were imposed in their interest upon breadstuffs, lumber, and timber, and the desire for free intercourse with the American States or colonies naturally had no pronounced existence. The American States have prospered and grown rapidly, and a condition of things more favorable to their growth could not have been desired. Since 1842, when the corn laws were abolished, the desirability of intercourse with the United States became greater and greater each year, and in 1849 an annexation party was already in existence in this country, many of the members of which have since been in connection with the party at present in power. We had Sir John Rose, Sir A. T. Galt, the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott, and other gentlemen high in the Conservative ranks, who were members of that party.

In 1854, however, free intercourse with the United States was secured, and when that intercourse was secured the annexation party disappeared. The country enjoyed that free intercourse for twelve years, and grew and prospered under it. In 1866, when that reciprocity was abrogated the country felt the disastrous influence of that abrogation in the severest manner, and there has not been a day since the abrogation of that treaty that Canada has not desired its renewal; there has not been a day since the abrogation of that treaty when it would not be in the highest degree desirable, in the light of Canada's interests, to have renewed that treaty; and, as year after year rolled by, the desirability of renewing it became more palpable and greater. When the treaty was abrogated the United States had a population, probably, of thirty-five million souls, and to-day that nation has a population of at least sixty-two millions. To-day it has more than double the wealth it had in 1866; to-day it is a much more desirable country, or customer, to deal with than it was in 1866; and to-day it is infinitely more desirable to secure reciprocity with the United States in the interests of Canada than it was in 1866. That country with its sixty-two million inhabitants, with its fifty-eight thousand millions of wealth (ten thousand millions more than England) with its vast manufacturing industries, its vast internal commerce, its immense and growing progress and development, is a desirable customer for us to have; and, notwithstanding all the restrictions upon trade, notwithstanding the commercial hostility between us, nature asserts itself, our geographical position asserts itself, and the trade of Canada, under all those adverse circumstances with the United States, is greater than the trade of Canada with any other nation of the world.

Why is it that we have seen in the past one hundred years so marvellous a development in this country to the south of us. In 1776 they commenced with free trade between thirteen States, and as one State after another has been added to that confederation the area and scope of this reciprocal free trade has been extended. The number of States banded together in this Zollverein, or this customs union if you may term it so, have increased from 13 to 42. The population under this arrangement has increased from three millions to sixty-two millions, and, as population has increased, as the number of States have been increased, as the scope of the operation of these free trade influences have been extended, their beneficent character has become more and more apparent. Does any man suppose that if tariffs had existed between each of these States, or if the States were divided into groups with a tariff between one group and another, that we would have seen that development which has taken place in the United States within the last hundred years. No man of sense will assert that such would have been the case. This country with its different zones, its great variety of climate, its great variety of production—a country embracing within its own limits almost all the productions of the known world,—was a magnificent field for the operation of free trade, for the development of the influences and results that flow from free trade and notwithstanding that their own fiscal policy with regard to other countries has been faulty yet the advantages of free intercommunication between all these States has been so great, that we see the results before us to-day in the accumulation of its great power, its greater wealth than any other country in the world, in its greater extent of manufactures than any other country in the world, and its ability to raise a greater revenue and undergo a greater stress in that respect than any other power in Christendom. To-day, Sir, we in Canada are situated outside of that magic circle. My friend the Minister of Finance the other night depicted in glowing and very powerful terms the repressing results of the existence of tariffs between the various Provinces comprising this Dominion before Con-

ederation. He pointed out how those barriers upon trade restricted commercial transactions between the Provinces, how great since the removal of those tariffs have been the developments of internal commerce, and now beneficent had been the consequence of that removal of the tariffs between the Provinces now comprising the Dominion. It struck me as being singular that hon. gentleman could not have gone further and realised how great would be the advantage of sweeping away the tariff over a still wider area, how great would be the advantage of removing the tariff not only between the seven Provinces of Confederation but between these seven Provinces and the 42 States of the American Union and having a free intercourse between 49 commonwealths instead of seven. I think the argument is one that he cannot fail to see the force of. If the removal of trade restrictions is good for seven commonwealths it is better still for 49. If the seven Provinces derive advantages from unimpeded commercial transactions, the widening of that circle and the introduction of a greater number of commonwealths to that circle, through which free communication was the rule, would be conferring still greater advantages than those he pointed out in the case of the provinces comprising this Dominion.

The position of our Canadian Provinces with regard to the United States is a peculiar one. There is a stretch of conterminous line from ocean to ocean. There is no mountain barrier between the two countries, there is no natural barrier of any character whatever, but they lie facing each other, and the very rivers and inland seas that spread along a portion of this line instead of being obstructions and barriers invite trade, and serve as highways for intercommunication from one to the other, and in spite of all these restrictions do secure an enormous burden of commerce between these two great countries. Now, Sir, if you look at the map, you will find that the Dominion of Canada is divided into four distinct geographical sections. The Maritime Provinces are separated from Quebec and Ontario by a wide stretch of rocky, uninhabited country; Ontario and Quebec are separated from the fertile belt of the North-West by nearly a thousand miles of wilderness which is almost worthless for agricultural purposes; the fertile region of the North-West is separated from British Columbia by a wide stretch of plain and mountain. These four geographical areas are distinct from each other; and in its geographical affinities each one is more a part of the United States for commercial purposes than a part of this Dominion. Take, for instance, the Maritime Provinces: The State of Maine projects like a wedge northward, separating them from the rest of Canada, and almost reaching the St. Lawrence. To carry on trade transactions between New Brunswick or Nova Scotia and Quebec we have to use the Intercolonial Railway for hundreds of miles; while these Provinces can reach with facility such markets as Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore for a tithe of the cost which is to-day required to reach Quebec. The potatoes of Prince Edward Island can be laid down in Boston for five cents a bushel, or a little more; coal, lumber and all the other productions of these Provinces can be carried very cheaply to the great seaboard cities of the United States. The natural geographical affinity between these countries compels trade, notwithstanding tariff restrictions and commercial hostility; and if these restrictions were removed an enormous trade would be the result. Then, we take Quebec, possessing the gateway of the great lakes, the natural outlet of the vast country to the west; and but for commercial hostility and restrictive tariffs the trade of that country would have gone down the St. Lawrence to the sea, and 300 miles of artificial water communication between Lake Erie and the Hudson River would, perhaps, never have been built. Before the construction of that water route, all the trade of western New York, Ohio and the west went

Mr. CHARLTON.

down the St. Lawrence; and Montreal might have continued to enjoy that trade, and might have been one of the great commercial centres of the continent to-day; but for commercial hostility it might have been the imperial gateway of the mighty west. But Montreal stands to-day on the St. Lawrence, with all its magnificent advantages and its magnificent site, a third-rate city. Quebec has easy access to the great commercial centres of the United States by the Richelieu River, Lake Champlain, Whitehall Canal and the Hudson River to New York, and by railway lines she can easily reach Portland, Boston and New York. All these great centres are at her very door; these are her natural markets; her geographical affinities are with the Middle and Eastern States. Then, if we come west to Ontario, we find that conditions compelling trade with the country to the south are still more potent. We find this great Province resting upon four great inland seas, with the waters of Ontario, Erie, Huron and Superior, washing her shores from Kingston to Port Arthur. We find this Province projecting like a wedge 420 miles south into American territory, from the 49th nearly to the 42nd parallel. We find that the commerce of Michigan, of Chicago, and the country west of Chicago, finds its shortest route to the ocean across the territory of this Province. We find new lines pushing to the Sault Ste. Marie, and leading across this Province to the sea. We find lines from Minneapolis, from St. Paul, from Duluth and from Pembina converging at the Sault; and we find, on looking at the map, that the shortest possible route from northern Michigan, northern Wisconsin, Minnesota, north and south Dakota, Montana, and a portion of Nebraska, to the seaboard, is right across the territory of this Province, from the Sault Ste. Marie eastward. Why, it is the geographical key to the energetic zone of this continent, that country lying between the 38th and 46th parallels of latitude, with its great centres of population, development and wealth. Ontario, I say, possesses the geographical key to this great region. She can reach with her productions, by means of this great line of inland seas, and with her railway lines, the great markets of this continent, with the utmost facility and ease; and her position for reaching these markets is better than the position of Michigan, Indiana, or any portion of the American territory to the west of these States; and notwithstanding repression and restriction, she has a vast commerce with the great American centres of population. Why, within a few hours' ride of her eastern border in New York, with 3,000,000 inhabitants within 20 miles of its city hall; two or three hours further on is Philadelphia, with a million inhabitants; a few hours further to the east is Boston, with 300,000 or 400,000 people; close by is Buffalo, with a quarter of a million, Rochester with 100,000, and Albany with 100,000; just across Lake Erie is Cleveland, with 300,000; just across the boundary of her western peninsula is Detroit, with 175,000; and within easy reach of her western territory is Chicago, with 900,000 inhabitants. I repeat that her geographical position enables her to obtain access to all these centres of population with greater facility than any of the Western States, except Ohio. Now, Mr. Speaker, am I to be told, is any sane man to be told, that this great Province, with its 200,000 square miles of territory, with its immense stretch of sea coast, with its agricultural, its mineral and its timber resources, would not be vastly benefited by sweeping away those restrictions that separate it from its natural market? Why, Sir, it is preposterous to make such an assertion. To consider the question for five minutes is sufficient to convince any reasonable man that vast advantages would be secured to this Province by free access to the markets to the south of us. Then, we pass on to Manitoba and the North-West, and here again we have to pass through a wilderness of a thousand miles which separates that country from the settled portion of the Dominion to the east. Here we find a country which is a natural part of the Mississippi Valley. Al-

most a rebellion was provoked in Manitoba because its people were not able to secure access to the markets lying in the south. Their trade naturally tends to such cities as St. Paul, Minneapolis and Chicago; and notwithstanding all the restrictions placed upon it, an immense and ever growing trade has sprung up between Manitoba and the North-West and those cities. And when we pass on to British Columbia, what do we find there? Why, nature decrees that British Columbia must have extended trade relations with Washington, Oregon and California. These are commonwealths in the same geographical group as herself. To carry on commerce with the east necessitates crossing five ranges of mountains and a thousand miles of plain at great cost; the incurring of this expenditure for transportation is unnatural. Trade by this outlet must be forced, and natural conditions compel British Columbia to trade extensively with the three American States on the Pacific slope; and to remove all the restrictions existing between British Columbia and these States would be to confer untold benefits on the former. Take these four geographical groups of the Dominion—the Maritime Provinces, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the Province of Manitoba and the Territories of the North West and British Columbia—nature has decreed that each one of the four shall trade more naturally and on more advantageous terms with the country to the south of the line than with any other geographical group in the Dominion. Now, I say in each nature asserts itself, notwithstanding the policy of my hon. friend and his party, as shown in our trade returns of last year. Our imports for consumption from, and our exports to the United States and other countries in 1888, were as follows:—

United States.....	\$91,053,913
Great Britain.....	79,383,705
All other countries.....	22,612,482
	<u>\$193,050,100</u>

Our imports for consumption during the same year were:

From United States.....	\$48,481,848
do Great Britain.....	39,298,721
do all other countries.....	15,066,531
	<u>\$102,847,100</u>

Our exports were:

To United States.....	\$42,572,065
Great Britain.....	40,084,984
All other countries.....	7,545,951
	<u>\$90,203,000</u>

And this in spite of hostile tariffs—this by virtue of the decrees of nature and geography, and in spite of the policy of hon gentlemen on the opposite side. We imported from the United States over \$9,000,000 worth of goods more than we did from Great Britain, and we exported to the United States \$2,500,000 worth of goods more than we did to Great Britain, by virtue of the inexorable decrees of nature and geography. We had a period, as I said a few moments ago, of twelve years free trade with the United States, and during that period our trade with the United States developed to an extent which must teach a lesson that cannot fail to be understood. Reciprocity was brought about in 1854. We began in 1854 with an export trade to the United States of \$10,473,000. That was without the stimulating effect of free trade. The next year, under free trade, that export had risen to \$19,316,000, an increase of \$9,000,000—an increase of nearly 100 per cent. in one year under the operation of free trade; and during the twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, that export trade to the United States increased from \$10,473,000 to \$39,950,000—an increase of 260 per cent. in twelve years. That included all the Provinces now comprised in the Dominion. In 1854, the exports of Old Canada to the United States amounted to \$8,649,000; the next year, under free trade, they jumped to \$16,727,000; and in 1866 they reached \$34,770,000. And this, without

estimating shortage in inland returns, which were very much less in 1854 than in 1866. Now, with an increase of trade between the various Provinces of this Dominion of 280 per cent. in those twelve years, with an increase of trade between Old Canada and the United States of over 300 per cent. in the twelve years under free trade, I wish to contrast the condition of our trade since then under the policy of protection; but before doing so, I will say that had the annual increase between 1855 and 1866 been maintained to the present time, our exports to the United States alone would last year have reached \$94,000,000, and had the ratio of increase been maintained in the twenty-two years following the abrogation of the treaty, that was maintained during the twelve years of the operation of the treaty, our exports to the United States last year would have exceeded \$150,000,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend may smile, but I believe the exports would have been greater than are indicated by this calculation. Now, against this increase of \$29,476,000, or an actual increase, estimating the inland returns shortage, which was \$3,413,000 greater in 1866 than 1855, of \$31,490,000 during this period of free trade—what have we to say with regard to the increase of trade since? Our exports last year were only \$2,620,000 greater than in 1866, or, deducting difference in shortage at inland ports between 1855 and 1866, our increase in exports in 1888, as compared with 1866, was but \$1,522,000 against \$31,490,000 in the 12 years during the operation of the treaty. This fact speaks volumes, and needs no comment. If the one policy gave this country an increase in exports of \$31,490,000 in 12 years, and the other policy gave in 22 years an increase of \$1,522,000, the two facts placed side by side, tell their own story, and need no comment. Great as were the advantages this country derived from free trade, those advantages were minimised by certain currency troubles that existed in the United States, at the close of the rebellion. From 1862 to 1866, the reckless gambling in gold, the depreciation of American currency, the reduction in the purchasing power of that currency, greatly diminished the advantages that this country would have derived from free trade had there been stable currency in the United States; and when the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated, almost immediately following that event came a more stable condition of American currency and a revival of business in that country, and an improvement in trade in consequence of that revival. We had the good effects of reciprocity minimised by this condition of currency, and we had the evil effects of the abrogation of the treaty for the first few years minimised by the return of the United States to a sounder currency; but even with these evils minimising the advantages in the one case and the disadvantages in the other, the results, as I have explained them to you, strikingly illustrate the great advantages to be derived by this country from free intercourse with the United States. What do our farmers remember about the years during the years which the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation? Talk with any farmer who lived then, and he will tell you of the excellent markets we had for our produce and cattle and stock. He will tell you that buyers swarmed in the country, he will tell you that there was an active demand for everything he had—and these are the days the farmers look back to as the bright days in the history of their country, these are the days they desire to see come again, and these are the days they are going to vote to have come again. These are the days that my hon. friend's resolution promises shall come to them again, and they will try that resolution, at all events, before they are convinced that they cannot have them again.

My hon. friend in his speech the other night showed, I was sorry to see, that he did not know

anything of a definite nature about the volume of our internal commerce. He told us it was great, I believe it is great. Internal commerce is naturally very much greater than external commerce. We have a large railway mileage, we have an extensive business done on those railways, we have extensive transactions between the various Provinces of this Dominion and also between various portions of the same Province, and I have no doubt that the internal commerce of Canada is a very large one, and I have no doubt further that, if the area over which our commercial transactions exist was extended, those transactions would be increased over that area, and I think it is easily demonstrated that the internal commerce of the United States is in proportion very much greater than our own. In the report of Mr. Switzer, the chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the United States, the last report made, we find a rather astounding calculation. I confess it startled me. It may be exaggerated or not, but it is made in an official document of the United States, and that statement is that the internal commerce of the United States in 1887 amounted to \$32,874,000,000. That is 360 times greater than the commerce of Canada with the United States, it is 170 times greater than the commerce of Canada with all the world. It is true that this is an enormous figure. It is two and a half times larger than the export and import trade of the world in 1880. It is twenty-five times more than the import and export trade of the United States in 1886. Whether it is closely correct or not, it shows how vast is the volume of commerce which courses through the business veins of that great country, and enlivens and vivifies the great industries within its borders. If one will stop to consider how grand a theatre for unfettered commercial intercourse is furnished by the northern part of the American continent, he can never for a moment imagine that the policy of our hon. friend opposite is a policy conceived in the interest of the country. Take this vast country, stretching from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean, with its great sweep of sea coast—the Mexican Gulf sea coast, the Atlantic sea coast, all along the States and along Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, along the coast of Labrador and up to the Arctic Ocean, and then the line of coast from Behring's Straits to the State of California—take that great country with its intercommunication by means of its rivers and inland seas—the Mississippi system with its 16,000 miles of navigation, the rivers flowing into the Atlantic, the St. Lawrence, the Mackenzie, the Yukon, the inland seas and all those great arteries of communication stretching throughout that country in every direction, and furnishing the means of intercommunication; take all the range and varieties of climate which exist from the sub-tropic climate to the Arctic; take its variety of products and consider that every known production on the face of the globe can be obtained within its boundaries; take its mines, its forests and its fisheries, its railway development, and estimate what will be the future of this great country and its future population when it has a population to day of sixty-seven millions. It is destined to be the seat of the greatest empire the world has seen, the home of civilisation. The best hope of humanity are centered upon this great land; and the future development of the wealth and population of this country will be beyond our knowledge and beyond our imagination. We are now outside of this union, and we have been invited to participate in the advantages which may result from the intercourse which should take place between us; and I say that every consideration of self-interest should induce us, if nothing else would, to break down the trade barriers which exist between us. Let those barriers be broken down, and the ever-expanding and cumulative forces of trade intercourse cannot stop at the boundary but will go on increasing for the advantage of both parties to the agreement. We have nothing to keep

Mr. CHARLTON.

us apart in connection with race distinctions. The French in Louisiana and the Anglo-Saxons in the other States get along easily enough and without difficulty; so also we trust will the French of Quebec and the Anglo-Saxons of North America. We have substantially the same institutions as they have. We have a common language. We have similar laws. We have religious affinities with our neighbors. There is nothing to prevent these two countries from living together in peace and amity, as far as their commercial relations are concerned. What are the forces which fight against the continuance of the barriers which impede trade? What are the forces which forbid that these two countries shall remain in a state of commercial hostility with one another? They are geography, nature, racial affinity, business interest, common sense, and the intermingling of the two peoples. We have now at least a million native Canadians in the United States, we have from a million and a quarter to a million and a half of the descendants of Canadians in that country. Do they exercise any influence on the opinion of that great people? We have perhaps half a million of foreign immigrants who have gone there after coming to this country, and that is a mighty force which is drawing these two countries more and more together, and is impressing on the mind of both countries the desirability of free commercial intercourse and the absurdity of maintaining the condition of things which now exist. I assume, then, that free intercourse is desirable, and perhaps I will enter a little more fully later into some particular reasons why it is desirable.

I assert now that the Government of this country show practically no sense of the importance of this question. I assert that they are trifling with the people of this country, that they are making an assertion that they have sought diligently to obtain free commercial relations with them, when they know, and every man of sense knows, that these overtures were made in a direction that they knew were fore-ordained to failure. They have professed to make overtures for free trade relations upon lines which they have been told again and again would never be accepted, they have studiously refrained from making overtures upon any line which was likely to be successful, and they have shown clearly and unmistakably that they do not want to have free trade relations and would not take them on any obtainable terms; but they seek to allay the feeling in the country in favor of this exchange of trade by professing that they are seeking for and are desirous of free trade relations, and that they will obtain them as soon as the United States will grant them on reasonable and equitable terms. Well, Sir, they will never get them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. They will never get them, because they will not sacrifice the interests of a small minority of the population of this country that are bleeding the majority, they will not sacrifice their interests for the interests of the millions of this country. They have been placed in power by a little clique of manufacturers, by a small favored ring, for whom the Government legislate, and whose interests are paramount, in the estimation of this Government, to the interests of the farmer, the lumberman, the ship owner, the fisherman, and the laborer; and for that reason they will never get it because they will never seek for it on terms upon which they can obtain it. They have been invited to come and get it. I have in my hand an invitation from the mouthpiece of the American nation, from their Minister of Foreign Affairs, to an hon. gentleman who no longer has a seat in this House. A plainer and more urgent invitation to open negotiations with a view to obtaining freer trade relations, never was proffered by one country to another, a letter of Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State of the United

State, written on the 31st May, 1887, to "My dear Sir Charles."

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh, Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; it is a bad pill for our friends, and I do not wonder that it extorts from them that expression of agony and pain. Mr. Bayard says:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. Your own able, earnest and patriotic services in the Government and Parliament of the Dominion are well known, and afford ample proof of your comprehension of the resources, rapidly increasing interests, and needs of British North America. On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country, and trust to do it worthily. The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain which has been *questio vezata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however, indirectly, or by any intendment, however, partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is not that an overture inviting this country to enter upon negotiations for the purpose of securing a modification, at least, of the trade restrictions existing between the two countries? I ask if that is not an overture that should have been responded to, if we had received it in a proper spirit, by an attempt, at least, to secure this modification of trade restrictions? Sir, I assert that it was an overture which was not met in the right spirit, and that no attempt was made by the Government of this country to meet Mr. Bayard on the lines that would have secured a modification of these trade restrictions—I assert that broadly. On the contrary, this Government has pursued towards the United States a policy of irritation, a policy of irritation characterised by the mode in which the fishery regulations were enforced, which I do not need to allude to more particularly, as it has been alluded to already. This spirit of irritation has been manifested in other respects; it has been manifested in the treatment of the question of canal tolls. We have imposed upon vessels passing through the Welland Canal a toll of 20 cents a ton, and we have granted a rebate to those vessels going to the port of Montreal of 18 cents a ton. We have discriminated against the American commerce passing through that canal to the extent of 18-20, and that in face of that fact that our shipping has been permitted to use the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, an expensive work, costing over five million dollars, entirely free of charge. For years, ever since the construction of that canal, the United States Government has kept it in repair, and furnished a force to operate its locks; and every Canadian vessel that has passed through that canal has done so without payment of a cent. The same with the St. Clair Flats Canal; the same with the improvements of the Lime Kiln Crossing, and its expensive works which the American Government have permitted us to use entirely free of charge. In return for this neighborly conduct, we levy upon their commerce passing through the Welland Canal 20 cents a ton, and we discriminate against commerce going to their ports, by rebating 18 cents of that 20 cents a ton to all vessels going to Montreal. Sir, that is not neighborly treatment. Then, when we granted the free admission of fruits, we destroyed entirely all evidences of friendly feeling and kindness of spirit in this matter by that poor little contemptible tax of one cent a basket on the baskets in which the fruit comes; and the collection of that tax, I am told by fruit importers, in some cases led to serious loss on whole car loads of fruit. They were side-tracked, in order to

go through the formalities of a customs entry; the owner in some point in Ontario would be required to come down and enter them, and by the time he had got through the entry and paid the one cent a basket on his purchase, the fruit, especially in the case of peaches, would be badly damaged in consequence of the delay. I have a letter in my pocket to that effect. No doubt this tax cannot yield anything of any consequence; nevertheless it is irritating in its character, more so perhaps than it would be if an amount of revenue of any consequence was realised from it, and it seems to me that nothing could have been more impolitic than the petty cheese-paring spirit manifested. We had this spirit manifested the other day in respect to a few curlers coming over from Buffalo to engage in a friendly game with another party at Toronto, and bringing with them an illuminated address. They were required to give bonds that their curling stones would not be kept in Canada but would be carried back, and they were charged \$1.75 duty on their illuminated address that they were going to present to the curling club in Toronto. Well, it is \$1.75 gained for the Government and bad feeling engendered. I do not think this is wise conduct; I do not think we are making enough, in the shape of revenue, to compensate for the effect upon friendly relations between the two countries, by these small affairs. Then we have the raising of invoices. I know of one case where a party who wished to import certain malleable goods, went to the parties producing the goods in this country and offered them the cost of these goods with the entire amount of duty added. It was refused, and he imported the goods, and the Customs placed its own valuation upon those goods and made him pay duty on 50 per cent. more than their cost. This is not the kind of policy that produces good feeling, it is not a kind of policy that is commendable or politic. Then we are greatly interested in sending fresh fish to the United States free of duty. We import a small amount of fresh fish from the United States, and we impose a duty of half a cent a pound on this fish, jeopardising the whole vast trade of this country with the United States in fresh fish—another specimen of the wisdom of the Government in their management of international relations. There has been, I am sorry to say, an unfriendly spirit manifested in many things. The Americans believe that spirit is unfriendly, and these manifestations have provoked resentment of a very serious character. It is believed in the United States that we have purposely made our fishery regulations oppressive and troublesome for the purpose of extorting from them concessions, and, naturally, they say: "We will see you further before we will give you any concessions under these circumstances." If our friends will read *Æsop's Fables*—

Mr. BOWELL. We are hearing them now.

Mr. CHARLTON—there is an instance related where the wind concluded that it would make a man open his cloak. It blew upon him with great force, and the more the wind blew the tighter the man wrapped his cloak around him. It was found impossible for the wind to compel that man to throw open his cloak. Well, it ceased its efforts, and then the sun shone out warm and benignant upon the man, and after it had shone a few minutes he unbuttoned his cloak. Warmer and warmer it got, and finally the warmth of the sun compelled him to remove his coat. And so it will be here. It is said molasses will catch more flies than vinegar. I believe it is true; and if we want to obtain concessions we do not want to provoke unfriendly conflict by seizing American vessels, charging one cent a basket on their peach baskets, a duty on their illuminated addresses and make them give bonds on curling stones. These are things we should not do. On the contrary, we want to treat them in a broad, generous and friendly spirit and thus engender that cordial feeling which will lead to trade concessions.



Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance the other night took the ground that our progress had been in the highest degree satisfactory, that we had, I understood him to assert, very little to wish for, that, under all the circumstances, we could not have expected to have progressed more rapidly or to have occupied a more favorable position than we now occupied. If our growth and development have been satisfactory, why there is no great reason to require change or modification of our commercial relations; and I propose to inquire briefly and in a very candid manner whether our growth and development have been of a satisfactory character. First with respect to increase of population. In 1871 we had 3,635,000 inhabitants; in 1881, 4,324,000 inhabitants, the increase being 689,000 souls, an increase of about 18½ per cent. I turn to the United States and find the increase in that country in the decade commencing one year earlier and ending one year earlier was 30 8, as against 18½ in Canada. This is not satisfactory. Here we have a difference in the increase of population of the two countries of more than 11 per cent. against ourselves, and there is no reason for it. This is a strong vigorous race in Canada, a race which would naturally increase more rapidly than the population in the United States, and if our increase in population was 11 per cent. less than that of the United States our ratio of progress and development is shown to be unsatisfactory by that one fact. As I stated a while ago, we have probably in the United States to day one million of Canadians; last census showed 712,000 and the ratio of increase that obtained between 1870 and 1880 would give within a fraction of one million. All these facts prove that our progress has not been satisfactory. There is another matter which shows this fact still more clearly: The United States have developed in excess of Canada in many respects. They raised last year \$700,000,000 worth of corn, a larger quantity of wheat than we raised per head, an enormous quantity of wines and fruits, of which we raised comparatively nothing, a larger quantity of wool, more sheep, a vastly larger number of swine, in proportion to population; and of articles that we do not produce, tobacco to the value of \$43,372,000; cotton to the value of \$254,117,000; sugar 145,000 hogsheads. In manufactures, where Canada produced in 1881 to the value of \$309,676,000, the United States produced in 1880 \$5,369,667,000 worth, or equal to five-tenths *per capita* in excess of our production. All industries, according to Mulhall, reached, in the United States the value of £2,281,000,000, Canada £167,000,000, or equal to two-tenths *per capita* in excess of our production. Mulhall gives the wealth of the United States and other countries in 1880 in pounds sterling, that of the United States being £9,495,000,000, and that of Canada £550,000,000, a *per capita* excess in favor of the United States of five-tenths. This shows a vast development in that country as compared with Canada.

In regard to public debt, notwithstanding the plausible explanation of the Minister of Finance, our position is a most unsatisfactory one. Our debt on the 1st February, 1889, was \$230,370,564, or equal to \$47.33 per head—I think the Minister of Finance made it a few cents less: The debt of the United States on the same date was \$1,121,845,973. The Pacific Railway debts it is fair, under our mode of calculation giving the net debt, to deduct as good and valuable assets. They are about to make some arrangements by which they will amply secure the United States on a 3 per cent. 50-year loan, at which rate the Government can borrow the money. Deducting the Pacific Railway debt, the principal and interest of the United States debt, February 1st, 1889, was \$1,009,982,000, or \$16.82 per head on a basis of population of 60,000,000, against \$47.33 per head in Canada on a basis of 5,000,000. If we add State debts, as the hon. gentleman said we should do, the net amount of which is \$170,000,000, this makes the

Mr. CHARLTON.

total equal to a *per capita* charge for national and State debts of \$19.67, as against \$47.33 in Canada. That is not a satisfactory condition of things. The hon. gentleman, at great length, compared the expenses of this country with the expenses of the United States. I have prepared some statistics on these heads. I find our debt has increased, since Confederation, \$160,941,923, or three fold. The increase of our debt in the last ten years was \$96,308,495. While our debt increased three fold, the American debt was reduced from \$2,508,151,211, in 1867, down to \$1,121,845,973, February 1st, 1889, without deducting the Pacific Railway assets, which are, in round numbers, \$111,000,000. In the period since 1873 the United States have reduced their debt by \$511,635,306, while during that period we have increased our debt by \$96,000,000. So in the matter of public debt, the comparison is a very unsatisfactory one for this country. Then we were told by the hon. gentleman that the United States pays no judges except a few Supreme Court judges, and has no immigration and quarantine charges, no governors to pay, no militia to sustain, no penitentiaries to keep up, and that if our expenditure had been on the same basis as that of the United States, instead of having a debt to-day, we would have had a surplus of \$45,000,000. I would ask the hon. gentleman how that calculation was worked out. I would ask the hon. gentleman what would have been the position in this country under circumstances such as those encountered in the United States from 1861 to 1864, when a supreme struggle for existence occurred during which the American people accumulated their great debt? Why, this country would have been ruined. The expenses under the following heads in the countries respectively, were as follows:—

United States Pension Charges, 1888 .....	\$ 80,288,508
Per capita, \$1.33 .....	
Canada Pension charges, 1888 .....	120,333
Per capita, 2-4 .....	
United States Military Establishment .....	33,522,436
Per capita, 51-4 .....	
Canada Militia and Mounted Police .....	2,136,143
Per capita, 42-7 .....	
United States Naval Establishment .....	16,926,437
Per capita, 28-2 .....	
Canada Ocean and River Service .....	211,462
Per capita, 4-2 .....	
United States Congress .....	5,892,115
Per capita, 9 .....	
Canada Legislature .....	807,424
Per capita, 16 .....	
United States Judiciary .....	4,581,828
Per capita, 7-6 .....	
Canadian Administration of Justice .....	678,814
Per capita, 13½ .....	
United States Foreign Intercourse .....	1,593,461
Canada, \$20,000 .....	
United States Interest .....	44,715,007
Per capita, 74½ .....	
Canada Interest .....	9,823,303
Per capita, \$1.96 4 .....	
United States Custom .....	219,091,173
Per capita, \$3.65 .....	
Canada .....	21,105,926
Per capita, \$4.42 .....	
United States Customs and Excise .....	343,388,044
Per capita, \$5.72 .....	
Canada Customs and Excise .....	28,177,413
Per capita, \$5.63 .....	
Customs and Excise in U.S., 1838 .....	\$343,388,044
Payment on Public Debt, year ending 1838 .....	112,163,781
	<hr/>
Per capita, \$3.85 .....	231,224,266

It must be borne in mind that the United States, last year, reduced their debt by \$112,163,000. That came out of their excise and customs duties, and that leaves their expenses at \$231,000,000, or a *per capita* expense, aside from the payment of the debt, of \$3.85 per head, as against \$5.63 in Canada. If we add to that, as my friend probably claims we should do, the *per capita* taxation for States of \$1.03 per head it would make for both of those \$4.93 as against \$5.63 in Canada, or still an excess in our case of 70 cents

per head. The United States pays 180·6 per head for pensions more than we do. It is an abnormal and not a permanent charge, and if we set this aside it would leave our *per capita* expenditure \$2 greater than the expenditure of the United States and the various State governments combined. I do not think the comparison is a favorable one to us. The lesson furnished to us is a suggestive one, and that lesson is that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance does really need to practice economy for we are on the high road to difficulties. The hon. Minister draws a rosy picture of our condition because he is able to point out that our debt *per capita* is not so much as it is in France or Belgium and other European countries, which are ground down to the earth by the expense of maintaining vast armies. These countries are continually preparing for war and practically live in a state of war every year. Their population is ground down by all the burdens that can possibly be imposed upon them; and yet forsooth, the Minister of Finance says we should congratulate ourselves because our condition is not quite so bad as theirs. I do not know that I need waste more time on this question, I had some more figures bearing on it but I may say that the conclusions drawn by my friend the Minister of Finance will not bear investigation, and that our condition as compared with the United States in matters relating to the finances of the two countries is an unfavorable one.

Mr. FOSTER. Your figures and mine about taxation are just the same.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aware that in some respects they are, but you attempted to draw conclusions from them that were in no wise warranted by the facts. Our railways show a still greater disparity in the development of the two countries. We carried in 1887 upon our railways 16,356,335 tons of freight; of this freight 2,580,000 was carried by the Canada Southern, and 6,458,000 by the Grand Trunk Railway. It would be a moderate estimate to assume that 3,000,000 of this freight was freight in transit through Canada from one part of the United States to the other, leaving the actual transit of freight in Canada about 13,300,000 tons. That same year the United States railways carried 552,074,752 tons, and we have therefore this result, that the carriage of freight in Canada was 3·27 tons per head and in the United States it was 9·12 tons per head, or about three times as much freight on the railways in the United States as upon Canadian railways. The number of passengers carried upon the railways of Canada was 10,608,638, and the passengers carried upon the United States railways amounted to 428,225,573, or 2·14 in Canada to 7 per head in the United States, again about three times the volume of passenger trade in the United States that there was in Canada. The total earnings of the railways in Canada was \$38,842,000 and on the United States railways \$931,385,154, so that the railways in Canada earned \$7·75 per head as compared with \$15·52 in the United States. We have the advantage of the United States in our railway system in one respect, for we have \$129,810,000 of Government money in our railways or \$26 *per capita*, while in the United States they have only \$65,000,000 invested, or \$1·08 per head, and that is not a subsidy but a loan. The statistics which I have quoted must prove pretty clearly that in the matter of the development of our trade, in the matter of increase of population, in the matter of debt burden, and in all the particulars which I have mentioned the comparison between the two countries show that it is not favorable to our country, and that a condition of things prevails here which we should not desire. I do not parade the fact for the sake of deriving any satisfaction from it, but it is necessary for us to face the situation, and to know exactly our condition, and in making our calculations we should know what is necessary to be done. We want to know exactly the basis

upon which our calculation should be made, and recognising the necessity for this knowledge it is perfectly proper that we should examine the question in this sense.

I referred a short time ago to the vast internal commerce of the United States, and I referred to that as proof of the great advantages derived by that country from unrestricted commercial intercourse between all those States. No more striking proof of this can be had than the statement made in the report that the internal commerce between the States was two and a-half times greater than the total export and import trade of the entire world in 1880. It was twenty-five times greater than the foreign commerce of the United States, import and export, which in 1886 was \$1,314,960,000. It was thirty times greater *per capita* than the commerce between Canada and the United States. I say that this vast internal commerce is one, which if we are wise, we should desire to enter into and to obtain the benefit of.

Mr. HAGGART. Where did you get those figures as regards the internal trade?

Mr. CHARLTON. From the report of Mr. Switzler, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States on the Internal Commerce of the United States for 1887, page 570.

I have just one more item of comparison to make between the trade of those two countries. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was kind enough to refer to me the other night in very friendly and kindly terms in connection with my labors on the Mining Commission of Ontario, and he stated, as was true, that in that capacity I had been able to have my ideas as to the great extent and capabilities of this country, in a mineral sense, very much enlarged. I had. I found that we have enormous mineral resources. I was glad to see how widely they are extended and how great they were, and I found out another thing also; I found from Ottawa to Port Arthur, wherever I went, one universal cry—and there was not a dissenting voice to that cry—on the part of every man interested in minerals, copper, iron silver, gold, and structural materials. They all said: "Give us access to the American markets, we are languishing for the want of a market; we are cribbed, cabined and confined; our energies are repressed and we can do nothing. Right across the line are unlimited markets for the products of our mines, but we are debarred from that market by the trade restrictions that exist between the two countries." I heard this complaint so often repeated that I finally became aware—and I am sure that a very few men of this country are fully aware of it—of the vast importance of this question as regards the mineral development of this country. No other great interest in Canada is suffering so severely or would be benefited so greatly by the removal of trade restrictions as the mining interests of this Dominion. Now, what is the state of our mineral development as compared with that of the United States? In Mr. Coste's report we find it stated that the mineral production of Canada last year was \$15,000,000; but he includes in that statement brick, coke, iron, steel and tiles. As iron, he gives both the ore and the iron; one is a duplicate of the other. The American report gives neither iron, nor coke, nor steel, nor tiles nor brick; and when we eliminate these articles from Mr. Coste's report for the sake of a comparison on a fair basis, we find that our mineral production last year was \$12,113,000, while the mineral production of the United States was \$542,284,000, or a *per capita* excess in the United States over Canada of 3·75, or nearly four times as much as ours. In these circumstances, we cannot flatter ourselves that our mineral production is on a satisfactory basis. Going into particulars, I find that the Americans produced *per capita* 12 times as much iron ore as Canada, 21½ times as much pig iron, 150 times as much lead, 4·05 times as much coal, 16·15 times as much coke, 3·07 times as much building stone, 3·2 times as much brick and tile, 4·25 times as much

lime, and 8 times as much cement as we did. Consequently I arrive at the conclusion that our mineral development, compared with that of the United States, is by no means satisfactory. And when I come to sum up the comparative development of these two countries, I find that in increase of population in a decade, our increase amounts to 18.75 against the United States' increase of 30.8. In agricultural products their production exceeds ours greatly in corn, wheat, wool, sheep, swine, fruits, wine, cotton, tobacco and sugar. In manufacture they exceed us by 5.10 per capita, in the products of industry they exceed us 2.10, in wealth they exceed us by 5.10; in debt we exceed them in the ratio of \$17.33 against \$6.82 *per capita*. In railway commerce they exceed us by 9.2 against 3.27 *per capita*; in passengers they exceed us in the ratio of 7 against 2.14 *per capita*; in earnings they exceed us by \$15.52 against \$1.75 *per capita*. Their internal commerce is 300 times as much as our commerce with them, and 170 times as much as our commerce with the world; and in mineral development they exceed us according to the statement I have given. Now, from these facts I arrive at the conclusion that our progress is not satisfactory as compared with theirs in any of the respects that go to make up the growth of a great state. I assert that but for the exodus, this country to-day would have had a population of 8,000,000 in place of 5,000,000, and the Province of Ontario would have had a population exceeding 4,000,000; and let any man picture to himself the condition of things that we should have seen to-day if the Dominion had a population of 8,000,000 in place of the condition we find actually prevailing. Now, Sir, what is the cause of this state of things? Is it lack of energy and vigor on the part of the race that inhabits this country? No, Sir, it is not. There is not a more vigorous or energetic race on this continent or in this world than the population of Canada. Canadians in the United States are everywhere making their way, and are considered the most valuable element almost in the population of that country. Let two young men go to any business house in Chicago or any other part of the west, having equal education and equal advantages, a man from Canada, and a man from the Middle or Eastern States, and in nine cases out of ten the Canadian will get the preference, simply because he is a Canadian, because of the reputation Canadians have in the United States for energy, vigor and intelligence. Well, Sir, is it on account of bad laws or institutions? No, Sir, it is not. The laws of this country are good; the institutions of this country are good. It may be that they have been badly administered in some cases; I think they have. It is our business very often to criticise the administration of affairs; but on the whole, considering the circumstances surrounding us and the difficulties confronting the administration of this country, the administration of affairs has not perhaps been so very much worse than we might suppose was inevitable. But I assert that the laws and institutions of the country are in no wise responsible for the case I present to this House and the country. Well, Sir, is it for lack of natural resources? No, it is not. Our natural resources in our fisheries, our timber, our mines, our minerals, and our soil, are enormous—resources sufficient, Sir, for one of the greatest nations of the globe. It is not for lack of resources, from want of energy or vigor in our people, it is not from any fault in our laws and institutions, that this country has not progressed as it should have done. Well, what is the cause? Why, Sir, it is defiance of natural laws; it is defiance of the requirements of geographical affinity; it is defiance of race affinity; it is defiance of the requirements of common sense; it is because we shut ourselves out from our natural markets; it is the want of continental free trade;—that is the trouble with this country.

We are told that the National Policy is a grand institution. Our friend the Minister of Finance told us the other day that

Mr. CHARLTON.

he could not sacrifice that one little feature of our policy on any consideration whatever. He told us that if we could get commercial intercourse with the United States in natural products, shut out their manufactures, and continue to foster our National Policy, we should be all right; but as for sacrificing the National Policy, it was not to be for one moment thought of; and in connection with that, the hon. Minister made an assertion that seemed to me rather astounding. He was descanting on the desirability of opening up foreign markets, and he told us in explicit terms that our cotton mills were able to find a profitable market for their products in those neutral markets where they must meet British competition on equal terms. If that be true, if they can find a profitable market in China, India, and Japan, where they must sell in competition with goods from Manchester without any advantage of tariff on their side, I want to ask why they cannot do it here—why it is necessary to have from 25 to 35 per cent. duty against those goods coming into Canada. I would like to know how that is; and I am afraid that if that is the case, this arrangement made by Secretary Fairchild, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, against the protective tariff of that country, has a vast amount of truth in it which will apply to this country. The Secretary of State says in this annual report for 1888:

"Beside the vexed economic question as to whether a country can make itself prosperous by a tariff, whether it can increase the relative average comfort of its whole people by diverting a portion of its labor and capital from the employments which could be most profitably followed under natural conditions, thereby making certain of the necessities of life more costly than they would be otherwise, there is a higher moral question which may well be asked, and that is, can a government be kept pure and free which, through the agency of its laws, offers vast pecuniary temptations to some kinds of business?"

"There are many indications that this question must be answered in the negative. There are many proofs that large classes of our business men have come to depend for success upon their skill in manipulating Governmental agencies, rather than upon industry, intelligence and honorable competition."

Does the hon. the Minister of Finance know anything about that?

"Is it not possible that eagerness for the money which men assume comes to them only through government, may lead them to use an overgrowing proportion of their gains to possess and influence the supposed source of their wealth. And will not the endeavor to make men rich soon become the chief function of our government? Is not this already the case? If these dangers exist, if they are not overestimated, then can it be doubted that the true welfare of our people calls for the rescue of the government from them as speedily as may be? This can only be done by severing government from private business; steps should at once be taken in that direction, always, however let me repeat, bearing in mind interests which may have become established under present laws; to the end that they may not suffer unduly while beneficent reforms are made."

Now, I fear that is the case in this country. I fear that these interests which seek to control the government do, in a large measure, control it; and instead of relying on their own energy, skill and capital, rely on undue favors from the Government for the profits which they seek to make. In fact, I am certain this is the case. But supposing we concede the National Policy is all it claims to be, conceding that it may actually create a home market in this country and will serve the purposes it is intended to serve, conceding all this, we have to the south of us a country that has been engaged in the same business of building up a home market for the last 25 years. During that time they have imposed heavy duties on their imports, they have fostered and created to some extent a great manufacturing interest, and I hold it would be the part of wisdom for Canada to seek access to that great market, created by the taxation of that country for 25 years, rather than undergo the expensive and not very desirable process which that country has undergone in the creation of that market. Break down the barriers, and instead of waiting 25 years to create a market in Canada, let us get access to the American market which is already created. If the National Policy is a correct policy, here is a short cut to

the very result you are striving for, and which otherwise it will take you 25 years to attain, and which when you have attained it will not give you one-thirteenth the market that will be opened to you by the adoption of the policy of free trade with the United States. I commend this policy to the hon. the Minister of Finance. It will be a stroke of genius on his part, and obviate the difficulties which beset the delusive course the Government have adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a great Hitt!

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be a very good Hitt indeed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the best way to Foster a market.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say a few words upon a very important branch of that part of my subject, which relates to the desirability of securing access to the American markets; that is the bearing which continental free trade would have on the mineral development of our country. Last year we produced in Canada 76,330 tons of iron ore, while the production of the United States amounted to 11,300,000 tons. We exported last year from Ontario 13,534 tons of iron ore, and from the whole Dominion 13,544 tons, and the total export of ore from Ontario since 1869 has been 524,511 tons. When we compare this trade with the volume of trade for a single year from Lake Superior, we will be astounded at its small proportions. It must be borne in mind that we have enormous deposits of iron ore, mines that are accessible and easily reached by railway, at quite convenient distances from lake navigation, and it is supposed we are capable of placing an unlimited amount of ore in the American market. The shipments of ore from Lake Superior ports to Lake Erie ports last year amounted to 5,023,279 tons, and that ore was worth at the point of shipment about \$20,000,000. In its transportation about \$6,000,000 was paid for freight. That volume of ore from Lake Superior was 350 times greater than the entire export from Ontario for last year, and nine and a half times greater than the entire export from Ontario since 1869—nine and a-half times greater in one year than the whole exports of Ontario during twenty years. We have enormous quantities of ore. We have discovered west of Port Arthur the Minnesota iron range projecting into our territory, of unknown extent, which it is believed contains sufficient ore to supply the whole consumption of this continent for centuries. That ore can be easily reached, yet, under the depressing policy of this Government, we have only a beggarly showing of 15,534 tons exported from Ontario while 5,023,000 long tons have been exported from Lake Superior. From the port of Two Harbors on Lake Superior the shipments from the Vermilion mine on this range, in 1884, amounted to 62,124 tons, and reached, in 1888, 511,539 tons. There are vast possibilities for the development of this trade, but it can be developed only on the condition that the duty shall be removed, and this ore admitted to the American market free. Last year we produced 24,827 tons of pig iron, and the United States produced 6,417,000 tons. The charcoal production of Michigan was 180,000 tons. If the duty were removed we could supply the whole of that trade as advantageously as Michigan. We could produce enormous quantities of iron in Nova Scotia. I am told by men conversant with the business that there is but one point in America where iron can be produced at a cheaper rate than at Picou, and that is at Birmingham in Alabama. With free access to the American market, there is no reason why we should not see an enormous production of iron in the mines of Nova Scotia, and of charcoal iron in Ontario, where the timber is contiguous to the ore, and the iron can be cheaply manufactured.

In coal we produced 2,368,891 tons last year, while the United States produced 116,049,604 tons of anthracite and bituminous. We exported from Nova Scotia to the

United States, 92,176 tons. Now, when I look at the position of Nova Scotia mines, they being the only coal mines on the Atlantic seaboard, being the most favorably situated for supplying every port on that seaboard,—when I look at the position of these mines, I am astonished that the exports should be but 92,000 tons in one year. The New England States require, according to a rough estimate, 4,000,000 tons of bituminous coal a year, and New York requires a large quantity also. Were these duties removed, there is no doubt that Nova Scotia could sell to the New England States and New York three million tons, or thirty times the amount of the present export. There cannot be any doubt that an enormous development of the coal business of Nova Scotia would result from the removal of these duties.

Then, with regard to copper, we have many mines of copper in this country, but many of them are not large enough to warrant the erection of smelting works, and copper mine owners tell me in every case that it would be of great importance if they could ship their copper to the American market. At present, they are charged five cents per pound duty on the copper contained in their ores.

Then there is the question of salt. We have in the Lake Haron basin probably an extent of 1,200 square miles of a salt district producing the best salt on this continent. The product in 1887 was 425,000 barrels, while the product in Michigan was 3,900,000 barrels. Were that market open to our producers, and were the duty on coal slack removed, there is no reason whatever why we should not compete with the Michigan producer, or share with him the enormous product of 3,900,000 barrels a year.

Then, as to building stone, we have at various points in Ontario marble, granite, freestone, and sandstone of the most excellent quality. At Nepigon Bay, on Lake Superior, there are immense quarries of freestone of a quality which stands the test of fire and frost better than any freestone in the market. We have mountains of marble. The Commission visited one marble quarry near Sault Ste. Marie, which was close to navigation, where vessels could load the stone without difficulty. It was 5,000 feet wide, and 50 feet high, and it went down into the bowels of the earth below the possibility of reckoning, and it went back into the country for several miles. But for the duty on marble, the manager told us that he could do a very large trade in that stone, and would, if the duty were removed, erect a mill for sawing and polishing that would employ 300 men. In 1887, the United States produced \$25,000,000 of building stone and marble, while Canada produced only \$558,491 worth. The exports of Canada to the United States of stone amounted to \$65,300, of which Ontario exported \$21,224. There was the beggarly amount of \$21,000 worth of stone of all kinds exported to the United States from Ontario, as compared with the produce in the United States of \$25,000,000 worth. The quarries of Ontario are so situated that marble, granite, freestone and sandstone could be exported, if it were not for the duties, at the least possible cost to Chicago with its 900,000 inhabitants, to Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo—all first-class cities which are using great quantities of stone in construction every year; and we, with the facilities for conveying that stone by water, combined with the superior quality of our stone could defy competition but for these duties, though, as a matter of fact, we only exported this small amount of \$21,000 worth. Then, as to brick, cement, lime, and so on, Canada produced in 1887 \$1,633,525, while the United States produced \$75,661,000. Of this we exported \$238,625, of which Ontario exported \$21,217. There is a great chance of development in this trade, and we have just as good a chance for reaching these great cities with this class of production as we have with stone, provided the duties were removed, and we could extend our communication with more distant parts of the United States by means of the Erie Canal and other means

of communication. In the production of these structural materials, the opportunity opening for trade with a free American market is without limit. The business might employ millions of capital and tens of thousands of laborers but for the tariff. The total export of minerals from Ontario during the years from 1869 to 1888 was of the value of \$17,675,391. Of that, \$14,332,497 went to the United States, \$3,340,317 to Great Britain, while \$2,577 went to all the rest of the world. We have vast mineral resources in Ontario, as well as in British Columbia and Nova Scotia. We have silver and gold in this country. The Commission visited a silver district west of Port Arthur which, I believe, will prove to be the finest silver district on this continent. I believe my hon. friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will bear me out in the statement that that it is likely to be the most productive silver region known on the American continent. That district would receive a vast development from the removal of trade restrictions. It is true that there is no duty on silver ore, but, if we could obtain the introduction of machinery free of duty and could attract the attention of American capitalists to that region, we would obtain a great impetus to the development of the silver resources west of Port Arthur and the gold resources near the Lake of the Woods.

I recently visited the south, and I saw that millions of dollars were pouring into that country, that a magical era of development had commenced, and that a new south was being created. Birmingham, Alabama, is a town of 50,000 inhabitants, which has grown up, I might say, like Jonah's gourd, in a night. I saw another city, called Bessemer city, with great furnaces and rolling mills, where not a tree was cut twenty months ago. I saw towns being built up, cities springing into existence, railways under construction or recently built, and agriculture benefited by the vast amount of capital which was poured into that country, and I asked myself: Why do we not share in this swelling tide progress? The answer is that the duties keep the capital out. Americans look upon Canada as a foreign country. The truth is that the duties deprive us of the advantages which we might otherwise obtain, and of the millions of capital which would come in here, the railways which would be constructed, the cities which would be built, and the vast development of our interests which would result if those duties were removed. I believe that in five years, with free trade with the United States, our mineral production would receive a development equal to \$20,000,000 a year, and that would involve an expenditure of \$12,000,000 per annum for labor alone. I want to know if the laborers of this country are not interested in a policy which in minerals alone, would add, in all probability, \$12,000,000 a year to the expenditure for labor.

Now, I wish to call attention to the Provinces in this Dominion whose exports of the produce of Canada to the United States exceed their exports to Great Britain. First, we have Ontario, which in 1883 exported \$23,074,733 to the United States and \$4,000,360 to Great Britain. Nova Scotia exported \$1,115,641 to the United States, and \$1,823,832 to Great Britain. Prince Edward Island exported \$915,951 to the United States and \$80,626 to Great Britain. British Columbia in the same year exported \$2,228,385 to the United States, and \$1,029,110 to Great Britain. So that, from those Provinces, there were \$29,334,710 worth of exports to the United States, and \$6,933,928 to Great Britain. What does that teach? Here are four of the seven Provinces that export to the United States almost five times more than their total exports to England. When I come to the classification of these exports, the produce of Canada to the United States and the exports to Great Britain, I find the following:

Mr. CHARLTON.

	United States.	Great Britain.
The Mine .....	\$ 3,341,308	\$ 478,260
The Fisheries .....	3,123,853	1,544,901
The Forest .....	10,622,338	8,932,177
Agricultural Products .....	10,306,278	4,292,640
Miscellaneous Articles .....	701,616	66,840
	<b>\$28,095,393</b>	<b>\$15,314,318</b>

This shows the vast volume of our trade with the United States, and the character of that trade; it shows that four Provinces of the Dominion have enormously greater transactions with the United States than with Great Britain. In the items of agricultural produce exported from Canada to the United States and Great Britain, I find the following, and this is a table worthy of careful scrutiny:

	United States.	Great Britain.
Horses .....	\$2,402,371	\$ 36,750
Sheep .....	1,027,410	211,861
Poultry .....	123,222	1,982
Eggs .....	2,119,532	262
Hides, horns and skins .....	515,220	25,634
Wool .....	223,125	.....
Barley .....	6,468,317	700
Beans .....	124,214	.....
Hay .....	800,632	64,781
Malt .....	154,145	.....
Potatoes .....	357,570	973
Vegetables .....	93,102	259
	<b>\$14,427,900</b>	<b>\$343,220</b>

Sir, these returns require no comment. They show how vast our trade is with the United States, and they show that in all these important productions our trade is almost exclusively with the United States; and the constructive loss of the country through being debarred of access to that market that we enjoyed between 1854 and 1866, is actually and positively beyond computation or belief. Now, the duty paid on our exports of \$37,323,161 to the United States last year amounted, at a rough estimate, to \$5,750,000, of which \$2,500,000 was upon our agricultural products. It is an interesting question, and I referred to it last year, it is indeed a matter of prime importance, to understand the bearing of the case—who pays this duty—of probably \$5,750,000 on the productions of Canada that went into the United States, on which duty was collected in that country. Now, I propose to examine the proportion that our imports to the United States bear to the total production of that country in the same line:

	Canadian Export.	United States Production.	Proportion.
Mine .....	\$ 3,341,308	542,284,000	1/80
Fisheries .....	3,123,853	42,536,000	1/13
Forest .....	10,622,338	291,585,000	1/27
Horses .....	No. 19,925	13,172,936	5/83
Horned cattle .....	No. 40,047	49,235,000	1/120
Swine .....	No. 1,276	44,348,000	1/3400
Sheep .....	No. 353,999	43,544,000	1/122
Eggs .....	doz. 14,147,739	.....	.....
Hides and skins .....	\$ 515,220	.....	.....
Wool .....	lbs. 354,189	285,000,000	1/800
Barley .....	bu h. 9,360,521	60,000,000	1/6
Wheat .....	bush. 777,698	457,218,000	1/585
Hay .....	tons. 84,068	41,796,000	1/487
Malt .....	bush. 193,14	18,273,000	1/90
Potatoes .....	bush. 2,486,441	168,051,000	1/67

Now, Sir, under these circumstances, with the small volume of our importations to that country as compared with the production of the same article in that country, it is preposterous to suppose that the duty levied upon these articles depressed the price of the enormous bulk of these several articles in that country to whose amount the volume of our importations bore such an insignificant proportion. We paid the duty. We receive for our horses, for our coal, for our barley, for every article upon that list that we exported to the United States, just exactly the amount received in that country, less the duty taken from it. In fact, that is not a fair statement of the case, because we lose more than

that. The purchaser of an article for importation into the United States, if that article is for sale, and he expects to make a profit upon it, will add his profit to the amount of the duty, as it is a part of the cost. Then the existence of trade restrictions all operates to prevent competition and to keep out a certain class of buyers. Whenever a purchase is made for importation to the United States, the purchaser must take out a consul's certificate; he makes the entry at the Customs and runs the risk of seizure. There is a large class of purchasers who do not care to embark in trade under these conditions, and we are suffering from these disadvantages in the duties. First of all, we lose the amount of the duties; then we lose the profit that the dealer importing these articles to the United States receives upon this duty, which is part of the cost; then we lose the benefit of that active competition which will exist in this country if the purchaser is free to trade without any restrictions or any customs regulations to deter him. I believe it is a fair calculation that there is a loss in these three respects of not less than \$10,000,000 a year on the importations from this country to the United States. That is the amount that would be realised under the present system of importations from the United States as measured by the returns of last year, to say nothing of the increase of trade that would ensue if the duties were removed. The rate of duty paid upon our various exports to the United States are, on coal and iron ore, 75 cents per ton; canned fish, about 20 per cent.; lumber, \$1 to \$2; shingles, 35 per cent.; horses, cattle, swine and sheep, 20 per cent.; wool, 10 cents per pound; barley and wheat, 10 cents per bushel; malt and flax seed, 20 cents per bushel; peas, 10 cents per bushel; hops, 8 cents per pound; butter, 4 cents per pound; hay, \$2 per ton; potatoes, 15 cents per bushel, &c.

Let us see what we buy from the people of the United States. Among other things we bought last year, in large quantities, coal, iron and steel manufacturings, tools, pianos and musical instruments, paper, coal oil, printing presses, watches, clocks, furniture, books, cotton goods, cordage, glassware, plated ware, boots and shoes, India-rubber goods, castings, hardware, iron, sewing machines, straw goods, hats, jewelry, &c. We paid in duty last year \$7,131,000 on dutiable goods of the value of \$27,076,680, imported from the United States, and imported from the same country free goods amounting to \$21,384,168. We paid in addition profits upon duty as part of cost amounting to \$3,000,000 more, and between the loss to this country on importations from Canada into the United States and on importations from the United States into Canada on dutiable goods, we were \$20,000,000 worse off than we would have been under free trade. So much for the advantages which would be derived from the removal of the present restrictions between the two countries.

I am occupying the time of the House longer than I had intended, but I wish before resuming my seat to refer briefly to the objections raised to this policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I desire to meet, as well as I can, any and all the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite or by their friends in the country with respect to it. First, they tell us—and I have met this objection in a measure before—what is the use of this agitation; in what respect is your position different from our own? We are in favor of reciprocity with the United States, you have not a monopoly of that principle, we are in favor of it. I deny it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not in favor of it, because they persistently refuse to make advances to secure it on terms which they know are the only admissible terms, and if they will not accept admissible terms but insist on seeking to secure impracticable terms, it is no use of their talking about being in favor of this policy. It cannot be secured on the terms they propose. Reciprocity in natural products the United States will never grant. Why?

Because the former treaty did not work to their advantage or satisfaction. What was the volume of free importations each way during the 12 years from 1855 to 1866? The free importations from the United States to Canada amounted during that period to \$124,872,233. The free imports to the United States from Canada amounted to \$239,792,234, or almost double. The treaty did not work satisfactorily to the United States. Everything we wanted to sell to the Americans we sold to them, but we did not allow them the privilege of sending to us the products and manufactures they could exchange for our natural products, and it was not a fair reciprocity treaty. And, Sir, if we wish to have a fair reciprocity treaty now, it must be unrestricted reciprocity, a treaty permitting unrestricted interchange of commodities of every nature and character between the two countries, and that is the kind of reciprocity treaty the United States are willing to grant and it is not the kind of reciprocity which our friends on the Government benches are willing to accept.

The next objection is, that we cannot get unrestricted reciprocity, that it is no use agitating about the matter or talking about it or holding out inducements to lead the people to believe that it is a feasible project. I deny it. I think we have abundant reason for saying that this is not so. We have as a reason the resolution of Congress passed the other day by a nearly unanimous vote, and which only failed to be taken up by the Senate by a technical objection being raised by a single member to its immediate consideration, although it had been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. But for that circumstance we would have had the resolution of the House passed by the Senate.

Mr. McNEILL. What was the resolution?

Mr. CHARLTON. It was a resolution of Mr. Hitt in favor of commercial union. It indicates, on the part of the United States, a willingness to treat, for unrestricted reciprocity is one of the outcomes of commercial union, and commercial union is one way of arriving at unrestricted reciprocity, and another way is that which we prefer, and we are warranted in the belief from the passing of this resolution, that a good opportunity is presented to enter into negotiations for the attainment of our object, and that they would be willing to grant us terms somewhat different to those which they now propose. At all events it is worth trying. This objection that we cannot get unrestricted reciprocity is negatived by the passage of this resolution, and at least we are warranted by its passage in attempting negotiations to secure unrestricted reciprocity in a different way from that in which it is presented to us by the resolution passed by the House of Representatives. The feeling in the United States, and I saw it evinced in Washington when I was there lately, is an unmistakable desire on the part of American public men to cultivate friendly relations with Canada, to impress upon Canadians who visit their capital, their desire to treat us fairly and in a friendly spirit, and to show that they are ready to enter into a reciprocity treaty on a fair and equitable basis. There can be no doubt we can get it if we desire it, and the assertion that we cannot get it is not borne out by the facts.

The next objection is, that it is disloyal. To whom is it disloyal? If a policy is calculated to benefit the great mass of the people of this country it is not disloyal to them, because the highest requirement of loyalty is to be loyal to your own people and to promote their best interests. It may be a disloyal policy if you take into consideration exclusively the benefits accruing to a small ring of manufacturers in this country. It may be disloyal if you take into consideration the interests of another ring of manufacturers in Great Britain. Our imports from Great Britain last year amounted to the value of \$39,000,000. We will assume they were all

manufactured goods. I do not believe unrestricted reciprocity would diminish that trade; it would increase our prosperity and our purchasing power, and the tendency would be to increase rather than diminish the trade with Great Britain. But we will suppose that trade was obliterated, that we blotted out the entire importations to the value of \$39,000,000, what interests would be affected? How much capital is invested to produce those goods? Not more than \$20,000,000. How many operatives are employed? Not over 26,000; at least not over 100,000 are directly or indirectly employed in connection with our importations from Great Britain last year. Is our policy disloyal which would benefit five millions of Canadians at the expense of the owners of \$20,000,000 of capital, and at the expense of 100,000 people in England employed in manufacturing the goods we import? My sense of the requirements of loyalty would lead me to prefer the interests of 5,000,000 here to 100,000 people in England. My sense of loyalty would lead me to prefer the interests of English capitalists who have invested \$600,000,000 in Canada to the interests of British capitalists who have invested \$20,000,000 in manufacturing English goods imported into this country. The true loyalty is such as promotes the interests of our own people at home, and that is the object of the policy we advocate.

Then we are told that England would not sanction such an arrangement. I do not know about that. England did sanction a treaty called the Brown Draft Treaty, which amounted almost to unrestricted free trade, which put a very large number of articles on the free list. Here is an incident which has a bearing on this case:

"In 1874, when the Reciprocity Treaty was being negotiated by Minister Thornton, the English Government instructed him to modify it at the suggestion of the Canadian Ministry and make such additions to the list of American goods to be admitted free into Canada as the Canadians desired."

He did so and made out a long list of American articles to be admitted free of duty, so long that it was almost free trade. Not one of these articles coming from England was to be admitted free of duty. This draft of a treaty was sent to Lord Derby, who answered that the whole proceeding was approved, and the English Government assented to the arrangement admitting American goods free to a British colony, where a tariff of 20 or 40 per cent. was to be laid upon the same kind of goods coming from England or any other country than the United States. That was done by Lord Thornton and Lord Derby in 1874, and in view of that precedent, I do not think we have any reason for saying that if we desire unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and arrange the basis of a treaty, that England would refuse assent to that treaty any more than she refused assent to the Brown draft treaty of 1874.

The next objection raised against this treaty is that it would lead to annexation and it strikes me that the Government party are a little inconsistent in this matter, when they state that this policy will lead to annexation, that the Americans want annexation and that the Americans will not give us a treaty. There is an apparent contradiction there. The charge that this treaty will lead to annexation implies a good deal. It implies that the treaty will work so well and that the prosperity of the country under this treaty will be so great that Canadians will want more of it, that they will want to go the whole figure and not only have commercial union with the United States but political union as well. Now, I think, Sir, that the fact is that unrestricted reciprocity would give us just exactly what those who want annexation would desire, that is free trade relations with the United States. I do not believe there is one man in a hundred in this country who is an annexationist because he is dissatisfied with our political institutions or because he believes that American political institutions are superior to ours, but he is an annexa-

Mr. CHARLTON.

tionist because he desires to see this tariff wall broken down and he sees no other mode of obtaining that object than annexation. Give to that man the advantages that follow from the obliteration of those tariff restrictions and you give him all he wants and he ceases to be an annexationist. Just as in 1854, following the manifesto of 1849 which was signed by many of the friends of the party opposite, the existence of the annexation party ceased when the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was agreed upon, and we heard no more of annexation during the continuance of that treaty. We would not hear of annexation now if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the States. In any event I am disposed to take the prosperity that will result from this arrangement and run the risk. The future will take care of itself. Nature has decreed these two countries to live on intimate terms, nature has decreed that we should be geographically and commercially very closely allied with each other, and the endeavors of our friends on the opposite side to prevent the consummation of this decree of nature reminds me of the reported efforts of Mrs. Partington who one morning went down to the Atlantic beach and attempted to keep out the tide with her broom. You cannot keep back this tide of commercial free relations between the two countries. You cannot prevent these two peoples from securing free intercourse with each other. Your efforts in this direction will be surely unavailing. The people are bound to have this continent open to free play and interchange of these mighty agencies that have vivified the United States and made it the great nation which it is to-day. The population of this Dominion will be satisfied with nothing less than this and those paltry objections that are raised by the party in power will be swept away by the people as cobwebs disappear before the brush of the sweeper, and the tide will roll in as it did that morning down at Long Branch when Mrs. Partington stood on the beach and tried to keep it out with her broom.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a fable.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not so much a fable as it is an illustration of the puny efforts of man to counteract the forces and oppose the decrees of nature.

The next objection that is raised to unrestricted reciprocity is that it will lead to direct taxation. Well, this was a serious difficulty, and although as I have shown we will save in this arrangement twenty millions a year to the people of this country besides the prospective profits resulting from greatly increased trade, yet the people would not hesitate I presume if they thought that these twenty millions of dollars were to be purchases at the expense of direct taxation of two or three million dollars a year. But I do not believe that direct taxation would be the result, and I know that perhaps this is the only really plausible and strong objection to the consummation of this arrangement. Now, Sir, I wish to-night to indulge in a little theory in regard to this matter; a little theoretical speculation upon a branch of the argument that is not exactly pertinent to the subject. We have from the United States a proffer of commercial union, and it is something that is not expressed in the resolution before you. We expect if we make this arrangement to get it on a different basis, but as a mere matter of theory and to get into a region of speculation I wish to enquire for a moment what will be the probable result to us as regards this question of direct taxation if unrestricted reciprocity is secured upon the basis of commercial union—a basis be it observed which as I have said we do not propose to accept, a basis upon which we are not proposing a treaty, but it is only fair to give some degree of attention to this proposal so as to enquire what its effects would be. The United States customs last year amounted to \$219,091,173, their excise tax \$124,296,871 or a total of \$343,388,044. Our customs and excise amounted to \$28,177,412. Under com-

mercial union the total customs and excise of each country would go into a common fund. Now on the supposition that this arrangement was talked of that common fund would have amounted last year to \$371,565,456. This arrangement would have however involved a sacrifice of the duties collected by the United States upon Canadian imports as well as duties collected by Canada upon United States imports, amounting to an aggregate of thirteen million dollars. The consolidated fund would be diminished by that sum, and deducting that the total would amount to \$358,565,456. The percentage cost of collection would be somewhat reduced on this fund by the taking away of the interior line of customs houses in both countries. This common fund would be divided on the basis of population, giving to us one-thirteenth, or we would lose one-thirteenth of the total loss that resulted from the loss to both countries of the revenue derived by each from the importations from the other, and it would leave to us a share, on this basis of division, after deducting this \$13,000,000 from the consolidated fund of \$27,582,000, or \$595,000 less than the revenue derived last year from customs and excise. But if the United States should reduce their tariff, as they propose to do, to the extent of \$40,000,000 and we should deduct from that consolidated fund \$40,000,000, in addition to the \$13,000,000 joint loss of revenue, we should then have, as our share of this revenue, \$24,500,000. That would be the financial aspect of the case under commercial union. Now, we must always bear in mind that our tariff on importations from outside countries would be somewhat increased. We must also bear in mind that these two countries are expanding rapidly, that our expansion would be much more rapid than it is now, so that the tendency would be to have a largely increased revenue year by year. But if we were limited to the same rate as at present, we should have \$3,675,000 less revenue from customs and excise taxation under the circumstances named than we have at present. Could we make good that deficiency? We must bear in mind that we would save the cost of our whole interior line of customs houses. We could easily make a large saving in our militia appropriations; living on terms of peace with our neighbors, we would not require to prepare so fully for war. We could make a large saving in expense on public works, in subsidies, in the cost of the civil service, in the cost of the franchise. Then, we would enjoy an increased prosperity in trade, and the extension of business would produce a great increase in the traffic on Government railways and consequently a large expansion in their earnings, enabling them to wipe out that annual sum which we have to contribute to make up the deficiency in their expenses, and probably produce a surplus in their earnings. Under this proposed arrangement of Mr. Hitt, if we were to negotiate on that basis, I assert that if it were carried into practice, there would be no revenue difficulty whatever to meet.

Next, I come to the consideration of the question of unrestricted reciprocity. This is more difficult. Last year we had a revenue of \$28,177,000. If we should enter into this arrangement, we would sacrifice the duty on American importations, amounting to \$7,131,000, which would leave us a revenue of \$21,000,000. Well, that is a considerable shrinkage. Of course, we have to consider that the new arrangement would greatly increase our population, our resources, our trade, and our wealth, and that the exodus would be stopped.

Mr. WHITE (Kenfrew). Would it not increase our importations from the United States? There would be no revenue from them.

Mr. CHARLTON. It might increase our importations from the United States; if it did not, it would be of very little use. It would double and treble our importations from the United States. The profit derived by our farmers

from their trade with the United States would be three times as great as it is now. The ability of our people to purchase would be vastly increased, both from the United States and from all foreign nations in the world, and that would increase our revenue; there is no doubt of it. Our hon. friends opposite will insist on looking upon Canada as the country it is to-day with 5,000,000 inhabitants, increasing at the rate of 18 per cent. in a decade, instead of Canada we would be then, with rapid expansion, rapid growth, rapid increase of population, importations and wealth. But can we make this revenue up? We can. What was our revenue in 1880? It was \$18,479,000, and we had a deficit of \$1,543,000, making our expenditure in that year \$20,022,000. Now, how rapidly did we increase that expenditure from 1880 to the present time? Ought we to increase it faster than our population has increased? I think not. I think our expenditure to-day should bear that proportion to the expenditure of 1880 that our population to-day bears to the population of 1880; and if that proportion had been maintained, our expenditure to-day would not have been increased more than 20 per cent., or \$4,000,000, which would have left the revenue from Customs and Excise last year at \$24,022,000 instead of \$28,177,000. Now, can we raise that \$24,000,000? Can we get our expenditure back to that figure? I think we can; I know we can; but to do so there would have to be a greater inducement than that which rests on the Minister of Finance now, something more than a bare desire; it would have to be the imperative inducement of necessity, and under that pressure the thing could be done. How could it be done? We could save \$200,000 in the cost of the collection of customs revenue, because we would not need so many custom houses as we have now. We could abolish such custom houses as that recently established at Hagersville for the benefit of Mr. Montague. We would save \$100,000 in the cost of the collection of excise revenues; we could save \$200,000 of the expenditure on immigration, or for the matter of that the whole cost of immigration; we could save \$500,000 in the cost of militia; in our appropriations for public works, we could save \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000; we could save on civil service, and superannuation, if necessary \$250,000 at least; we could arrange our tariff on sugar so as to take the money we put into the pockets of the refiners at present and put it into the revenue, and at the same time secure to our people their sugar as cheaply as they get it now; in that way we could save possibly \$1,700,000. Then, the increased earnings on Government railways, owing to increased business, would probably amount to \$750,000 a year. And all these items would sum up to about \$5,000,000. I think we could meet the expenses under the rigid economy which would be necessary; the thing could be done, and it would be a benefit to the country. Our expenses to-day are enormously great. The United States in 1840, with a population of 17,000,000, spent but \$24,000,000 a year on the army, the navy, pensions, Indians and miscellaneous appropriations—everything in connection with the administration of the Government; and we are told that we cannot get down to the same limit with a population of 5,000,000, a population less than one-third as great. I do not believe it; I believe the thing can be done, and done easily. Then, other sources of revenue could be discovered. If necessary we could readjust the tariff. There are articles in the tariff on which duties could be imposed, if it were necessary to subject the country to that deprivation. Then, it must always be borne in mind that there would be an enormous saving to the country in the cost of goods imported, and in enhanced prices received for goods exported, besides prospective gains resulting from large operations in trade.

The next objection is that the Yankees would make our tariff. Well, that would be rather humiliating. But they certainly would not make it under unrestricted reciprocity



the only basis on which we propose to secure this arrangement. It gives us perfect control of our tariff, and the only concession we would make to the Americans would be the admission of their goods free of duty. That dismisses the charge, so far as the scheme before the House is concerned. But even under commercial union, the Americans would not necessarily have control of our tariff. In the arrangement of that treaty, there would be two parties to be consulted, and each party would possess exactly as much power as the other. One party will be Canada, the other the United States. The smallest iota of difference between the two powers with regard to that treaty will prevent the consummation of it. We must consent to every feature of that tariff. We must have granted to us such terms as we would require with regard to any future changes in that tariff. We would be one of the contracting parties with the same power and weight as the other; and unless that power be conceded, it is not necessary to make a treaty. It is preposterous to say that we will delegate to the United States the power to make our tariff under such an arrangement. In our own hands will be the regulation of every detail of the treaty and of every detail regarding the mode in which changes shall be at any subsequent time brought about.

The next objection is that it will ruin our manufactures. I might say with justice and truth that our manufactures are ruining us. I might say that they are bleeding our producing classes in this country. I might say that they are a great octopus which is sucking the life blood out of all except the small favored ring, and I do not know that I would sympathise very much with these men if they were punished. I do not believe, however, that it would hurt them; and if it would, I do not know that I would sacrifice the interests of the farmer, the lumberman, the fishermen, the miner or the laborer even to save the manufacturer. I would proceed upon the sound old adage, of the greatest good to the greatest number, and if the policy was to benefit a thousand men and only injure ten, I would not feel bound to do any more for the ten than extend them my sympathy. But I do not believe it would injure the manufacturers. I find a remarkable tendency in the United States to expand in manufactures in the newer districts. I find by the census returns from 1871 to 1881, that the increase in manufactures in the Dominion was 40 per cent., and that in Ontario the increase was 38 per cent. in those ten years. I find that in the older manufacturing States, the increase in manufactures, in the ten years from 1870 to 1880, has been as follows:—

Massachusetts.....	14	per cent.
New York.....	37	do
Connecticut.....	15	do
New Jersey.....	50	do
Pennsylvania.....	5	do
Michigan.....	59	do
Illinois.....	101	do
Wisconsin.....	67	do
Minnesota.....	228	do
Iowa.....	52	do
California.....	74	do

In every one of the newer States the proportion of increase has been vastly greater than in the old manufacturing States. The figures showing increase for a decade are as follows:—

1871 to 1881.		
Canada.....	\$38,000,000	40 per cent.
Ontario.....	43,283,000	38
1870 to 1880.		
Massachusetts.....	77,223,000	14
New York.....	295,502,000	37
Connecticut.....	24,632,000	15
New Jersey.....	85,143,000	5
Pennsylvania.....	32,934,000	5
Ohio.....	78,585,000	30
Indiana.....	39,389,000	36
Michigan.....	56,000,000	59
Illinois.....	208,224,000	101
Minnesota.....	52,955,000	228
Iowa.....	24,511,000	52
California.....	49,624,000	74

Mr. CHARLTON.

In some of the principal cities of the west the increase in production of manufactures from 1870 to 1880 is as follows:—

Louisville.....	\$ 35,000,000
Chicago.....	242,000,000
Milwaukee.....	43,000,000
St. Louis.....	114,000,000
San Francisco.....	78,000,000
Birmingham.....	50,000,000

I am not very much alarmed about the manufactures of this country. I do not take any stock in the doctrine of Canadian inferiority. I do not believe in it. I believe that with equal chances we can compete with the Americans. I believe that we have the energy, we have as cheap capital, and cheaper labor, and I see no reason under Heaven why, with the whole market of this continent open to our manufactures, we should not have an equal chance with the Americans. It is certain that there would be a great impetus in certain natural lines. For instance, the production of lumber could not fail to be greatly increased. In the production of planed lumber, the American tariff absolutely prevents our engaging, while if the duty were removed we would find millions of dollars invested in it in this country. In the production of doors and sashes, house trimmings, we are precluded by the American tariff. Yet this is a vast business which we would otherwise naturally, to a great extent, control. In the manufacture of furniture, wooden ware, leather, for which we have special advantages, we would inevitably vastly increase our business. We would increase the manufacture of iron and woollens, and there is one branch where the chances for expansion are limitless, that is the manufacture of paper from pulp. We have the facilities for this branch, in the possession of limitless quantities of the poplar and other woods required, and would naturally supply the continent with this article, the business in which would amount to millions of dollars a year. I have no fear as to the result of free trade on the manufacturing business in this country. Here and there perhaps a little exotic industry, pampered into existence by a high tariff, would be swept away, but as a whole our manufactures would vastly extend their business under the operation of free trade.

Now, some of our friends opposite—for it is not a party issue at present—propose an offset, and this proposition is at least an indication that there is a feeling of unrest in the country. It indicates that there is an acknowledgment of the desirability, if not the necessity of some change in the condition of Canada. That scheme proposed by them is Imperial Federation. I have no doubt that in some respects a closer union of the colonies with England would be advantageous to the colonies, based however upon one absolutely necessary concession upon the part of England, and that is the enactment of discriminatory duties in favor of the colonies. If England will give us the corn laws again; if she will place duties upon food and lumber, wool and raw materials imported from any country besides the colonies, and admit the productions of the colonies free, we would have advantages in the English market very great as compared with other countries, and it might be worthy of our consideration whether we would not go into such an arrangement. But have we any reason to suppose that she will? Have we not every reason to suppose that she will not? Have we not the express declaration of her leaders, not of one but of both parties, that England will never consider for a moment the propriety of levying duties upon the raw materials and the food of the people. She never will, and if she does not, then the scheme has no attraction for us. We would have our burdens increased by this arrangement, we would have an undue and undesirable interference with our autonomy, and it would not be desirable for us to have our affairs settled by the Parliament at Westminster in which we had a small representation of twenty or thirty members. We would never consent to such a thing.

We want no share in paying the expenses of England's foreign wars; we do not want to assist her in fighting the Afghans in Afghanistan, or the Arabs in the Upper Egypt, or the Zulus in South Africa. We do not want to bear a share of the expense of maintaining her army or navy. Such an arrangement would largely increase our burthens. We might be called upon, if England required it, to furnish a large quota of troops to help her, and we would prefer to run our own concerns, attend to our own business, and trade on equal and unrestricted terms with our neighbors to the south.

I am happy to say I am about through, and I feel as much relieved as my friend opposite. I have indulged perhaps in some criticism that may not be palatable to my hon. friends opposite, and if I have, I entreat them not to "bring in the Sepoy to shoot me in my tracks." I have spoken, as I believe, in the interests of the people of this country, and I believe I have advanced sentiments and opinions which will carry the vast majority of the people. If there is common sense, if there is a deep appreciation of what appertains to their best interests, this policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States must and will commend itself to the great majority of the people of Canada. Our friends on the other side may hoot, they may scout it, they may laugh it to scorn, but the logic of events will convince them that they have failed to interpret the signs of the times. If this arrangement is consummated, if these two great peoples are brought into more intimate commercial relations with each other, if the barriers that keep back the forces which have advanced the United States so greatly in their course are removed, and we are allowed to have the unimpeded play of those forces upon us, we will reach the position which we hope to see. Without the play of those forces upon us, without the intercourse with that people and the influence of the forces which have made the United States a people of sixty-two millions and the richest nation in the world, we will continue in the way we have been plodding on in a ratio of progress which is unsatisfactory and slow. The bearing of this question as between England and the United States, were this arrangement consummated, would be most salutary. The only cause of trouble that I can see at present existing between these two countries is likely to arise in Canada itself, and, with free trade relations with unimpeded commercial intercourse, with perfect amity which the removal of these causes of dissatisfaction and irritation would bring about, the relations between the United States and England would naturally become more amicable, and would therefore be more conducive to the prosperity and well being of both of these great branches of the Anglo Saxon race and of every other Anglo Saxon community on the face of the globe. Those two great countries produced last year 63 per cent. of all the iron that was produced in the world; 69 per cent. of all the steel that was produced in the world; they had one-half of all the exports and imports of the whole globe; they had 68 per cent. of the shipping, and 60 per cent. of the manufactures of the world. These two great powers, acting in concert, with amicable relations between them, are able to sway the destinies of the world. The idea of Anglo-Saxon unity is a magnificent dream, but I believe it is destined to become a mighty reality; and with the United States, with its vast capabilities, its vast power, and its enormous wealth, creating, as it is, a mighty navy, with England commanding the approach to the Mediterranean and to the Red Sea, and swaying one-fifth the population of the world, with an Empire in India, another Empire at the Antipodes, and a third founded in South Africa, I say that these two nations acting in concert would promote the best interests of civilisation and realise the highest hopes of humanity. And the most pregnant step towards that union would, in my opinion, be to bring about uninterrupted, unimpeded trade between the seven commonwealths of the

Dominion of Canada and the forty-two commonwealths of the United States of America. We can promote that great end, and at the same time promote our own interests by bringing to bear the forces that will make this country populous and wealthy, with its mines developed, with its agricultural resources developed, with its commercial resources developed, with the prairies covered with prosperous towns and thriving villages, and brought under cultivation by millions of people who will then populate them. The coming of the time when these results will be fully consummated will be greatly accelerated by the adoption of this proposed measure which forms the cardinal plank in the policy of the Liberal party of this Dominion. Believing it to be my duty to further that result as much as I can, I beg to second the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford and to pledge for the promotion of it my support in this House and outside of it.

Mr. WHITE. (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, rising, as I do, at this late hour of the night, to discuss the motion placed in your hands, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any very great length. The able exposition which the hon. the Minister of Finance has given of the fiscal position of Canada to-day, and the brilliant speech delivered this afternoon by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are, in my opinion, a sufficient defence of the Government's policy, and the whole case of the Conservative party might well be left to them; but, after listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken on the other side of the House, I deem it my duty as a Canadian to raise my voice in opposition to the views which that hon. gentleman has put forth. In listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), and to the manner in which he decried the position of Canada and lauded the position of the United States, I thought that the speech he delivered to-night would have been more appropriately delivered on the floor of Congress. It is a regrettable circumstance that a gentleman who is charged with the mandate of a constituency owing allegiance to the British Empire should have given expression to the sentiments to which that hon. gentleman has given expression to-night. It is not my intention to follow him through all the intricacies of figures and statistics with which he regaled the House, but I shall endeavor, as concisely as I can, to present my views as to the position of Canada to-day and the possibilities of obtaining a larger measure of trade relations with the people of the United States, and what would be the position of Canada or the advantages to be gained by such a larger measure of trade. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the speech he delivered here the other night, followed the course which he has adopted from 1879 to the present time. He began by decrying this country. He continued, as he has done on former occasions, by declaring that the people, by supporting the policy of the present Administration, had given evidence of their folly and stupidity. I have listened to that statement every Session since the time when the people in their might hurled the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was a member from the position which they occupied from 1873 to 1878. Now, the hon. gentleman declares that the country is in such a position that it requires some drastic measure to remove the evils under which it is laboring, and in support of that he said that we were suffering from an exodus, that we were suffering from a depreciation in the value of our farming lands, and that we were suffering in various other ways of which he spoke. I do not propose to deal to-night with the question of the exodus, but I would call attention to this fact: We all remember with what volubility the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) Session after Session laid before Parliament what he was pleased to call the

school statistics of the Province of Ontario. And that he deduced from these school statistics the fact that we were losing instead of gaining in our populations. I am glad to see that the hon. member has on this occasion, at all events, abandoned the arguments which he used in that respect, and the statistics which he has been using during several Sessions of Parliament heretofore. But he has declared upon the authority of the statistician of the Province of Ontario that farm lands in that Province have been declining in value, and that he declares to be an evidence of the decadence of the wealth of this country. Sir, I do not propose to call in question the honesty of the compiler of the statistics of the Province of Ontario, but I think that any body who looks at the report that gentleman has made, and which I hold in my hand, must come to the conclusion that the information upon which these statistics are based, cannot be possibly correct. Let us see what he says:

"A comparison of the totals for the last six years indicate a very variable course throughout in the value of farm lands. In 1883 the high figure of \$654,793,025 was reached, but in the next year it tumbled to \$625,478,708; again in 1886 the \$650,003,000 was nearly attained, only to drop back to \$636,983,775 in 1887."

I ask any member in this House from the Province of Ontario whether he believes that from 1883 to 1886 there has been these variations that are recorded in this report of Mr. Blue, the statistician of the Province of Ontario, in the value of farm land in that Province. I believe there is no one within the sound of my voice who knows anything about the circumstances of the Province of Ontario, who will disagree with me in the statement which I make, that there cannot have been any such a variation as that which this gentleman declares to have occurred in the value of farm land in that Province. But, Sir, suppose it were a fact; and suppose that the statements made by this gentleman were true, and suppose the value of farm lands was declining in the Province of Ontario, as the hon. gentleman opposite declares, what do we find to be the case in the United States, that country to which these hon. gentlemen look for a remedy for the evils under which they declare Canada to be laboring at the present time? Sir, if you take the statistics furnished by the census returns of 1870 and 1880, you will find that the improved farm lands, including buildings, in the whole United States, in 1870, were valued at \$39.32 per acre; in 1880 they were valued at \$35.42, or a diminution of about \$4 an acre throughout the whole United States between these two years. If you come to the great state of New York, which lies alongside of the Province of Ontario, you will find that that diminution was from \$65.18, on the average, in 1870, to \$59.61 in 1880. So you will find in regard to many of the States of the Union, that there was a diminution in values between the returns as furnished by the census of 1870 and that of 1880; there was a diminution in the value of improved farm lands in the United States greater than any that has been exhibited in the Province of Ontario. And let me say to my hon. friend that in making the calculation and the comparison which I have made, I have taken into consideration the fact that in 1870 gold was at a premium of 25 03, and I have deducted from the valuations of 1870 the excess that was shown by the premium upon gold in that year as compared with 1880. In addition to the statement which my hon. friend made in regard to the diminution of the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario, he also put before the House the statement—and it is a true statement, I do not pretend to deny it—that there was a diminution in the trade returns of Canada from 1873 to 1888. As I find by the *Hansard* report, he took the whole volume of the trade of 1873 at \$217,000,000; but in making his comparison with the trade in 1888, he spoke only of the importations that were entered for consumption in the latter year; so that in that respect, at all events, the comparison which the hon. gentleman made was not perfectly correct. But there is no doubt that the volume

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

of trade in 1873 amounted altogether to \$217,801,000, whilst in 1888 it had fallen to \$201,017,000. But it seems to me somewhat singular that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in making these comparisons respecting the diminution in the volume of trade in Canada, invariably selects the year 1873 instead of the year 1878. What do we find to be the condition of things in 1878? We find that whilst those hon. gentlemen came into office with a volume of trade of 217 millions, when they left office in 1879 the volume of trade had fallen to 153 millions. I do not pretend to say that that was due altogether to the maladministration of the then Government, but I do say that the hon. gentleman, in making his comparisons to show the decadence of Canada, ought to take into consideration the circumstances that existed during that time, particularly as that hon. gentleman made his comparisons for the purpose of denouncing the Conservative party and the Government that has held office since 1879. I say, then, that in all justice to the Conservative party and to the Government whose maladministration he denounces, he ought to make his comparisons, not between 1873 or 1874, when the present leader of the Government held office, but he ought to make his comparison between 1878, the last year of the administration of his Government, and the present time. Now, let me point out this important fact in connection with the volume of trade between the years 1873 and 1888. The whole of the imports and the exports of both these years I have included in the comparison which I have made. If you will look at the returns you will find that in 1873 the imports and exports of coin and bullion amount to \$6,854,000 as against \$2,193,000 in 1888, and if you will eliminate these figures from the returns of this year—which should not properly enter into these returns, because they do not form any part of the volume of exports and imports—if you eliminate these sums from the consideration of the volume of trade in these two years, you will find that the diminution has not been so great as these hon. gentlemen pretend it has been. But, Sir, we are told to look to the United States, and if you take the trade returns of that country you will find that from 1881 down to 1887 almost the same course of events has occurred that have occurred in the Dominion of Canada. For instance, you will find that in 1880 the volume of trade in the United States amounted to 1,503 millions, in 1881 it amounted to 1,545 millions. In 1882 it fell to 1,475 millions; in 1883 it raised again to 1,547 millions; in 1884 it fell to 1,408 millions; in 1885 to 1,319 millions, and in 1886 to 1,314 millions; or a diminution in the volume of trade between 1885 and 1883 of about 200 million dollars, showing that not alone in Canada has there been a diminution of trade during those years. Not only is that the case, but if you go back to the returns of the United States—that country to which we are told to look as a remedy for all the evils under which we are suffering—you will find the volume of trade in that country in 1826 amounted to \$335,390,546, in 1843, just seven years later, the whole volume of trade, exports and imports, amounted to \$79,727,593, or a diminution during those six years of \$255,000,000. But did that circumstance induce the people of the United States to decry their country, did it make the people of the United States despair for their future? Not by any means. But the amount of the foreign trade of a country, of its exports and imports, is not always, if we are to believe the statement of the lieutenant of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the gentleman who has just spoken and who has seconded the resolution—if we are to believe the statement of that hon. gentleman, the amount of foreign trade is not always the measure of a country's prosperity. Let me say that the first ideas in favor of the principle of protection I imbibed were imbibed to a considerable extent from a speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the floor of Parliament in 1876. That hon. gentleman then depicted the

advantage to be obtained from a protective policy, and not only did he do that, but he made this statement:

"We have at our own doors all the illustrations and experience of protection and its benefits required for our government and guidance. The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their manufactures have been fostered and promoted, until in 1870 their products reached the sum of \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives and distributing over \$775,500,000 in wages."

But this next paragraph is that to which I desire, more particularly, to draw the attention of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) continued:

"It has been charged that protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country. That may be true; but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000. What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risk of foreign trade."

I commend to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has seconded his resolution, and I ask him to consider whether the vast impetus given to interprovincial trade by the adoption of the National Policy has not benefited the country to a very considerable extent, even though at the expense of our foreign commerce. I wish to draw attention to the further fact, that whilst the volume of trade in 1873, imports and exports, amounted to a considerable sum greater than in 1888, yet the excess of imports over exports in 1873 was \$33,221,000, whilst in 1888 it only amounted to \$20,691,000. So there was a diminution in the excess of our imports over our exports as between those two years of about \$18,000,000, which was more than the difference of the volume of trade, including exports and imports during those two years. I desire to say a word or two as to what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said in reference to the effect of the National Policy upon the farmers. He declared that the effect of the National Policy was to make this the dearest country for the farmers to purchase in and the cheapest in which to sell their farm produce. I have here the statement which that hon. gentleman made in 1876, and unless he has greatly changed his views since that time, I think it will be shown that the position he takes now—and I do not know that he has ever recanted the position he took in 1876—is not at all in consonance with the position he took in that year when he was advocating before Parliament a policy of protection. He said:

"I believe the interests of the nation at large will be promoted by judicious protection. I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away. With a home market of this kind established to manufacturers by protection, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops. The purchasing power of money is not a correct measure of the purchasing power of labor. A farmer raises a bushel of corn which he sells for fifty cents in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but, supposing the manufactures are brought to his door, and the better price which it creates increases the price to 60 cents or 70 cents per bushel, and although import duties are levied on cottons from Manchester so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn instead of the three yards it was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labor is increased."

So I place Mr. Charlton of 1876 against Mr. Charlton of 1878 in regard to the views which he then and now expressed as to the effect of a protective policy upon the interests of the farmers. But in addition to that, I think I am able to show that a protective policy has been beneficial to the people of Canada in this respect. I find upon examining the Trade and Navigation Returns that in 1878, before there was an impost duty upon agricultural products coming into Canada, we imported for home consumption \$13,575,825 in value of agricultural products, that in 1888 we imported for

home consumption \$1,909,000 worth, or a reduction of nearly \$12,000,000 during those years. I am quite free to admit that the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1878, compiled as they were without any regard to duty, would leave the impression that all the agricultural products imported during that year were entered for home consumption, while many of them were exported. In view of that fact, I take the whole exportation for 1888, including the whole quantity entered for home consumption and what was brought in for export, and the total importations of agricultural products amounted in 1878 to \$13,575,825, while in 1888 it amounted to \$7,392,363. In addition to that I am able to quote from the *Globe* a comparison of prices the day before yesterday of certain agricultural products in Toronto and Buffalo. I find in Toronto red wheat was \$1.09; Buffalo, \$1.04; oats, Toronto, 36c. to 37c.; Buffalo, 31c.; rye, Toronto, 60c.; Buffalo, 54c. to 55c. Yet we are told that the obliteration of the lines between Canada and the United States would be a benefit to Canada. It becomes us in dealing with the question to consider not only what benefits would accrue to the people of Canada, but as to whether we in Canada can without sacrificing our position as a colony—if you choose to call us such—without sacrificing our future as owing allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain, whether we can secure from the people of the United States that which those gentlemen declare to be the remedy for all those evils under which we labor. It has been attempted to be proven by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that there are no difficulties in the way of our securing reciprocity with the United States, or indeed commercial union, if such be the position which they take up, without sacrificing our independence in the slightest way. Before I come to this point, however, let me consider the question as to whether we would be materially benefited by being a part of the United States, which we practically would be if this policy of hon. gentlemen opposite were adopted. It has been said by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he presented a long array of figures to the House to prove the position he took, that we, in Canada, and especially in the Province of Ontario, to which I think he more especially referred, were in a much worse condition as regards our taxation than the people of the United States. I will give that gentleman an extract from the *Globe* newspaper of the 10th November, 1888, taken from an article in which I am bound to say the *Globe* endeavors to prove that the position of the people of Ontario was worse than that of the people of the United States, yet the facts which they were obliged to present for the consideration of the people are such as will lead to an entirely different conclusion. In speaking with regard to the taxation of the United States as compared with Canada it has been the fashion to compare only the federal debt and federal taxation in the two countries, but in this article to which I refer not only the federal taxation but also the municipal and state taxation is taken into account. Here let me say that my hon. friend from South Oxford takes the ground that the estimates which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture made in regard to our population of the present time are mere guess estimates. What else could they be? How could the Minister of Agriculture estimate the population upon any basis other than that of the previous census. The estimate of the population has been made on the basis of last census and on the accretion to population that took place between the census of 1871 and the census of 1881, and yet my hon. friend opposite takes the ground that that basis of calculation is entirely inaccurate and that no credence should be given to it. The *Globe* in this article to which I have referred gives the population of Canada at 4,800,000, and the population of the States of 60,000,000, and there is a foot note to that statement as follows: "The present population is slightly underestimated in both cases," that is both in the case of

Canada and the United States. Taking this as a basis of calculation, they bring about the following result:—The taxation per head in Ontario is: federal, \$5.98 per head; municipal and state taxation per head, \$4.70; total, \$10.68. In the State of Ohio the taxation, per head, is: federal, \$5.60; municipal and state taxation, per head, \$8; total, \$13.60. In Michigan the taxation per head is: federal, \$5.60; municipal and state taxation, per head, \$5.27; total, \$10.87. The *Globe* goes further and makes a comparison between the taxation in Ontario at \$10.68 per head, and in the whole of the United States at \$11.62 per head, thus showing that the taxation per head in the United States, including federal, state and municipal, amounts to nearly \$1 per head more than it does in the Province of Ontario, notwithstanding that hon. gentlemen opposite have been telling us that we were loaded to the ground with taxation in this country. Our hon. friends on the other side, both the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have told us that if the people of Canada have pronounced in favor of the policy that the present Administration have faithfully and honestly carried out from 1879—in accordance with their previous promises—up to the present time, that it is not because of the force of that policy, but because of the Gerrymander Act and because of the revising barristers. I do not propose to deal with those questions at any considerable length. We have heard from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House every possible excuse for the position in which they are placed, except the real and true one. We have heard it explained that they were in continued opposition because of the Gerrymander Act in the Province of Ontario, but I should like to know by what means the present Administration could have given to the Province of Ontario the four additional members which they were entitled to by the Act of Confederation without having to some extent as those gentlemen declare gerrymandered the constituencies. I say, Sir, that the basis on which the present Administration readjusted the representation of the Province of Ontario was a perfectly correct basis, and that they only readjusted it on the basis of population.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do not try to defend that act?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend dissents from that, but notwithstanding the fact that he thought the Gerrymander Act was going to relegate him to private life, so popular was he with the people of his constituency that we find him here with his genial countenance ready to attack the Government on every occasion. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the revising barristers were instrumental, to a very considerable extent, in bringing about the result of the election in 1887. I do not see my friend the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in his seat at the present moment; but if he were I would recall to his mind certain statements he made in reference to Judge Morgan in the county which he represents, and in which that hon. gentleman declares that although Judge Morgan had been attacked by the press of the Liberal party throughout the Province of Ontario, the course pursued by him in the revising of those lists was one of utmost impartiality and was to his entire satisfaction. Sir, not only is the taxation in the United States greater than it is in the Province of Ontario, but we have the additional fact that in many parts of the United States the condition of the farming population is very much worse than it is in the Province of Ontario. I take from the *Globe* newspaper of the 15th of December, 1888, the following statement:—

"A rebellion against mortgages has achieved success in western Kansas, to the extent that a legislature has been elected purposely to deal with the eastern Shylocks. During the last few years a number of companies dealing with western farm mortgages have been launched. Most of them do respectable business, but some of them are the veriest

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

sharks. All of them profess to lend only to one-third of the value, yet there have been thousands of foreclosures after the mortgages had endured two or three years and the farms have been found insufficient to satisfy the mortgages. Part of this failure is due to the crops having been destroyed by drouth for three years in succession, and part to inequitable laws. The new legislature is pledged to pass an Act allowing a mortgagor three years in which to redeem property that has been foreclosed upon. This, however, will not effect a revolution in the climate. The long and the short of it is that the arid belt is played out as a place for settlement."

That is what they say in regard to the State of Kansas, a State which I have heard lauded on the floor of this House by leading members of the Opposition time and time again. I could give other statistics to show the condition of the farmers of the United States, which I think would inevitably lead to the conclusion that the people of Canada, especially in the Province of Ontario, are not in the dire straits that these gentlemen would lead us to suppose. But, Sir, suppose it were necessary for the people of Canada to look for some solution of the difficulties under which they are laboring. Could they find that solution, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and every calm and thinking man in this House, by making overtures to the people of the United States? Let us consider for a moment the course of events connected with past negotiations between Canada and the United States regarding trade relations. We had the Treaty of 1854, under which it is alleged both Canada and the United States prospered to a very considerable extent. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that that treaty was not favorable to the people of the United States, that it was an unfair treaty, because free goods were imported from Canada into the United States to double the value of goods imported into Canada from the United States during the existence of that treaty. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman surely forgot that the population of the United States was ten times greater than the population of Canada, and it was only natural that there should be a larger importation of goods from Canada into the United States than from the United States into Canada; so that the only illustration the hon. gentleman gave of the alleged unfairness of that treaty does not show unfairness at all. Well, the time came when that treaty expired by limitation of time. The people of Canada did not give the United States any intimation that they wished it to be abrogated. That intimation came from the United States, and not only that, but all the efforts made by Canada—efforts which were denounced by leaders of the Reform party, and notably by the *Globe* newspaper, at that time—were wholly unsuccessful in securing any renewal of reciprocal relations with the United States. Moreover, an American, holding an official position in Montreal at that time, actually reported to his superiors in the United States, that, by withholding from the people of Canada a renewal of that treaty, they would force us into annexation with the United States. Sir, the same condition of things exists to-day, but I am sorry to say that the opinion which prevails in the United States that by withholding from us equitable and fair trade relations with that country will force us into annexation, is stimulated by the expressions of members of Parliament on the floor of Parliament and elsewhere. Sir, I think I have the best evidence of the fact that the people of the United States are not prepared to give us any measure of reciprocity unless it is conditioned upon our becoming politically united with that country. I hold in my hand a report of an interview which is alleged to have taken place between the Washington correspondent of the *New York Sun* and Senator John Sherman, and which is reproduced in the *Toronto Globe* of 3rd December, 1888. Mr. Sherman is reported as follows:—

"I studied the proposal for commercial reciprocity only to be convinced that it was illusory and impracticable. A Reciprocity Treaty with Canada would be acceptable to the Dominion, but would never be tolerated by our people. The bargain would be too one-sided. We should offer them a free market of 80,000,000 people for the raw material in exchange for a free market of 5,000,000 for our manufac-

tures. That is what our people look at. It is of no use to discuss the theoretical advantages of reciprocity. The American people won't have it, and the question may as well be dismissed at once. Political union is another thing. The advantages it offers are more equal. Canada would gain all the advantages reciprocity offers her, would retain all the political freedom she now has, and would reach the additional advantage of almost unlimited American capital to develop her material resources, build up manufactures and exploit her industrial and commercial possibilities generally. This would attract immigration which is now drawn into Canada by constant effort on the part of the Government, only to drift over the frontier into the United States."

I presume the hon. gentleman took his inspiration from the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the floor of Parliament in regard to that matter.—

"American capital and immigrant labor, aided by free connection with American railroads, would develop the country at an incredible rate. They understand this perfectly in Canada." The advantages of political consolidation with Canada to the United States are no less palpable and obvious. Unless immediate, they will be even greater in the long run. At the outset we shall add \$300,000,000 to our present debt of 1,400 millions—a mere bagatelle,——"

I recommend that to the consideration of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who considered the present debt of \$236,000,000 as bearing upon the people of Canada with such an enormous pressure that they were unable to withstand it:

"—in return for which we shall not only add five millions to our taxable population, but acquire valuable and extensive public works, whose title is now in the Dominion Government, railroads, canals, public buildings, fortifications, &c. But this present gain is not worth considering in comparison with the future advantages to accrue to the American Republic from the vast extension of her territory. I doubt if we foresee these any more adequately now than the Americans of Jefferson's time saw the potential value of the Louisiana purchase. The material wealth, undeveloped resources and industrial possibilities of the great British North-West are, even yet, only dimly understood."

Here is another paragraph I would like to commend to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright):

"The most extravagant estimate of its productive capacity and power to support a thriving population is probably below the reality."

I think I heard my hon. friend the other night ridiculing the estimate which had been made by the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) in regard to the productiveness of that country.—

"The most extravagant estimate of its productive capacity and power to support a thriving population is probably below the reality, that union with the American republic, free connection with the American railroads and opening to American immigration and enterprise would reveal and which will be revealed in no other way."

Mr. Sherman says that the development of our country will be furthered in no other way than by political union with the United States, and I am quite sure he was led into that belief by the statements which have been made by leading members of this House upon the floor of Parliament and outside in discussing political affairs. There is another view to be taken of this question as regards the farmers. We are told that reciprocity with the United States would be of the greatest possible benefit to the farmers of Canada. Well, when we come to consider that the farmers of Canada would be brought into competition with a people who export agricultural products in vast quantities, the great advantage to our farmers will not be so manifest. I find, on examining the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States, that the Americans exported agricultural products to the extent of \$500,840,000, or 73·23 per cent. of the whole quantity of their exports. Now, I presume it is unfair that we should include in that calculation all the exports of agricultural products from the United States, such as cotton and tobacco, and perhaps we should, for the purposes of comparison, limit ourselves to the exports of agricultural products from that country, such as are produced in Canada. But we find that the Americans exported \$283,000,000 worth of agricultural products similar

to those produced in Canada, so that our farmers would be brought into competition, if we were a part of the United States, if we had free admission into their markets and they into ours, with a people who exported \$283,000,000 worth of agricultural products, or about 40 per cent. of the whole export from the United States to the whole world. A good many things were said by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to which I would like to draw the attention of the House, but the time at my disposal will hardly allow me to enter so fully into these matters as I should like. I was going on to say that the people of the United States in 1836 abrogated the treaty which had existed from 1834 down to that time, and that all the efforts made by Canada to renew that treaty were wholly unavailing. We found however it was possible to live on this American continent without becoming part and parcel of the United States, and I venture to say that from 1866 down to 1873 the prosperity of Canada was as great as at any other period of its history. In 1874, after the Mackenzie Administration had obtained power, they deemed it proper in the interests of Canada to secure a renewal of reciprocity with the people of the United States, and the Hon. George Brown was sent to Washington to negotiate a treaty. That treaty was promptly rejected by the Senate of the United States. It has been alleged by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that in the treaty negotiated by the Hon. George Brown, in 1874, it was proposed to admit goods from the United States free of duty into Canada, which would be taxed if coming from Great Britain. On that point I wish to draw attention to Mr. Brown's own statement, made on the floor of the Senate, and subsequent to the negotiation of the treaty. He said:

"The first of these objections is that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain in favor of the United States. Nothing could be more unfounded than this. It was perfectly understood from the opening of the negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States that was not also free with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment."

There was nothing contemplated in that treaty with regard to admitting products from the United States into Canada free, which were not admitted free from the mother country. That treaty having been rejected by the Senate of the United States, matters went on until the celebrated letter was written, to which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to-night. He told us there never was any more complete, any more frank offer to open enlarged trade negotiations with the United States than that which was made in the letter addressed to Sir Charles Tupper by Mr. Secretary Bayard. Well, what was the result? It was true the letter indicated a desire on the part of Mr. Bayard for enlarged trade relations, but when the Commission met in Washington, and when an offer was made by the British Plenipotentiaries to start upon the basis of enlarged trade relations, that offer was promptly rejected by Mr. Bayard. Not only was that offer rejected, but when the treaty which the American Government of the day, declared to be a fair treaty, was submitted to the Senate of the United States, it also was promptly rejected, and we were told in effect that no treaty negotiated between England and the United States, which had for its purpose the settlement of any dispute between the United States and Canada, would be accepted by the Senate of the United States. Did the President of the United States hold to the position which he had taken with regard to that treaty. On the contrary, he sent to Congress a Message in which, after having declared his view that the Treaty with England, which had for its object the settlement of the disputes which existed between this country and the United States, was a fair treaty, yet, because the Senate of the United States had rejected it, he proposed to impose additional restrictions on the trade between Canada and the United States. I pointed out the opinion which was held by Senator Sherman and

the opinions which were expressed as to the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada, but I find the opinion of a much more prominent gentleman than Senator Sherman, Mr. Blaine, the present Secretary of State in the United States, and he says :

"I have here an official copy of the Mills Tariff Bill as it passed the Democratic House, and as it lies on the tables of the Republican Senate. If I were to give it a name locally befitting its character, I should say it was 'a Bill for the destruction of the material interests of Maine.' It is a Bill to throw open our American market to our Canadian neighbors without any consideration or recompense or exchange, but absolutely free of all charge. (A voice, 'they shan't have them.') It invites the Canadians to bring in, without duty, every form of timber, hewn and sawed and squared and sided, and every other form which wood is manufactured at the saw mill. Lest one might escape they put in a general clause which covers every possible article. The Bill then provides for admitting free of duty all forms of farm products, grains and vegetables and fruits and flowers, and for admitting all their wool, every form of stone that can be quarried, their meat of all kinds, their milk and their eggs, their poultry, their game. In fact the Democratic House says to our Canadian neighbors: 'If you want our American markets without cost and without price, you may have them, for everything that comes from your forest, from your farm, from your orchards, from your gardens, from your dairies and your flocks. All your meats and your poultry and your game, the stones from your quarries and the bricks from your yard. If you have grown weary waiting and wishing for the markets of the United States, I, Grover Cleveland, President, therefore propose to relieve your fatigue, and to ask you to walk in and sit down and make you self at home in our highways and our byways, and especially in our market place.' My friends, this giving away of our markets strikes me all the more remarkable because the very men who passed this Tariff Bill in the House have been urging us for years to renew the reciprocity treaty with Canada. For the last twenty-two years since it expired many efforts have been made in Congress to reopen the negotiation for a reciprocity treaty, and having got tired, I suppose the Democratic party now proposes to establish a reciprocity treaty all on one side, and without asking the Government of the Dominion to give way to a single point, without asking them to concede any item or line or word in their tariff. This Bill gives away almost every material interest in Maine. Why, gentlemen, viewing that merely as a trade, as a swap, I should be utterly ashamed of any decent horse jockey in Maine that could not do better. There is not a horse jockey in Maine who would not lose his standing with his fellows if he traded his horses on as poor a basis as the Democratic administration proposes to trade with Canada."

And further on he says :

"The value of a day's work, the protection of our industries, the preservation of American rights, are all larger questions than party organisation or party triumph. You pay your taxes in Maine; you pay your taxes in the United States; you yield obedience; you owe allegiance; you observe the laws, you live under the flag. You stand ready to fight for the national union, as you have already fought. Beyond the frontier, across that river, our neighbors choose another government, another allegiance. They are subjects of Queen Victoria, they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes and the actual cash remuneration of American markets. (Great applause) They cannot have both at the same time. If they come with us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, and who have no part nor lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for a Democratic congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have."

That is the expression of opinion of a gentleman who holds now the position of Secretary of State, the first position in the Cabinet at Washington. I say it is as impossible for us, if we continue to hold our allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain, as I hope we shall, to induce the American people to remove the barriers which had been set up, not at our instance but at theirs, as to accomplish anything which is utterly impossible of accomplishment. The position we hold here in Canada is one of which we ought to be proud. We are told by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that the people of Canada are equal to the people of any other nation in the world. We are told that we have unlimited resources in this country, which only require development to make us a great country. But what is the price which they propose that we shall pay for the development of our natural resources? It is nothing less than the giving away of our country to a foreign nation. That is their

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

position. I think it is an untenable position. I, as a native Canadian, as a man born in Canada and having lived all my life in this country, am not prepared to subscribe to such a doctrine. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that, when the American colonies revolted, the people of Canada chose to continue their allegiance to the British Crown. Not only was that the case, but there were in those thirteen colonies a considerable number of people who held their allegiance to the British Crown so dear that they left their homes and came to this country and settled in what was then a wilderness. I believe that the sentiment which prevailed with those people who left the thirteen American colonies when they revolted from the British Crown still prevails in the minds of a large majority of the people of Canada. I believe that the people of Canada are able to work out their own destiny on this American continent. I believe they will be able eventually to develop their own resources, and to become a power on this continent; and, for my part, I hope the time will never arrive when we will be so abject as to sue at the feet of the people of the United States not only for reciprocal trade relations with them, but for what that involves in the minds of the leading statesmen of the United States, political union with that country. I admire the people of the United States, I believe they are a great people, they are Anglo-Saxons, they spring from the same race as ourselves, and while I quite admit the greatness of their country and the magnitude of their trade, I believe, Sir, that we are able, on this North American continent, to maintain our autonomy, and I, for one, am opposed to the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:20 a.m., Friday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the Finance Minister in his place, but before the Orders are called I would like to suggest that it would be desirable to have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee called. The chairman is not here.

Mr. BOWELL. The instructions left to the chairman were to call a meeting of the Committee as soon as the papers which had been moved for were ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There may be other things besides the papers.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, I will see that it is called for Tuesday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The room will be occupied on Tuesday by the Railway Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, say Wednesday, then.

Mr. BOWELL. Very well.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) stated yesterday that he had called for the original papers. I wish to read to the House the motion which he himself placed before the committee :

"That there be laid before Public Accounts Committee at its next meeting, all accounts and vouchers for militia clothing supplied during the fiscal year : also, all contracts under which such clothing has been supplied ; also, all invitations for tenders to supply all or any of such clothing, and whether by advertisement, notice, letter, telegram, cablegram, or otherwise, and of all replies thereto ; also a classified statement (having regard to the respective kinds of clothing supplied) of all expenditure for militia clothing during such year ; and that Lieut.-Cols. Powell, Panet and Macpherson be requested to attend this Committee at its next meeting."

I read the motion to show that the demand made was not for the originals, and in any case I was not going to supply the originals. They will be brought before the committee when the proper officer in charge of them can take charge of them there. This order was placed in the hands of the officers of the department, and they immediately went to work to have the papers copied, and I hope they will be completed by to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will remember that the hon. member for North York, in the remarks he made on his motion, said that he would like to have the original papers, and also to have the officers of the department before the committee to be examined with regard to them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not so understand. The hon. gentleman stated that he was anxious to have the officers named in this motion before the committee to be examined ; but he never, to my knowledge, mentioned anything about originals, because, if he had done so, I would have told him just what I have said to-day. The motion does not refer to any originals, and the ordinary practice is not to send originals to the committee unless the proper officer in charge of them is to be examined.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose, now that the hon. gentleman knows what the desire of the hon. member for North York is, he will have the originals.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I will have the originals, but I was not going to send them up.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the hon. Minister of Militia has made much of a point, further than to prove what a slow institution his department is. He said he would have obeyed the order of the committee, if he had to supply copies. If so, he has had ten days in which to comply with that order, and, so far as I know, up to this moment it has not been in the slightest degree complied with. He may have put some clerks at work in his office, but we will see, when these papers are produced, whether the explanation he offers is a sufficient explanation for his not having been able to get these papers copied by the ninth day after they were ordered, or whether this is a sham excuse like many other excuses of the hon. gentleman. The First Minister shakes his head, but that does not change my opinion. I have seen too much of the tactics of the Minister of Militia not to know how ready he is to give excuses which are not justified by the circumstances of the case. However, I reserve any further remarks until we see whether the papers to be produced are sufficient to justify him in saying that he could not, with all the force at his command, have got them ready in less time than nine days.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman has no right to speak here of any sham excuses. There is no reason why I should sham, and the bullying of the hon. gentleman, which is almost continuous, is not called for, as I try to be civil to him as well as I can, and much more than I ought to be. I told the hon. gentleman exactly what the facts were. I placed the order of the committee

before the officers of my department, and upon that order the necessary papers were being prepared, and they will be ready by to-morrow. When the hon. gentleman gets the papers, he can make any further remarks he likes. I am perfectly ready to meet him and his remarks whenever he chooses to make any.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think —

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I just want an opportunity of replying.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. Minister of Militia must certainly be wrong with regard to the mode of procedure in the Public Accounts Committee. When an order is passed there for any documents, the originals are always produced. This is the seventh Session that I have been a member of that committee, and I do not remember any occasion on which the originals of any documents ordered were not produced. The reason for producing the originals is that it is much more easy to produce them than to make copies. It would be an endless task, if the officers of the various departments were called on to make copies of every document the committee asks for. The Public Accounts Committee ought to be called together more frequently. Here we are in the sixth week of the Session, and we have not yet had a meeting for the prosecution of business, and the orders which were passed at the last meeting for the production of papers have not yet been complied with. If the committee is to be of any use at all, it should not be put off from week to week until the close of the Session before it can examine accounts, when it will be too late to do anything.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. the Minister of Militia has said that he is having his accounts copied for the purpose of placing them before the committee. I have been a member of the committee for some years and have never yet known of copies of accounts being brought down. We have always had the originals. Last year an order of the committee was passed to bring down the accounts in reference to Rideau Hall, and the originals were brought down. I cannot understand why an exception should be made in this case. What we want is the original accounts, and those are what we ordered.

Mr. MULOCK. The fact is that the Department of Militia has broken down. When the Minister of Militia asks this House to accept his explanations, let me remind him of our last experience with him. He said, a few evenings ago, when asked to explain certain expenditures, that the vouchers would be found with the Auditor General, but, at the very first meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, he had to admit that there was no foundation whatever for that statement. We always find that it is his wicked partner who is at fault. He always lays the blame on his clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be apparent to the House that it is very inconvenient to break the Rules in this way, and I shall insist on the Rule being followed in future that no debate can take place at this stage of the proceedings.

#### PRIVILEGE.—CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the Government to a fact respecting the survey of the Indian reserve at Caughnawaga, in the County of Laprairie. The survey has been executed by Mr. McLea Walbank. Last year I had the honor of questioning the Government on several occasions in the matter of this survey. The survey was begun in 1882, and we are desirous—the Indians more particularly—of having the report of Mr. Walbank. When I made my inquiry of the Ministry the last time, I asked whether it was their intention to lay before this



House Mr. Walbank's report when he had finished his survey. The Hon. the First Minister answered that there would be no objection to laying before Parliament the report of the surveyor's operations whenever this report was received. Lately, I had the honor of inquiring of the Ministry whether the survey had been completed, and whether the report of Mr. Walbank had been placed in their possession; after receiving an affirmative answer, I looked for and still look for the laying of this report before the House, in order that we can take communication of it. This action of mine is fair enough, it is now nearly seven years since this work was commenced; and the survey of some twelve or thirteen thousand acres of land has already cost the country the sum of \$22,000. I hope that the hon. members of this House will understand our anxiety to procure this report. I wait for an answer from the Ministry in this matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The Hon. the Minister of the Interior not being in his place, I am not able to state when the report will be laid before the House. I do not know whether the First Minister has promised that this report should be brought down.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) I have already stated that last year the First Minister had answered my inquiry by saying that the report would be laid before the House as soon as received.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I shall draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to what the hon. member has stated, in order that he may make himself acquainted with the case. I am persuaded that no difficulty will be raised.

#### RULES OF COURT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 55) respecting rules of court in relation of criminal matters.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has been held incompetent for Local Legislatures to authorise the rule-making power in relation to proceedings which partake of a criminal nature, or even of a *quasi*-criminal nature, and, therefore, I have brought in this Bill to give the judges the requisite authority to make the necessary rules.

Bill reported and read the third time, and passed.

#### CORRUPT PRACTICES IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 71) respecting corrupt practices in municipal affairs. He said: This is a Bill from the Senate, and it proceeds on the principle that it is expedient to declare the law as to offences against municipalities, and to enact penalties in respect of such offences. The principal offences the Bill deals with are attempts to influence the votes of members of municipal councils, and the acceptance by members of such councils of a consideration for such votes, either in council or in committee.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the Minister of Justice tell us whether this is based upon similar penalties already existing in regard to the legislative bodies of the country, or whether it specially provides for the punishment of these acts in municipal bodies, and whether it goes further than the present law in regard to legislatures?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it does not go further than the common law in regard to legislative or municipal bodies. The Bill itself deals with such offences in regard to municipal bodies only.

Mr. DOYON.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that this is rather a stretch of the criminal law in dealing with these bodies. The municipal bodies are under the Provincial Legislatures. They exist altogether by the legislation of the Local Parliaments. They are created by them, and they may be wiped out of existence at any moment. They owe their existence to the action of the Local Legislature, and it seems to me that, when the Local Legislature is authorised to accompany any statute it may pass with the penalties which may be necessary to carry it into effect, the Local Legislature has power to provide for this case. For instance, I have no doubt that the Local Legislature has power to provide that a local returning officer should hold an election in a particular way, subject to fine and imprisonment if he should be derelict in his duty, or if anything irregular or disorderly should take place. They can provide the means by which their own laws shall be enforced and obedience to them secured. I do not mean to say that, if it were found by experience that the powers with which the Local Legislatures are invested were inadequate, we might not act here, but it seems to me that, as far as the discharge of official duty by any officer of the Local Legislature is concerned, the powers with which the Local Legislature is invested are sufficient to secure respect for its authority. That seems to have been the intention of the law. The powers of the one Government are not enlisted merely for the purpose of enforcing the authority of the other. Suppose, for instance, that they were to provide the mode by which the local elections should be held, and that any party who stole the poll book should be punished by hard labor for a number of years. I have no doubt they are competent to pass such a law, and I think that is wholly distinct from the general provisions of the criminal law. We recognise this fact here, that although the power to deal with the subject of property and civil rights is vested in the Local Legislature, nevertheless where a power is specifically conferred upon us, although it comes within the definition of property and civil rights, we have exclusive jurisdiction so far as that specific power is concerned. We have here conferred upon us generally power to legislate upon the subject of crime, but that general power given to us in respect to crime, no more limits the specific powers given to the Local Legislatures, to provide for a provincial crime, than does the granting of powers on the subject of property and civil rights, prevent us from dealing with the specific class of cases falling within the definition given to us here by the British North America Act. Now, I think that is perfectly clear; and that being the case, why should we deal with the class of cases which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with here? If there were great and notorious offences committed in the way here described, and it was found that the provisions made or which might be made by the Local Legislature were inadequate for the punishment of infractions of the law, and for the offences which were committed by this particular class, then I think there might be some warrant for our interference, so far as the expediency of the question is concerned. I do not think there has been any statement given to us showing that it is expedient for us to act. I point out, as a matter of principle, that we ought not to deal with it, because, as a matter of principle, the Local Legislatures are expressly authorised to provide, by fine and imprisonment, for the punishment of such offences as may be committed against their local authority. Now, that being the case, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman will require to make out a very strong case before he can interfere with the exercise of that power

given to the Local Legislatures, and deal with the subject under the general power of criminal law. It has been well said by a Chief Justice of the United States, in an important case, that under any federal system the boundary which separates the federal authority from the local authority is as clear and distinct as if they were separate and distinct political communities—distinct nationalities. When the certain powers given to the Local Legislatures are exclusive, let us for a moment suppose that the Local Legislatures possessed these powers outside of the Dominion altogether, that it was a separate territorial entity, as well as a separate personal entity or corporation, and you will see at once the impropriety of undertaking to extend the powers of your criminal jurisdiction to a class of cases such as this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. member is quite correct in stating that municipalities are unknown to this Parliament. It is true that they are not created by this Parliament, they are created by the Local Legislature, but, inasmuch as every one of the Local Legislatures in Canada has, by competent authority, established these municipalities all over Canada, I think it is rather a refinement to say that this Parliament cannot take notice of the existence of these municipalities. Now, in proposing legislation of this kind, we are not seeking to interfere with the law relating to municipalities, we are not constituting municipalities, we are not delegating to them power, we are not increasing their powers. We find these municipalities existing all over Canada, and we simply say that it shall be hereafter a crime to attempt to corrupt a member or an officer of that municipality, and that it shall be a crime for a municipal officer to accept corruptly a consideration for his vote, or for any act as a municipal officer. I take it that we have precisely the same right to protect municipalities against the bribery of their officers, as to protect them against a breach of trust in their officers. We have a right to protect their property, and we have a right to pass a Bill relating to criminal law and say that it shall be a crime to steal the property of a municipality, and we have the right to regulate the mode in which a person who steals the property of a municipality shall be indicted, tried and convicted. I do not dispute for a moment the proposition that the Local Legislatures have power to enforce the regulations of their municipalities, but I say this is not a question of enforcing the regulations of any municipality, nor is it legislation to interfere with municipal law. We propose by this Bill, if the common law does not do so already, to raise to the rank of a crime, by virtue of our power over the criminal law, the offence of bribing an officer of the municipality, and the offence of accepting a bribe on the part of such officers. Now, it seems to me that that is a matter which it is quite incompetent for the Local Legislatures to do, and it is a matter which, in my humble judgment, the common law does already reach, but, inasmuch as it has been supposed that this law does not reach members of municipalities in various places who are guilty of these acts, I think it is wise that this House should legislate, and that we should say that if there be any doubt upon the subject as to the nature of the common law, that doubt shall be set at rest, and that if it were not a crime before, it shall hereafter be a crime to destroy the existence or usefulness of a municipality by corrupt acts.

Mr. AMYOT. I am very glad this measure is brought down. I do not look upon it as diminishing the power of municipalities, but as sanctioning their power. We do not declare that the elections shall be voided—this would belong to the Local Legislature, which has power to make it a crime to be guilty of bribery, corruption or intimidation. But I think we should extend these provisions to every corporation that is created by law, either by the Federal or by the

Local Legislature; and that in respect to every corporate body the elections should be held according to the principles laid down in this Bill, so that the purity of the elections may be protected. I entirely concur with the views of the Minister of Justice on that point. I think it is sanctioning the powers of the local municipalities, and all the corporations existing in virtue of the Local Legislatures; but I wish the hon. member would make this Bill the common law of the country for any election held by a body corporate and politic.

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS. Is there any special reason that this House should legislate on the subject of municipal bodies, and not legislate in regard to Provincial Legislatures? Is it a more serious offence to commit bribery at municipal elections than it is to commit bribery at provincial elections. The Minister of Justice assumes by this Bill, that a Local Legislature cannot punish as a criminal offence any act, and if he chooses to raise a particular act to the rank of a crime, that then it is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. But the decision of the Queen vs. Russell by the Privy Council, shows that that body, at all events, assumed there were certain specific provincial offences which Local Legislatures were authorised to punish as crimes. By calling the offence under an institution which owes its existence to a provincial Act, a misdemeanor, does not change the character of the offence. This House has not, by the British North America Act, any exclusive jurisdiction over words in the dictionary. The Local Legislature may call an offence against the local law a misdemeanor. There is nothing in the British North America Act to prevent it. It is true the Local Legislature cannot legislate on the subject of crime generally, whether for grave or trifling offences, but they can legislate to enforce their local laws where necessary by making the violation of those laws a criminal offence, specifically, not generally. There is a distinction between a wrong done, say by a treasurer appropriating public funds, and wrong done by him with respect to the discharge of some duty of a special character; and so it is with respect to those parties who are exercising authority under the Municipal Act. There is a difference between the law that is executed under the control of the Provinces and the ordinary criminal law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not doubt me when I say that I always like to hear his views on these subjects, although I hardly ever agree with him. I do not dispute at all the proposition that this Parliament has no exclusive authority over the dictionary, but we have authority over the criminal law. If a Local Legislature declares a certain offence a felony, although that word happened to be in the dictionary, it, notwithstanding, has an inseparable connection with the subject of the criminal law, and could not be dealt with by the Local Legislature. It is one thing to have it in the dictionary—and we cannot expel it from there—but it is quite another thing to have it made an enactment. I do not doubt, for a single moment, the capacity of this Parliament to make it a misdemeanor, or a still greater offence if they thought fit, to bribe a member of the Legislature. The hon. gentleman asks me why I introduce legislation with reference to municipalities which I do not propose with reference to Parliament. I can only say that the demand for this legislation has been made with reference to municipalities, and has not been made in reference to Parliament. There was some difficulty in hearing the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), at this distance, but I understood his proposal to be, to make it a misdemeanor to bribe, or to accept a bribe, at elections for municipal councils.

Mr. AMYOT. I referred, not only to municipal elections, but to every corporation recognised by law, such as banks,

&c. My object was to extend the law so as to make it a common law offence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Hon. gentlemen will see that we would have to introduce a new subject into the Act to deal with the purity of elections of municipal councillors. The one subject which this Bill proposes to deal with is the corruption of municipal councillors after they have been elected. We would be changing altogether the character of the Bill if we made it to deal with municipal elections, although there is, no doubt, a good deal of force in his suggestion that it is desirable to suppress offences of that kind.

On section 3,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the clause in the Bill extending the time for bringing those charges to three years. Three years seems to be rather a long period to have those charges hanging over a person's head, and it might be that blackmailing would result. I think that in the Dominion Elections Act the time is one year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to make it two years. I think it is a little different from the case of elections, for it may take some time to discover those offences.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### ENQUIRIES CONCERNING PUBLIC MATTERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No 72) to make further provision respecting enquiries concerning Public Matters. (From the Senate.) He said: I do not know whether this Bill requires any explanation. It originated in a suggestion from the Government of Quebec in relation to an enquiry into a public matter which interested that body. It appears the progress of the enquiry was arrested by a claim of privilege on the part of a witness, and it was apprehended the same would be made in regard to other witnesses. The purpose of the Bill is, that witnesses being examined in the course of public enquiries set on foot by the authority of His Excellency or the Lieutenant Governors, shall not be privileged from giving evidence. The single safeguard in the Bill is that the witness will not be liable to be prosecuted in respect to the evidence given there, unless he be under indictment for having given false evidence. I propose to amend the third clause by inserting after the words, in the sixth line, "administration of justice therein," the words "or in reference to any municipal matter," and in the ninth line the word "himself" should be "him."

Mr. EDGAR. In this clause which protects the witness, the Minister of Justice refers to more subjects of enquiry than are covered by the Act in the Revised Statutes. I suppose enquiries as to municipal matters would only be enquired into under a provincial commission, and unless he intends that enquiries into the administration of justice shall be enquired into by a provincial commission, I think that he ought to amend the operative section of chapter 114 to cover that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to take that power. It is only intended to extend the provisions of the enquiry under the authority of the Lieutenant Governors.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### CONDITIONAL RELEASE OF FIRST OFFENDERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 91) to permit the conditional release of first offenders in certain cases. He said: The object of this Bill is very succinctly stated in the preamble:

Mr. AMYOT:

"To make provision for cases where the reformation of persons convicted of first offences may, by reason of the offender's youth or the trivial nature of the offence, be brought about without imprisonment."

It has been the practice, in Ontario at least, for the judges to exercise to some extent this jurisdiction, by permitting young prisoners charged with first offences to be liberated on recognisances to appear on a subsequent day when sentence might be delivered, and not to require them so to appear or receive sentence unless they commit some other breach of the law. I am not aware of any authority which justifies that practice. I am aware that, occasionally, in Great Britain, in individual cases in which the judge has been strongly convinced that a conviction should not have taken place, he has undertaken to exercise a similar power to release the prisoner without sentence, on his own recognisance. The power, however, has rarely been acted upon, and only in cases in the old country where the conviction has been obviously improper, as the result of facts proved, or has been such a great hardship, in consequence of the oppressive nature of the law administered, as to induce the judge to take upon himself personally the high responsibility of defeating the conviction. It is better, I think, that the system should receive the sanction of law so far as it properly can, and that it should have the safeguards which this Bill proposes, and by which it is provided that in the case of a subsequent offence, the prisoner can be summoned to receive punishment. The Bill is a practical adaptation of chapter 25 of the Imperial Statutes of 1837.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment.

Mr. ARSTRONG. After the able and exhaustive speeches made on both sides of the House on the question now before us, it is not my intention to bore the House by a long speech, and in the remarks I wish to make I shall confine myself almost exclusively to the question from the farmer's standpoint. I wish to speak on the question as a practical farmer, and to endeavor to point out how he is affected. About a year ago I gave a notice of motion in this House in favor of commercial union with the United States. That motion I allowed to drop. I did so for two special reasons. First, because notice had been given of another motion in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Reciprocity was the great object we had in view, and although I had a preference for commercial union over unrestricted reciprocity, still, provided we obtained reciprocity, I did not care so much what the mode might be. Another reason was that I was afraid of offending a few of the weak brethren. I was in favor of reciprocity then, and I am in favor of it still. I believe it is preferable to any other mode of free trade with the United States which can possibly be adopted. I may, at the outset, mention two or three objections urged against commercial union. One of them was urged with a great deal of spirit last night by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), and it is the only very strong objection I have ever heard made against it. But so far as the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) is concerned, so far as others who have spoken on the subject are concerned, and so far as the public prints opposed to the measure are concerned, the objection has never gone further than bald, bare assertion. The assertion to which I refer is that commercial union would lead to giving the Americans the control of our tariff. As I said before, this is but a simple assertion, and that is no proof of a proposition, and we have never had any argument adduced to prove that such would be the case. Why, is it not true

that, if ever an arrangement of this kind is made with the United States or with any other country, Canada goes into the negotiations altogether as an independent party? They will have the right and the power to say whether they will or will not agree to any measures that are to be proposed, and, if any arrangement of that kind is ever made between Canada and the United States, or between Canada and any other countries, it will have to be by the full and free consent of the Canadians. They will be independent parties to the bargain. They will have just as much to say in making that bargain as the other party will; and is it giving any other party the control of our tariff, simply because we agree with that party that, for a certain period of years, a common tariff, to be mutually agreed upon, should prevail between the two countries and the rest of the world? The assertion of the statement carries with it its own absurdity and its own condemnation. The same objection might be made against unrestricted reciprocity, and, without either commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, I confidently assert that the Americans have in effect the control of the tariff of Canada. To make my meaning clear, I will say this. We all agree that the Americans have a much higher tariff, apparently, than we in Canada have, but that does not prevent smuggling into this country. Suppose, for example, that the tariff was lowered in the United States, say 5 or 10 per cent., or below ours, what would be the result? Increased smuggling into this country, in consequence of the lowering of their tariff below our own. The merest child in public business can understand that, in that case, it would take half the people of this country to prevent the other half from smuggling. So, in that way, the Americans really have the control of our tariff. It may be objected to this that there is no danger of such a state of affairs, that the Americans have a higher tariff than ours, and that that tariff is likely to be continued. I believe nothing can be further from the truth than such a statement. I need not tell this House that, for nearly twelve months, a strong agitation has been going on in the United States for the reduction of the tariff, for the reduction of the taxation, and that a Presidential election has recently been run on that question, and I need not tell the House that 100,000 majority of the electors voted for that reduction. The workmen of the United States, the farmers and all the industrial classes are beginning to feel the terrible load under which they are ground down, and they are crying out for a lowering of the tariff and a reduction of the taxes. We know, when once an agitation of that kind commences, how fast it proceeds in a country like the United States where the people are supreme. Once let the agitation fairly set in, and it will go down and down with railroad speed until it will reach the point that nothing will be collected in the way of taxation beyond what is necessary for carrying on the Government of the country; and when that point is reached, Canada cannot possibly keep up the high tariff she now has, so that commercial union, as we understand it, a certain agreement for a certain number of years to have a set tariff, is the only security we have for the permanency of our tariff. Another strong argument for commercial union over unrestricted reciprocity is the fact that, if it were adopted, we could do away with the whole of our Custom houses along the border. The very idea of commercial union is to have a common tariff and common Excise regulations, to collect common tariff duties and common Excise duties, so that there would be no need for the long string of Custom houses which extends over our 3,000 miles of frontier, or for the needless host of Custom house officials whom we now have, but who could be dismissed and sent to do something which would be of real benefit to the country. Then, another argument in favor of commercial union over unrestricted reciprocity, is that it is altogether practicable. A year ago, it was fashionable to say that we could

not get commercial union, that the United States would not grant it to us, that they were too astute to grant us any such measure. At the last Session of the House, we had an hon. gentleman, whose abilities we all admire, who had been sent to Washington to negotiate a treaty, and after he came back, he stated from his place in this House, that such a thing was practicable. I will quote his own words from the *Hansard* of 1888, page 681. He said:

"I tell you that I did not meet a man of any party, I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada."

That was Sir Charles Tupper's statement twelve months ago, and events that have very lately happened show how correctly he gauged public opinion on the other side. It was only the other day that a resolution in favor of commercial union with Canada passed unanimously the House of Representatives of the United States. It passed the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate unanimously, and when it came to the Senate, there was only one man who objected to it, and it was, therefore, laid over for further consideration. We, therefore, see that commercial union is altogether practicable. Now, whether we ask for commercial union or for unrestricted reciprocity, I wish to say at the outset that we are not going to the Americans asking for this as paupers, telling them that we cannot do without it. We are going there as an independent nation, offering them equal privileges to those we ask from them. We say to the Americans, We buy a vast quantity of what you have to sell, and you buy a great deal of what we have to sell; it is for our mutual benefit that the barriers that obstruct our trade should be broken down. We meet them on equal terms, and offer them as good as we get. Neither do I advocate this measure on the ground which, I am sorry to say, has sometimes been taken, that the farmers of this country are a poor, miserable, half-starved class that cannot live without it. Any such statement is a libel on the farmers of this Dominion. Considering the industry of our farming population, considering the intelligence and the skill they bring to bear on their profession, it is impossible, under present circumstances, that they can be any such poor, miserable class. I repudiate the idea altogether, but I do say that, considering the amount of capital that the farmers of this Dominion have had to invest in their property, in their plant, in the implements and the stock necessary for them to carry on their calling, considering the great skill, the untiring industry and the indomitable perseverance they have shown in their calling,—taking all these things into consideration, I do assert, without fear of contradiction, that the farmers are not reaping that profit which they have a right to expect. That is all that I assert about them, that they do not reap the profit from their calling that their industry, and their skill, and the amount of capital they have invested, entitle them to expect, and we seek by this measure which is now before the House to enable them to get something like a fair share of what they have fairly earned. Now, we are told by almost every speaker from the other side of the House, that we have a better market than the United States, that Britain is our natural market, that we ought to trade with Britain, that it is patriotic to trade with Britain, that it is more profitable for us to trade with Britain. Well, Sir, it is more patriotic and profitable to trade with Britain, why do we not do it? The reason why we do not do it, and the reason why we do trade with the Americans, simply is because, for nearly the half of what we have to sell the United States is our natural market; that is the simple reason why we trade with them. Sir, this is shown by the large trade that we do with them in spite of the two tariff walls that have been erected one on each side of the line to prevent us from trading with them; and also in spite of the fact that every ounce of

produce of any description that we send to Great Britain, is allowed to enter that country without the payment of a shilling of duty. We have actually free access to her market, while we have a tariff wall between us and the United States; yet in spite of that tariff wall, we sell more to the Americans than we do to the inhabitants of Great Britain. We see this fact more strongly brought out in the circumstance that our trade with the United States is constantly increasing, while our trade with Great Britain is diminishing. Allow me to draw the attention of the House to a few figures taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, to prove this position. In 1887, we imported from Great Britain \$44,962,233 worth; from the United States we imported \$45,107,066 worth. In that same year we exported to Great Britain \$44,571,312 worth; we exported to the United States \$34,658,275 worth. Now compare that with the year 1888. Last year we exported to Great Britain \$40,084,984 worth; while we exported to the United States \$42,572,065 worth. Then, in the same year, 1888, we imported from Great Britain \$39,298,721 worth; while we imported from the United States \$48,481,843 worth, a decrease in our trade with Great Britain, in 1888, as compared with 1887, of \$10,149,840 worth; and showing an increase of our trade with the United States for the same year of \$11,288,572 worth. This shows that our trade with the United States during 1888 was greater than our trade with Great Britain, to the amount of \$11,670,208 worth; and all this increase, Sir, in spite of the two tariff walls that have been erected, one on each side of the line, to prevent us from trading with the Americans. Our aggregate trade with the whole world, in 1888, was \$201,097,630; of that, the enormous amount of \$91,053,913 worth was with the United States, or only \$4,747,451 worth less than one-half of our trade with the whole world. This has been, as I said before, in spite of these tariff walls, and it shows, if anything on earth can show, that trade will follow its natural channel in spite of all the barriers that you erect against it, and it shows, too, that the country that tries to fight geography in the matter of trade, fights a losing battle. Then, Sir, the importance of the United States market to this country is further shown by the fact—and I wish to emphasise this—that they take what we have no market for in Great Britain or anywhere else. I want to draw particular attention to this fact in respect to horses, and I may say, as a practical farmer, that the raising of horses for sale is one of the most profitable branches of farming at the present time. Well, where is our market for the surplus horses that we raise? In 1888, we exported to Great Britain 246 horses, of the value of \$36,750. In the same year, we exported to the United States 19,845 horses, of the value of \$2,402,371. The United States was the only market we had for these horses, and except for that market they could not have been sold. We shipped of cattle to Great Britain, 54,248, valued at \$4,123,873. We exported to the United States 40,047 valued at \$648,178. When the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. McMillan) was speaking last year, the question was thrown across the floor respecting the small value of the cattle shipped to the United States as compared with those shipped to Great Britain. The difference is easily explained. The cattle shipped to Great Britain are principally raised in Ontario, and consist mainly of heavy steers weighing from 1,300 to 1,700 lbs., a few of which cattle are now coming down from the North-West; while those shipped to the States are light cattle, cows and young cattle. There is no market in England for them, and it would not pay to send them over. Accordingly, the United States is the only market for our light cattle. There is another feature of this matter. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that a great many of the cattle exported to the United States are sent from the Maritime Provinces; in fact, as a general rule New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island do not raise a class of cattle fit for

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

shipment to the old country. The cattle there are for dairying purposes, and for this class we find our market in the United States. We exported of sheep to Great Britain 30,421, of the value of \$211,881. These also came chiefly from the far west. In regard to the statements contained in our Trade and Navigation Returns, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) showed the other night that they did not tally with those of the United States authorities, and that the latter show a much larger number of cattle, sheep and horses imported than do our Trade and Navigation Returns, and I am inclined to believe, through no fault of the Minister of Customs, that much stock is shipped to the United States which is never reported to the Customs Department. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we exported 359,353,999 sheep to the United States, for which we received \$1,027,410. Again, they are a class of sheep for which there is no sale in England, and it would not pay to send them there. The larger proportion of those sheep came from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and were sent to the Boston market. They were principally lambs and light sheep, for which we have no other market. Next, in regard to grain. Of barley we exported to Great Britain 1,657 bushels. The truth of the matter is we have no market in England for our barley. The attempt made to malt our barley there proved to be a failure, as it would not make the quality of ale and porter required. On the other hand, it makes the ale and porter and lager which the Americans love, and the result is we have the best barley on the continent and they buy it. Last year they purchased from us 9,365,021 bushels. If it were not for that market it would not pay our people to raise a bushel of barley, for it is an unprofitable crop to raise for feed. Of hay, we shipped to Great Britain 6,044½ tons, for which we received \$64,781, while we shipped to the United States 84,068 tons. This came principally from the Province of Quebec, it furnishing 74,970 tons. The total value of the shipments to the States was \$800,622. In regard to potatoes, which are an important product in some parts of the Dominion, we exported to Great Britain 1,427 bushels, of the value of \$973; while we exported to the United States 2,484,441 bushels, of the value of \$957,570. This is a vital matter to some of the Maritime Provinces. An enormous quantity is raised in Prince Edward Island, and large quantities also in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and for these crops the Eastern States are their only markets. Before they are able to reach that market, however, they have to pay a duty of 15 cents per bushel in addition to the expense of carriage, so, in effect, they have to give one bushel of potatoes to get another bushel into market. But that does not end the matter, for, when the farmer brings back his money, the manufacturers' "combines" go through his pockets and take a large part of what remains. Is it any wonder he is dissatisfied and asks for a change? Of wool, Great Britain did not take from us a single ounce. It may be said that we can have no object in exporting wool, as we import wool, and we cannot, therefore, want to ship our wool. We do want to ship it. We have in the west some excellent breeders of long-wool sheep, principally Cotswold, these breeders having brought stock from the old country, as they preferred that to any other breed. This class of wool is not manufactured in the Dominion, and so we have not a profitable market for it. In the United States it is used for combing, and it is there we sell it. The Americans took 954,975 lbs., for which they paid \$223,206. Another article, of which we export largely, is eggs. We exported to Great Britain 2,379 dozen, for which we received \$262. We exported to the United States 14,147,739 dozen, for which we received the splendid sum of \$2,119,582. Our lumbering, mining and fishing interests are in precisely a similar position as

are our farming interests in this respect. Of those products we exported the following quantities: Products of the mine, to the value of \$4,110,937; of the fisheries, \$7,793,183; of the forest, \$21,302,914. Of these the United States took, of the products of the mine, \$3,341,308; of the fisheries, \$3,123,853; of the products of the forest, \$10,622,338; of the farm, \$17,902,021. We, therefore, find that it is a matter of vital importance to all those industries that we should have for them free access to the American market. Now, Sir, having detained you so long with figures, I want the particular attention of the House for a few minutes, while I deal with some of the objections that are urged against the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. We are told, first of all, that it would be hurtful, and even ruinous to our manufacturing industries, and here the question comes in, is it right, and proper, and just, that all these other great industries of the country should be hampered, and hindered, and impoverished in their operation so that one single industry, and that not by any means the largest, should thrive and make large profits. That is an important question, whether it is fair that all these should suffer for the sake of one single industry. Now, Sir, it is hard to get a correct estimate of the amount of capital employed in each of the great industries of the country, but we can easily find out from our Trade and Navigation Returns how much of the products of each of these great industries have been exported out of the country, after supplying the necessities of our own people; that is, how much has been exported over and above what we wanted to consume ourselves. In 1888 we exported of the products of the mine, \$4,110,937 worth; of the products of the fisheries, \$7,793,183; of the products of the forest, \$21,302,814; of the products of the farm, \$40,155,657 worth; making a grand total of \$73,362,591 worth. Now, Sir, how much did we export of the products of our manufactures after supplying the wants of our own people? Why, Sir, the magnificent sum of \$4,161,282 worth. But, Sir, there are not a few who are well fitted and able to judge of the effect of such a measure as that proposed in the motion of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who declare that it would have exactly a contrary effect on the manufacturers, and there are not a few of our manufacturers, and amongst those, the very best and ablest of them, who declare that they are not afraid of open and fair competition with the Americans, that they are ready to have the barriers thrown down and to take their chance in any common market with the people of the United States of America. Again, we find that the manufacturers are now complaining of hard times. This, Sir, is the natural result of the National Policy, as it is called, or the protective system. Its first effect was to induce the investment of immense amounts of capital in manufacturing enterprise. The result was that the business was overdone, and not having an outlet for their actual production, they had to prey upon the people of this country. About a year ago, I went into the establishment of one of the oldest established and largest manufacturers in London. After the question, "Are you afraid of fair competition with the United States of America, are you willing that the tariff would be thrown off on both sides of the line?" the manufacturer answered: "Afraid! Why, there were young men who learned the business in my shop and who are in the United States of America to-day, getting from \$1,500 to \$2,500 a year, for overseeing works; surely, if they can hold their own with the Americans, I am not afraid that I can do it too." The fact of the matter is, that the protection afforded by this National Policy has confined our market to our own people, for the moment you enter upon a system of that kind, you cut the country off from the other markets of the world. Therefore, I say that any such assertions about the people of this country, as that they cannot compete with any other country in the world, is

a slander upon our people. I hold, Sir, that man for man Canadians are as good as any men on the face of the earth, and are able to hold their own in any contest with any peoples in the world. I may remark here that the principal reason why this policy was asked, or why it was given to the country, was, as we were told, that it would secure reciprocity with the United States of America. The great cry that was raised in 1878 was "let us have reciprocity in trade, and if we cannot have that we must have reciprocity in tariff." It was the open declared intention to force the Americans to give us reciprocity in trade by our adopting reciprocity in tariff. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in this country of ours, although we have immense resources, these are in a large measure undeveloped. I believe, Sir, that in our forests, and lying in the earth in the shape of ores, we have immense resources that have never yet been developed and that in a great measure have never yet been discovered. Now, Sir, what we want for these is an outlet and a larger market. In our own country we have not this larger market. We have copper here in almost untold quantities. I have seen, Sir, at the Sudbury Mines specimens of ore thrown out which was too rich to mine and which could not be torn off from the parent body, and every pound of copper shipped to the other side is met by a tariff of 3½ cents a pound. That is entirely preventing us from availing ourselves of the benefits of that natural market. Then, again, we have large and rich mines of what is known as nickle, one of the most important metals for economical purposes that we have. The United States is our only market for nickle and they want it there, but every pound of it that goes in the United States is met with a tax of 12½ cents. Then we come to the question of our iron resources. In 1887 the hon. Sir Charles Tupper, when delivering his budget speech, told us that he had at last discovered what this country really needed, that he had discovered a great want, and that the rectifying of that wrong was about to give this country prosperity. He said that the great cause of complaint in this country, the fact which would account for our poverty, was that we had not a scientific tariff on iron, and he proposed to give us prosperity by imposing such a tariff upon us. He adopted that tariff, and of certain kinds of iron he just about doubled the price to the people of this country. And how much better off have we been? Those who had the privilege of listening to his speech on that occasion can remember the glowing terms in which he spoke of our resources of iron. He told us of the vast stores of iron ore lying unused in the bowels of the earth; he told us of the great stretches of forest which could be converted into charcoal; he told us of our great deposits of lime-stone which were necessary to effect the fusion of the metal; and he told us of the immense armies of men who would require to be employed to cut down the timber and to convert it into charcoal, to mine the iron ore, and to smelt the iron. He told us it would be the dawn of a new era of prosperity; nay, so positive was he of the truth of what he asserted that he told us precisely what was going to be the result in one particular. He said that the imposition of this tariff on iron, in conjunction with the removal of the duty on anthracite coal, would have a certain effect. What was that effect? He said that the moment—no waiting, no possibility of being deceived—the moment this is done, we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay and at Kingston. Well, Sir, I have made enquiries, and I have not seen an individual who has seen a blast furnace at any of those places. I have seen many people who have travelled throughout the country, and not one of them has heard the wood-cutter's axe felling trees to be converted into charcoal. They are still standing in the sun, and the iron is still lying in the bowels of the earth. Now, why was this prediction, so confidently made, not realised? Was it because that illustrious statesman had miscalculated the resources of this

country, or overestimated their value? No such thing. Even his exuberant imagination could hardly overestimate the undeveloped wealth, in those respects, which we have in this country. Well, how is it that his predictions have been so completely falsified? For the simple reason that, although we have the resources and the appliances necessary for the production of the wealth he alluded to, yet the main thing is wanting, and that is a market. We were told that this country required to import 260,000 tons of iron in a year. That seems a vast quantity, but let me tell this House that there are two, if not three, establishments on the other side of the line, any one of which could supply that quantity in any given year, so that it is evident that, if we are confined to the Canadian market, the prediction of our late Finance Minister is doomed to be still unfulfilled. But, Sir, I may tell you where there is a market. In 1887, according to the *Iron and Mining Review* of the United States, there were 1,800,000 tons of iron imported into the United States, in spite of a prohibitory tariff. Give us that market, and the dream of the late Finance Minister will be in a fair way to be realised. Another objection often urged against any such measure is that if we were to have free trade with the United States, while we maintained our tariff against Great Britain, and other countries, it would be unfair discrimination against Great Britain. Well, Sir, in reply to that, I say that is just exactly what we are doing now: we are discriminating against Great Britain today. In 1887 we imported from Great Britain \$39,298,721 worth of goods, on which we collected a duty of \$8,972,739. In the same year we imported from the United States \$48,481,848 worth, on which we collected a duty of only \$7,109,233. In other words, we imported \$9,183,127 worth of goods more from the United States than we did from Great Britain, and charged on them \$1,863,506 less duty. It may be said that that is accounted for in a great measure by the fact that we admit so many things from the United States free of duty. But I ask again, is that not discriminating against Great Britain just as much as if you had a discriminating tariff? No matter under what guise you admit these goods, the effect is the same so far as Great Britain is concerned; and the question of discrimination is only one of degree. But, Sir, Great Britain has other interests in Canada besides those of a merely mercantile nature. Great Britain, Sir, has the interest that a creditor has in a debtor—the interest of seeing that everything is done that can possibly be done to enable us to pay our great indebtedness to her with promptitude. That, Sir, is a consideration that far outweighs the question of the quantity of goods we buy from Great Britain. According to the *London Economist*, in June, 1887, our indebtedness to Great Britain, all told, amounted to somewhere between six and seven hundred millions of dollars, and it is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Britain, that we should be in a thriving and prosperous condition, so as to be able to meet our indebtedness when it comes due, and to meet the interest on it until it is due. Then, Sir, there is this other fact to be considered. Great Britain is independent of every other nation on the face of the earth in the matter of tariffs. It makes no difference what tariff wall any nation erects to keep out her goods, she can get her goods over it, because every nation in the world needs her goods, and no matter what duty they impose, they must take them. Another objection—and it is the old stock objection against everything proposed for the benefit of the country from this side of the House—is that this measure would lead to annexation. We were told, even by so sensible a gentleman as the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), that that would be the result of commercial union. Well, Sir, all experience, as well as common sense, teaches that it would have just the contrary effect. I think too much is said about annexation sentiment in this country. I believe the people of this Dominion are loyal

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

to the Crown of Great Britain, and that if ever the tie that binds us to Great Britain is broken, it will be through the action of the mother country herself, and not through any action of ours. Now let me draw attention to one or two facts. In the year 1849 there was an immense agitation going on in certain parts of this country in favor of annexation. A league was formed, in a city not more than a thousand miles from here, called "the annexation league," which held regular meetings. I have seen a list of the members, and I know that some of them were men of high standing in this country, men who have since been honored with seats in the cabinet alongside the right hon. the First Minister. And what was it that put a stop to that agitation? It was neither more nor less than the Reciprocity Treaty which we were able to effect in 1854, and from that day until the treaty was abrogated not a whisper of annexation was heard in this country. In 1865, when the Americans abrogated that treaty, the Government of this country made representations to the home Government and the strongest ground they urged in favor of renewal of the reciprocity treaty was that such renewal would prevent any movement in this country for annexation. Again, in 1869, a minute of Council was passed by this Government and sent to the Colonial Secretary, urging upon the Imperial Government the expediency of doing all they could to procure a renewal of that reciprocity treaty, and the principal reason urged was that its renewal would prevent anything in the shape of annexation feeling in this Dominion. Is it not, therefore, the height of absurdity, is it not the most childish folly, for men in this House to declare that reciprocity now would have exactly the contrary effect it has had when formerly in force? So far from reciprocity stirring up any annexation feeling, all our experience in the past has shown that it would be the most effective means of preventing the spread of any such feeling. I do not think there is any fear of anything like an annexation agitation spreading in the country, but if anything would give currency to such a sentiment it would be our being denied the privileges which we would enjoy under unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. It is by debarring our people from the privileges and profits which they would enjoy under free trade with the United States that an annexation feeling can be developed. If you want to make the people contented with the Government, make them contented with their circumstances; show them the Government has done everything man can do to procure all the advantages within their reach—do that, and you will take away all desire for a change of circumstances. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) read a long extract last night from an interview with Senator Sherman. I hardly know what he intended to prove by that, but it proved to every thinking man in this House one thing, and that was that the only opposition to a treaty of this kind in the States is due to the fact that the Americans believe once this policy is adopted there will be an end, at once, and forever, to all annexation feeling in Canada. Senator Sherman strongly opposed reciprocity on this very ground. He held the old Monroe doctrine, that the two countries ought to be one, and he objected to anything that would prevent such a consummation; and he felt that nothing was more calculative to prevent any such consummation than to give us all the privileges which we would enjoy under annexation without it. I referred, at the outset of my remarks, to a measure lately passed through the House of Representatives at Washington, and which would have passed through the Senate but for the objection of one of its members. Who was the Senator who made the objection? Why, it was Senator Blair, the man who appeared in the annexation resolution. He did not object to commercial union on its merits. I believe Sir Charles Tupper is right in saying that there is not a man of any standing in the United States who is not thoroughly convinced

that unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union would be a benefit to both countries, but Senator Blair objected to either solely on the ground that if such concession was granted to Canada, it would kill, once and forever, all annexation sentiment. Some time ago, in the debate on the treaty-making power in this House, the hon. the Minister of Finance said that the right to make our treaties was about the only tie that bound this country to Great Britain. Well, if that is the only tie, the sooner it is broken the better, because he will find that this country is not going to submit much longer to that tie; but I believe we are bound by ties immeasurably stronger than anything of the kind. We are bound by ties of affection, the ties of a common history, the ties of kinship, the ties of common interest—we have a share in the glories of the old Empire—these are ties immeasurably stronger than mere commercial consideration, or any paltry treaty-making power. But Great Britain has another interest in the settlement of this question. I need not tell this House that the fishery question is one that causes a great deal of irritation, not only between this country and the United States, but between that country and Great Britain, and I believe it is immeasurably more important to Great Britain than that difficulty should be permanently settled than any question of trade, or of dollars and cents, between the two countries. I believe that—as Secretary Bayard wrote to Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir Charles Tupper wrote to Secretary Bayard—the only permanent settlement between the two countries of the fisheries question can only be on the line of the resolution now before the House, or on the line of commercial union, and the result in either case would be certain. It is clearly of immense importance to Great Britain that this question should be settled in a satisfactory manner. I do not intend to blame the Government altogether, or to blame them at all, for putting in force the law in regard to the fisheries. The Government of the day are the guardians of the rights of the people. It is their sworn duty to execute the laws which the people pass for the protection of their rights, so that, in protecting our fisheries from encroachment, the Government were simply carrying out their sworn duty in protecting the rights of the people. As to whether they were harsh in carrying the law into effect or not, I am not now going to express an opinion, but I will say that, whether it was harsh or not, the Government had the laws to carry out, and on behalf of the Government I wish also to state that, although the law provides for redress where illegal seizure or injustice is done, as far as I know—and I think I have studied the question pretty closely—no one of those who were affected by these seizures has appealed to a court of law to obtain redress against the action of the Government. That is *prima facie* evidence that the Government have carried out the law in a pretty judicial spirit. The law was there and had to be carried out, and whether they carried it out in a harsh or a mild spirit, the fact remains that, as long as things remain in their present position, the grounds of difference between this country and the United States, and between the United States and Great Britain, must remain, and it is, therefore, of great importance to Great Britain that this question should be settled in a pacific way. We are, perhaps, too apt to overlook the importance of this aspect of the case. On the other side of the line is a people akin to ourselves, speaking the same language, having the same literature, having the same ancestry also. If we are proud of the former glories of Great Britain, so also are they, because that is their fatherland and the bones of their forefathers rest there; and we can hardly estimate what an immensely important matter it would be to the world if these two nations could have everything removed which obstructs peaceable and quiet intercourse between them, so as to work together for common objects, and what the results would be to the world at large. If these two great nations,

who possess the largest share of the commerce of the world, and the largest shares of the sinews of war, the wealth of the world, were acting together in concert, bound together as they are by a common tie, they could regulate the foreign policy of the nations of the world. When any small nationality was oppressed, they could say to the oppressor: This thing must stop, and it would have to be stopped. The fact is, that in such a case those two nations could make war impossible, and it requires no great stretch of imagination or fancy to see the great boon that would result to humanity, if the armies of the world could be abolished, if the hundreds of thousands of men who are to-day maintained in idleness, and who are supported by the sweat of the poor laboring men and women, could be engaged in active employment of a peaceful kind. Then, consider what an immense boon it would be, as far as the commerce of the world is concerned, if men could engage in commerce and in manufactures in every part of the world, without being afraid of being disturbed by any internal or external commotion, what an impetus it would give to the business of the world. It is impossible to overestimate the immense benefit which such a proposition as this might be the beginning of, and which, in future years, with two such countries combining for that peaceable object, acting in all matters in harmony as they should do, would probably bring about universal peace as the result. As I see it is six o'clock, I will conclude my remarks by supporting, with great pleasure, the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

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

### After Recess.

#### SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 65) respecting Rules of Court in relation to Criminal Matters.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 71) from the Senate, intitled: "An Act respecting corrupt practices in Municipal Affairs."—(Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 72) from the Senate, intitled: "An Act to make further provision respecting enquiries concerning Public Matters."—Sir John Thompson.)

Bill (No. 91) from the Senate, intitled: "An Act to permit the Conditional Release of First Offenders in certain cases."—(Sir John Thompson.)

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 45) to revive and amend the Acts relating to the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Lac Seul Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)



Bill (No. 59) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company."—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 60) respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway (as amended by Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines).—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company (as amended by Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines).—(Mr. La Rivière.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Central Counties Railway Company."—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Calgary, Alberta and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bewman.)

Bill (No. 48) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorize them to issue Debenture Stock.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 87) to amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.—(Mr. McGreevy.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Edmundston and Florenceville Railway Company.—(Mr. Landry.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

#### SEIZURE OF BRITISH SCHOONER.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call the attention of the Government to the following despatch, which appears in the evening papers:—

"BOOTH BAY, ME, March 8.—The British schooner *Gleaner*, from St. John for New York, was seized here at noon by the customs officers for non-entry, and is now in charge of the revenue cutter *Woodbine*. The fine is \$1,500."

Have the Government received any information on that subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. PORTER. Of the importance of the subject now under discussion you have, Sir, often been assured. Of the merit displayed in its conduct I think Canadians need not at all be ashamed. The exhaustive discourse of the hon. the Minister of Finance, the other evening, was undoubtedly an able setting forth of the financial and commercial condition of our country. It was a lucid arrangement of a long array of statistics, which places that gentleman in the first rank of those who have held the position of Minister of Finance in this country. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was seized with his usual paroxysm of financial rage when the Minister of Finance had finished the Budget speech. He lashed himself into the usual fury, and made a severe attack upon all the points which had been made by the Minister of Finance, and yet, I am glad to say, he was completely unhorsed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not desire to maltreat a fallen foe, and I think it is very creditable to the ability of the hon. gentleman that now he has been able, as bees gather around the honey pot, to get the Liberal party to cluster round that part of his corporeal frame which a few years ago they longed to kick. As I said, he was unhorsed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. All who heard the brilliant attack which that young gentleman made on the hon. member will agree with me that he will deserve the title of the Canadian Hotspur of debate. If that young gentleman goes on as he promises to do, his services will be of great benefit to his country, and he will not only prove himself the worthy son of a worthy sire, but will show that he is deserving the highest credit as a scion of the race from which he has sprung. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) denominated the matter of the speech of the hon. the Minister of Marine as chaff. Well, chaff is neither nutritious nor very palatable, but I think the House and the country will prefer the diet offered to us by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to that which the hon. member for North Norfolk offered us—dirt pie. The speech of the hon. gentleman was nothing but an effort to induce Canadians to adopt a policy which would be in favor of the United States. It was a laudation of the United States. It was not an argument in favor of any commercial arrangement, it was not addressed to the Canadian people, but it was simply a speech in praise of the great Republic. No matter how much the hon. gentleman may lament the want of material wealth in this country, no matter how much he may depict the unfortunate condition of our people, he cannot deny that the people of Canada are noble in character and generous in spirit, for otherwise they would never have permitted that hon. gentleman to make a speech of the tone and sentiment which characterised his address. This was not the fitting arena in which to air his eloquence on that subject, but, if he had made such a speech in the legislative body of that nation to which he gives so much praise and honor, I have no doubt that that people, patriotic as they are, eminently jealous of their national autonomy, would have invited him to take a walk to visit the sour apple tree once associated with the name of Jeff Davis. Not only was that speech eminently unsuitable in what it said, but it meant more than it said, and through it there was a black thread of unbelief, an undertone of insincerity, because, while he was portraying the glories of the United States, he never, in all his eloquence, descended to details. If the people, and especially the farmers, of the United States are so rich and prosperous, are doing so well in the world, have so many comforts in this world, if they are so much superior in condition to our farmers, why did he not ask them, our farmers, to go over to the State of New York, or to Michigan, or to Illinois, why not leave their miserable, servile condition here, and go to the country where they might have those rich habitations, those pleasant

homes, that superior intelligence, greater wealth and higher social standing which he indicates are possessed by those across the line? Because he could not. Because, in spite of all he has said as to the position of the Canadian farmer, I defy him, and I defy anyone on that side of the House, to point to any civilised nation—and uncivilised nations, of course, are not in question—in which the condition of the farmer is better than it is in Canada. I have a little more to say in reference to that gentleman. His allusion to the might and power of England in our defence was ungraceful and ill-advised. There is no talk of war. Who seeks a quarrel? Not Canadians, certainly, and the United States declare themselves to be a nation of peaceful instincts. Why, then, drag in a question of that nature in a discussion where it is neither sought for nor well advised? No doubt, the people of the United States are largely superior in numbers to us. No doubt, they have more population than the British Islands proper, but, if that unhappy time should ever come—God grant it may never come—when the people of the United States and the people of Canada should be flying at one another's throats like wild beasts, the people of Canada will fight, as they have done before, for their hearths, their homes and their altars. An eminent warrior is reported to have said that God fights with the largest battalions. That may be very well, but I think it would be better to suppose that the God of battles would fight for the right. If the necessity should come, we may find that the history of Lundy's Lane and Chateauguay may be repeated. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) spoke last. I thought his remarks on the whole were very fair. He made a mild argument for nothing in particular, and no one can take much objection to it. He started out in favor of reciprocity. We all agree with him in that respect. I have not heard a word uttered against reciprocity in this House, and in that respect I heartily agree with him. He went further, and said he was in favor of commercial union. I believe he is in favor of commercial union, because a year ago he had the courage of his convictions and put a notice upon the paper proposing that commercial union should be adopted by the people of this country. I have no doubt he is sincere in that, and, no matter how much he talks of unrestricted reciprocity, I believe that all his arguments are really addressed to the furtherance of that scheme of his in reference to commercial union. Sir, he offered a refutation of several arguments which were adduced in opposition to commercial union. Amongst others, he said that it is often argued that commercial union would lead to annexation, and he scouted the idea. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is sincere; I have no doubt that in his heart he believes that it would not; but while I give him credit for sincerity and candor, I cannot give him credit for acuteness or perception. The hon. gentleman says that annexation will by no means follow commercial union, and that, indeed, the United States people do not wish anything of the sort. Sir, although I do not like reading extracts, if you will allow me, I will show that the hon. gentleman has not kept himself in touch with the public sentiment of the United States, as expressed by their leading men and their newspapers. I will read a short extract or two from a speech delivered by Mr. Murray, generally known as Adirondack Murray, in the Music Hall, Boston, in the fall of last year. This gentleman is not a politician, by profession, but he is a very intelligent man, and has his views and sentiments on political matters, as all men have; and not being allied with any party, he looks at matters from an independent standpoint, and is not inclined to oppose or favor a question simply because it would help his party. Mr. Murray, speaking on this very subject of commercial union, referred to the state of things in Canada, and one would almost think that he had been

having a private consultation with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Mr. Murray says:

"The Canadian question, briefly stated, then, is this: Canada is now unconnected with those powers and forces which commercially and politically represent the continent. Being thus unconnected, she suffers. Her sufferings are approaching a crisis. She is casting around how to make the needed connections with us. She interrogates us. Our answer is—no patriotic American, who understands what the interrogation and answer means, can make other reply than this—*Join us.*"

What does that mean? Is not that a statement of the Canadian situation from an impartial observer in the United States? He next gives his reasons, and I will read some of them:

"I think I do not over-estimate the American instinct, touching the solidarity of this continent, when I declare that we, of the Republic, shall never stand idly by and see a great power built up either on the southern or northern side of us."

Are these the sentiments of the American people, or are they not? He refers to the action which the American Republic took at the time of the attempt of Maximilian to found an empire in Mexico, and he goes on to say:

"But we should have done it because we have it as a policy and a settled conviction that no foreign power, under any name or flag, shall ever divide this Continent with us, or build itself up either to our worriment or our peril. By right of deeds done and blood shed, of money spent and progress made; by the rights of trials numberless bravely borne, of sacrifices beyond count freely offered upon the altar of our national faith, and, as we believe, on the altar of God, we do solemnly hold, that we have a right to live and grow, unchecked, unhindered, unimperturbed by any other flag or power on the whole Continent from gulf to gulf, and ocean to ocean, will, must, shall, in the fulness of time, and we hope by the law of benevolent attractions, come under the banner of the Republic, of which to be a citizen we hold, is better boon than to be a King."

"I do not see, therefore, how we can, with due regard to our own ultimate and highest interest, and to our own conviction as Americans, assist Canada to commercial, military and political greatness, by any reciprocal mercantile arrangement under the name of Reciprocity or any other name, while she remains foreign to us in fact, and hostile perhaps in policy and spirit."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman said that he does not believe that annexation would follow commercial union; he said that United States people are not in favor of annexation. I ask him not to attend to the sentiments of newspapers who may be guided by party interests, but to listen to the sentiments of a man well known to be clever, a man outside of the political field altogether, and who, I think, voices the public sentiment in the United States, at least as it appears to me, and as, I think, it appears to every impartial man in the Dominion of Canada. There is but one end, there is but one object in view among the people of the United States, and that is the absorption of Canada by the Republic, no matter how they may talk around the question, or what they may say of Commercial Union or Unrestricted Reciprocity, or whatever you may call it. I am convinced, and I think every impartial Canadian is convinced that there is but this one idea, and that is, as Mr. Murray says, that there shall be but one flag from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean. If my hon. friends on the other side of the House will take the trouble to read this pamphlet, they will see that that is the tendency of the arguments adduced by Mr. Murray, and he only summarises those which leading men have used on platforms in the United States. Sir, the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), as I have said, I believe to be honest and candid, but I cannot give him credit for acute perception. Going on from the question of commercial union, he spoke of the exports and imports of Canada, and the trade between this country and the United States and Great Britain. Well, he does not expect me, of course, to follow those figures, or to refute them; it is not necessary. Let me ask him, what objection does he make to our selling horses and cattle to the people of the United States? Has he any fault to find with us for doing so? If the people of the United States did not want our horses and cattle, would they come and buy them? If they think they can do better here than to

buy at home, they will come here; but if they think they can do better at home, they go to Michigan, or Dakota, or elsewhere. It is a mere matter of business, and what argument, I ask the hon. gentleman, can be found upon the fact we can sell a large number of horses and cattle to the United States? It is a matter of business. They want them, and they come for them; if they did not want them, they would not come for them. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Americans come over here and buy our goods for charity's sake? Do they come and give us \$200 or \$250 for a horse just because they have an affection for us? No, Sir; it is because they want the horses, and if they did not want them they would not buy them. The hon. gentleman went on to enumerate other articles of the farmers' produce. I will not detain the House long with that matter, because it would sound more like a lecture upon a practical agriculture than a political discussion. He mentioned, for instance, hay. Well, as a practical farmer, such as the hon. gentleman is, I would put the question to him: Does he think it is good policy to sell hay, even though you may have a good market for it? I have lived with farmers all my life, and I never met an intelligent farmer who believed it to be good policy, either to sell his hay or his coarse grains. I think years ago there was an organisation in the Province of Ontario named the Grange Order. The hon. gentleman has heard of that Order, no doubt, I was individually connected with it myself, and was very anxious for its success, because I believed many of its objects were good. And the hon. gentleman will remember that one of the principles laid down was, that it was better to sell less by the bushel and more by the hoof. If our policy in any way tended to discourage the sale of hay and coarse grains, if we could fatten stock and sell them rather than sell hay and grain in a raw state, the tariff would be of good service to agriculture. Not only so, but there are hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House who have stated clearly and distinctly their belief that the farmer is better remunerated if he uses his hay and grain to fatten cattle rather than to sell those products to the Americans. Hon. gentlemen opposite have characterised those manufacturers who thrive under the National Policy as vipers, anacondas, snakes, and everything else that is ugly and bad. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) expressed want of sympathy with manufacturers, he was yet kind enough to inform the House that he has great confidence in Canadian ability, nerve and vim. He, as a Canadian, believes that the people of this country can compete with any men in the world, and that they are not inferior to any. I am very proud to say that no one has yet been so unpatriotic as to state the reverse. But this is not a question of men. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the question of manufactures is not merely a question of men. It is now, in this advanced state of modern civilisation, more a question of capital. But the hon. gentleman should reflect how it came about that the United States, to which he wishes to annex us, adopted a protective policy to encourage manufactures. Was it because the Americans were inferior to the British, because they considered that a workingman, a mechanic, in the United States was inferior in ability, physical or mental, to the workingman of England, France or Germany? No, but it was for another reason altogether different, which the hon. gentleman knows quite well. If we protect our manufactures and give them that measure of safeguard which we believe is necessary for our manufacturing development, it is not because we believe they are inferior as men, but it is because we believe that the commercial conditions render it imperatively necessary that we should throw a wall around them to protect and sustain them until a certain period has been reached. The hon. gentleman, as a good Canadian, dilated at length on, and said he was proud of, the natural resources of our country. He pointed to the min-

Mr. PORTER.

eral wealth, to the lumbering wealth, and to the wealth we see all around us. Of these resources we have enough for ourselves, and enough for nearly all the world besides, and of that we are proud. It is our inheritance, and I think it should be our endeavor to maintain it as our inheritance. What would be the result if the scheme which that hon. gentleman, and hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, were adopted? It would be simply this, that under commercial union the raw material would be taken from this country, and manufactured in the United States, and the manufactured articles would be sent back here. They tell us that is all nonsense; if you had commercial union with the United States your country would flourish, manufactures would spring up here; you would have a larger market; your population would increase in every town and city, and your rural population would increase; we need fear nothing from commercial union, so far as our manufactures are concerned. Allow me to say that commercial union between the States and Canada would be altogether different from commercial union as it exists between New York and Pennsylvania. New York and Pennsylvania are commercially united, but they are also politically united. If a resident in New York State has \$500,000 which he wishes to invest in manufactures, he can invest it in Pennsylvania with every confidence, and under regular conditions the investment would increase, for it is made not in a foreign country. But in the case of an American with \$500,000, what is there to induce him to invest his capital in manufacturing establishments in Canada? Nothing whatever, for he would be investing it in a foreign country. The investment might be ruined by tariff changes, and even if we made a treaty for ten, twelve, fifteen years, it would not be sufficient to induce men to advance large sums in establishing manufacturing industries here. The only course that would be adopted is obvious. The Americans would take the raw material and manufacture it in the United States and send the manufactured products back here. Of course they would be quite safe under such an arrangement. In the event of the arrangement being broken their trade would be hampered for a time, but they would not lose much money. So the analogy of commercial union as between New York and Pennsylvania does not apply to commercial union as between Canada and the United States. Then the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) touched on the iron industry and waxed very indignant that such industry had not flourished immediately after the introduction of the measure which was brought in two or three years ago. He said that the tariff was largely increased, that we were promised blast furnaces here and there, that the manufactures of iron would be largely increased in our country. The hon. gentleman, I presume, knows very well the nurture and increase of an industry of this nature cannot be effected in a day or a year. He knows that taking all the iron producing countries of the world, they all attained to eminence in production only under a protective tariff, and not only so, but only after a series of years of protection. The business men of those countries did not rise and charge the Government with being incapable because when they planted the seeds they did not immediately grow and develop. No, they waited patiently. They sowed the seed and years after they got the ripened ears. I have, perhaps, directed the attention of the House at a sufficient length to the remarks of the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and I will now proceed to consider some of the arguments advanced in this House why this Parliament should adopt commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The great inducement held out to us, of course, is material prosperity, the great argument adduced is that if we adopted this change it would tend to the prosperity of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have employed every means in their power, every means that

ambition could suggest or ingenuity devise to persuade, the people to withdraw their confidence from the leader of the Government and those who support him. They have used every means to excite discontent among the people, but no method is more to be deprecated than that which they persistently employed, in endeavoring to persuade not only our own people, but the world outside that Canada is in a ruinous and depressed condition and fast crumbling to pieces. With front unabashed they declare that great distress prevails in our borders; they say we are burdened with a weight of taxation that is hampering all our energies and enterprise, they lament the decrease in the value of land, they say there is a huge debt hanging around our neck like a millstone which is dragging us down to the depths of national despair. Sir, almost with joy they shout, that our people are fleeing, and have fled, from our country as from a plague-stricken city, on account of the provoking tyranny of an obstinate, of a wicked and an ignorant oligarchy. Sir, they not only tell us that, but they say that millions of money are every year extracted from the pockets of poor men, clothed in rags and on the verge of starvation, and iniquitously handed over to swell the bloated wealth of that abomination of abominations, that *anathema maranatha*, the manufacturer. Not only that, but they tell us that the trade of our country has not increased as rapidly as it ought to have done, or as rapidly as it could have done, under a system far different; and, Sir, they recall with a sigh of tender regret, the good old days when men, strong, self-respecting workmen, were forced to be idle, were looking for work but could not obtain it, and were condemned to dine on the smell of the soup kitchen. In the foreground of this dark and melancholy picture, there is one figure which they persist in keeping there, and that is the Canadian farmer. The Canadian farmer they bespatter with compliments which no one can regard as sincere, and they beslobber him with a fulsome flattery that is perfectly disgusting from its obvious selfishness. In one breath they tell us that the Canadian farmer is quite able to take care of himself (and in that opinion I very heartily agree), while a moment later they bewail his unhappy condition as being ground down under the iron heel of a fiscal despotism. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), a year ago, declared that the condition of the farmer in Canada was perfectly deplorable; burden upon burden was being heaped upon him, and he was being subjected more and more to the keen competition of the markets which he had hitherto controlled. In fact, so dreadfully wretched was his condition that the hon. gentleman was forced to exclaim that the Canadian farmer "exists" but does not "live." Sir, the summing up of this hon. gentleman, after a survey of the material condition of Canada, was simply this: that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people of Canada were born to toil, and moil, and starve, and suffer, and die—not a very bright picture, indeed. Sir, I have given you a short outline of the condition which those gentlemen wish us to believe the country is in. I shall leave it now, for I am sure every one knows that a walk through a graveyard is not conducive to bright or cheerful thoughts, and every man is thankful and happy to be awakened from a nightmare. Before I turn from it to something that is more welcome to our ears and more encouraging to our hearts, I wish to make a brief observation. It requires no great ability to snarl at our present state or to belittle our present good and to fill the future with evil forebodings. Fault finding is within the reach of the humblest intellect, because, Sir, such is the nature of all human affairs that pessimistic criticism is always possible, for as no nation or no individual is perfectly wise, so no nation and no individual is perfectly happy, and we will always find something in our condition as citizens or as private individuals of which we may with apparent reasonableness

justly complain. But, Sir, I tell those hon. gentlemen opposite that he who distorts a truth, or exaggerates a misfortune for selfish motives or ambitious ends, is guilty of a grave wrong against his country. For the purpose of showing that the state of our country is not so dreary, so melancholy or so sad, as they would represent it to be, I shall take the opportunity of troubling the House with a few figures. I know that the mention of figures to hon. gentlemen is not very agreeable, for we all know how very unpleasant it is to listen to a long string of figures which some, perhaps, can scarcely grasp, but notwithstanding it is sometimes necessary to use figures in order to make clearer the point that you are arguing. I think, Sir, it may be laid down as an axiom of political economy that a nation that is saving money and laying by money year after year, must be in a commercially sound and healthy condition. Now, if I can show that the people of Canada have for years past been laying money by, I think that these imputations of poverty and groans of distress which the hon. gentleman made with reference to our country, will not be substantiated. From the Public Accounts, I learn that we began Confederation with a balance in Dominion saving banks to the credit of the four old Provinces amounting to \$1,994,565.22. On 1st July, 1872, this sum, with the help of Manitoba, which had lately been constituted a Province, and British Columbia admitted to the Confederation during the previous year amounted to \$10,221,393.48, of which \$1,749,835.35 were in cash deposits. On 1st July, 1877, with Prince Edward Island admitted in 1873, the sum to the credit of the various Provinces was \$14,898,010.37, of which sum \$7,090,729.04 were cash deposits. On 1st July, 1882, the balance in deposits was \$36,575,010.69, of which sum \$13,893,065.13 were in cash deposits. On the 1st July, 1887, the total amount due to the thrifty people of this Dominion was \$53,892,122.25, of which sum they had deposited during the last twelve months, \$11,480,859.02. In these figures which I have quoted, I have exhibited to this House the simplest and perhaps the most accurate barometrical test which it is possible to present of a nation's prosperity. Its accuracy consists in this: that it is far wider and more exact than individual experience could possibly be; and its accuracy may be depended upon, because neither political passions nor party prejudice has a place in the showing. Nor can it be said that our people have been saving money at the expense of their credit, because, if we again turn to the statistics, we find that in the five years from 1873 to 1878, inclusive, on every \$100 of notes and other debts due by our people in the chartered banks of Canada we paid an average of \$96.48½; in the five years from 1878 to 1882, inclusive, we paid \$96.34, not quite as much as in the preceding period; but in the five years from 1882 to 1887 we paid \$97.66. In other words, our ability to pay this class of indebtedness fell short of complete liquidation in the first quinquennial period by 3.51½ per cent.; in the second period by 3.66 per cent.; and in the last period by only 2.34 per cent. I think this statement shows very conclusively that, during the last five years at least, the people have been saving money despite all that hon. gentlemen opposite have to say of their poverty and distress. It is almost impossible to believe that people who are so distressed as these hon. gentlemen represent us to be could by any possibility manage to pay so much of their lawful debts; but it may be gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite to learn that during the period which is marked by their incumbency of office, our inability to discharge debts of the kind mentioned was at the highest point, namely, 4.59 per cent. And, Sir, that our people are living in comfort may be inferred from the sums expended by them upon luxuries and the elegant refinements of life. For instance, in the year 1868, they spent upon imported silks, satins and velvets, upon jewellery and other costly trinkets in gold and silver, and

upon musical instruments, \$1,689,626; in 1873 they spent \$3,790,664; in 1878, under the reign of hon. gentlemen opposite, they spent only \$2,313,227; in 1883 the sum had again risen to \$3,397,624; and in 1888 it amounted to \$4,343,848. Now, Sir, it is impossible to believe that a people of between four and five millions in a distressed and starving condition could expend such large sums of money upon articles which are not necessary for their existence, and we must conclude that the representations of ruin and decay which have been made in this House are untrue and entirely without foundation. Again, Sir, the average yearly amount involved in business failures from 1873 to 1879, a period in which a revenue tariff was in force, was \$17,887,000, whereas the yearly average from 1880 to 1888, inclusive, was \$11,582,313, or \$6,304,687 less than during the former period, showing that the business of the country during the last eight years was in a much more healthy condition than during the preceding period. Sir, this part of my argument is not intentionally devoted to a defence of the National Policy, but to every Canadian who desires to know the true state of the trade and business of the country, I submit that these figures are very pertinent indeed. These hon. gentlemen also complained that the trade of this country has not increased as rapidly as it should have done or as it would have done, had they, I presume, been in office. Now, Sir, to the state of the trade of the country I wish to call your attention for a short time. Looking at the figures given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, it is quite evident that from Confederation up to a certain period our trade advanced but very slightly. In fact, it seemed as if it were about to be very seriously impaired; but, Sir, I am happy to say that, later in our history, this fear proved to be altogether groundless. I have divided our history into three periods of trade. I think the principle of comparing the exports and imports of one year with those of another is scarcely the proper way in which to obtain a correct idea of the business of the country. The first period I have taken extends from 1865 to 1874. In that period the Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia were brought into the Confederation. The trade for these years shows a total annual average of \$172,834,414, and for the second period, from 1875 to 1879, inclusive, the yearly average was \$175,239,776, which is, perhaps, no greater than the first period would have been had the Provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia been included. The third period, extended from 1880 to 1888, exhibits such a marked increase in the value of trade that it cannot fail to arrest the attention. Whilst in the first days of Confederation our trade had scarcely increased by a single dollar, at the close of 1879 the average annual value of the trade was \$28,000,000. I ask hon. gentlemen if this is not creditable to Canada? I ask them if it looks like ruin and decay, and if it is a sufficient reason why they should clothe themselves with sackcloth and ashes, rend their garments, tear their hair, and cry out with bitter lamentations that Canada is going to the dogs? No, it is rather cause for rejoicing and congratulation, and ought to convince the incredulous, and confirm the doubting, that Canada has nothing to fear from the peaceful rivalry and competition of friendly powers, but that the only thing which can injure her growth and prosperity is treason and cowardice at home. This statement cannot be weakened either by referring to the decline of prices, because the decline which took place in 1873 has continued down to the present time in a great many articles. I think I have adduced sufficient statistics, varied and adequate, to prove that the gloomy view which these hon. gentlemen take of our condition is not sustained by facts. Before I leave this subject it will be necessary to speak of the effect of the National Policy upon this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not only described our country as in a pitiable

Mr. PORTER.

condition, and our people as very much depressed, but they have also found a cause for it, and that cause is the National Policy. I do not intend to enter upon the arguments attacking or defending that policy, because it would certainly be a very bold, I should say a reckless man, who would attempt to weary the House with arguing on a subject that has been debated by the keenest intellects in the Dominion. But while hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to attribute all the evils of this country to the National Policy, which they consider to be the poisoned source of all our woe, I would ask them for a moment to consider that, perhaps, those who have opposed this policy from theoretical views or from lessons learned from political economists, might be inclined, perhaps, to pause when I observe that neither free trade nor protection is, in my opinion, an essential of exchange, but that they are simply conditions of trade, and before we condemn the fiscal policy of Canada, we should study very carefully the two different fiscal systems of the great English-speaking peoples and the greatest trading commercial nations in the world. If we do that, we will be less inclined to blame the National Policy for any of the effects which we consider are not satisfactory in our country. Under a system of free trade, as well as under protection, there would be found large commercial development and a sound financial condition, and I may also say that under either system will be found these signs and indications which show an awakening in commercial and mechanical enterprises, and under neither system will we find that the adoption or the modification of either has been either able to banish from the toiling masses of the poor the morbid song of oppressed poverty and the touching refrain that we hear from those who through improvidence are unable to look after themselves. Before leaving this subject I wish very briefly to allude to the effect of the National Policy on the agriculturists of this country. We are often told that the National Policy has had a most injurious effect upon the interests of the farmer, and in this respect I am not at all inclined to agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. When this policy was discussed, it is alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that certain promises were made to this country; and they have repeated in this House time and again that it was promised the National Policy would bring higher prices for farmers' produce. In fact, the right hon. the First Minister has been charged, time and again, with having made this promise. Now, I consider that is a wilful misrepresentation of the facts. It is a wilful misrepresentation both of the spirit and the letter of all the arguments that we ever heard on this subject. All that was said in defence of the National Policy was simply that since the people of the United States would not admit our produce to their markets upon the same terms as we admitted theirs to ours, and since their farmers were driving our own farmers out of the country, and obliging them to sell their produce in a foreign land, then we would take a leaf from their book and protect ourselves, and whatever advantage was to be obtained by having a home market for the farmers, we would have. That was all that was ever said. Now, the question to be asked and answered in this House is not, Has the National Policy made prices higher or lower, because no one ever contended that it could have such an effect, but the question is, Has the National Policy kept the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer? If it has, then I contend that all the objections that these hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches make to the National Policy, in regard to its influence on the farming community, are perfectly groundless, and that they have no foundation whatever in fact. I shall now proceed to show you from the few statistics I have here that this contention has been fulfilled, and that the Canadian market has been kept for the Canadian farmer. In the eight years preceding the adoption of the

National Policy, \$103,330,226 worth of wheat flour and other breadstuffs was imported for home consumption into Canada. In the eight years succeeding the National Policy, only \$25,459,165 worth has been imported. That is to say, that our farmers have sold of their own products, in their own markets, nearly \$78,000,000 worth, or nearly \$10,000,000 a year, more than in the eight years prior to the introduction of the National Policy. Does not that show, and prove as clearly as figures can prove, that the National Policy has kept the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer. Let me put it in another way. Of the \$128,000,000 of breadstuffs imported for home consumption for the sixteen years from 1872 to 1887 inclusive, 80 per cent. were obtained before 1875, and only 20 per cent. since that year. In the presence of these facts, I ask how hon. gentlemen can say that, in these articles at least, the National Policy has not kept the Canadian market for the Canadian farmer. This policy has also contributed largely to the advantage of the farmer in other respects in his occupation. There is no question that, in regard to the dairy interests and the cattle exportation business, which are now forming the main interests of many farmers in this country, the National Policy has had a beneficial effect. But it is said that, even if the farmers are receiving a little more for their stock and their dairy produce, if the National Policy has benefited them in that way, they are being charged more than their fair share of the burdens of the country. That I also deny. I contend that such is the condition of the Canadian farmer that, supplying as he does so many of these articles for his own consumption, so many of the commodities which he uses himself, he is effectually and safely guarded against any excessive imposts. The farmer of this country is able and willing to pay his fair share of the amount required to provide for the good government of the country, and he is not flattered by hon. gentlemen who represent him as a pauper or as an overburdened drudge. Something has been said in relation to the fall of the prices of farm produce. The hon. the Finance Minister alluded to that subject in his Budget speech. I will for a short time examine that matter a little further, and show how it is, apart altogether from any fiscal policy, that the prices of agricultural products of every kind, not only in Canada, but the world over, have fallen. When hon. gentlemen are discussing the low prices of produce here and the low receipts which farmers get for what they raise, they should be honest. They should not say that it is the National Policy that causes the fall in prices. Let them point out any article of the farmers' produce which they can say would have been higher in price if the tariff were abolished. Can they mention a single article that would be one cent higher if the National Policy were abolished to-morrow? Not one. Then, if the protective tariff does not of itself lower the price of these articles, why should they charge it and make it blameable for all the evils which affect the Canadian farmer? In the year 1873, a noticeable downward tendency of prices began in very many articles, not only in Canada, but all over the world, and, as Canada is a country which still exports largely of agricultural products, and these have been affected by this decline, I shall endeavor to show, as clearly as I am able, how this downward tendency has affected the produce of farmers. In 1882 we exported a certain quantity of wheat, for which we received a certain sum of money. In 1887 we exported 41.9 per cent. more wheat, and received 3.6 per cent. less money. In other words, in 1882 we sold 100 bushels of wheat, for which we got \$127, and in 1887 we sold 141.9 bushels of wheat, for which we got only \$122 50, the price falling in that time 40 cents per bushel. Do the hon. gentlemen mean to say that the National Policy was responsible for that, or that free trade would have been responsible for it? There are causes all over the world which result in this downward tendency, but what the

National Policy has done is to allow our farmers to stand more firmly against that decline than the farmers of any other country in the world. Their own energy and courage, combined with the National Policy, have enabled them to stand more steadily than almost any farmers in the world. Of flour we exported in 1887, 4.5 per cent. more than in 1882, and we received 19½ per cent. less money; that is, for every 100 barrels of flour in 1882 we got \$579, and for every 100 barrels sent out in 1887 we got only \$446. We will take also cheese, another very important article in our agricultural industry; in fact, it is the mainstay of many farmers in the western section of the Province of Ontario. Of cheese, in 1887, we exported more than in 1882, by 42.04, for which we received 26.03 more money; that is, for every hundred pounds of cheese exported in 1882, we got \$10.80; for every hundred pounds exported in 1887, we only got \$9.60. Numerous other articles might be taken to show how this fall of prices has affected the value of the agricultural products of Canada, how the volume has undoubtedly increased, and the value has diminished. But, Sir, the National Policy is not responsible for that. Now, these hon. gentlemen have found the causes of the ills, which, they say, affect Canada, but they propose no remedy. Well, suppose that all the evil things which they have declared to exist, do really exist, then we will enquire of them, What remedy do you propose? What have you to offer instead of the National Policy that will better promote the national sentiment, the national prosperity, the national progress, the national life? Have you a policy of your own, which you, as Canadians, can formulate and devise and maintain, that the ever changing, every varying conditions of Canadian life demand? No, Sir, they have not. They have nothing to offer as a remedy for this alleged pitiful and mournful condition of our country. They have nothing to hold out to us except the pity of a foreign nation which has never been remarkable for its generosity, but always remembered its own self-interest. Sir, a broad line of distinction is very marked between the two great parties that divide the political sentiment of this country. For the alleged distress and depression of trade, the gentlemen have nothing to offer except that which they may obtain from another country, they have nothing to present by which this distress and depression may be removed. Twelve years ago, when this distress and depression were real and undeniable, did the Conservative party appeal to a foreign power? No; they only appealed to the intelligence and the enterprise of Canadians, and Canadians only. The hon. member for South Oxford the other evening, while speaking of the policy of this nature which the people of Canada had adopted, declared that the Government were knaves and their followers were fools. Sir, the instincts of human nature suspects a man who expresses a supercilious contempt for his neighbor's virtue or his neighbor's wisdom. I will not call the hon. gentleman a fool, I will not call him a knave, but the people of this country, by their acts, very shrewdly suspect that he is a nauseous compound of both. Sir, I ask you, which is the more dignified course to pursue: appeal to a foreign nation, or appeal to your own nation? I ask, which is the more likely to be conducive to our welfare, which is the more in harmony with the spirit of a people, which is the more conducive to the promotion and preservation of our self-respect, of our rights and liberties? Sir, which is the more likely to be effectual? Unrestricted Reciprocity, which these hon. gentlemen, by the aid of their good friends on the other side of the border, hope to persuade the people of Canada to adopt, is a dream which no one seems precisely to understand, or, if they do, they are afraid to express it. If by Unrestricted Reciprocity, as we sometimes are led to believe, is meant a treaty, an arrangement, a scheme, a bargain, with the people of the United States upon the line of the

Treaty of 1854, narrowed in some places, widened in others, but which will enable us to keep full control of our tariff with the different nations of the world, why, then, that is the policy of the Conservative party, that is no new policy, and the word "unrestricted" is quite superfluous. But if, by Unrestricted Reciprocity is meant Commercial Union, which the hon. member for South Middlesex undoubtedly adopts and defends, then I say that any scheme by which that may be brought about, any arrangement by which commercial union between Canada and the United States may be consummated, is not a treaty of trade and commerce, it is the political surrender of a nation. Commercial union, let hon. gentlemen say what they please, let them define it as they like, only means one thing, and that is for all practical purposes we shall become an integral portion of the United States, that we shall not only become, but be, a portion of that country; that we shall be regarded and treated as such by other nations, England included. Now, I consider that to adopt this scheme would be to do that which no free people will willingly do. We are told that unrestricted reciprocity would not necessarily lead to annexation. Suppose it did not; it is undoubtedly true that we would be one in thirteen of a body to regulate our tariff. Now, Sir, I say that no free people can give up the right to tax themselves. If we do so, we abdicate at least one of the attributes of a free and sovereign people which we now possess. But, Sir, not only do we give up the right to tax ourselves, but we are compelled to tax ourselves as we do not please, because there can be no help for it but that we must have recourse to direct taxation, and that system is not palatable to the people of this country. No doubt, in the brief history of Canada there have been things which we could wish had been otherwise; there is no question that the future of our country is in our own hands, and there can be no question, I think, that the people of Canada are of the opinion, and have made up their minds, that they will go their own way in the path of progress and development, irrespective of all the blandishments of power or wealth. For my part I believe it to be unmanly to seek to cast our burdens upon others, I think it is cowardly. Besides, Sir, why should Canadians shrink from the future? It is true that we may have regrets, but why should we have fears? Sir, the 21 years of our short life is but as a day's march in the long road that leads to national prosperity and national splendor. If Canadians are only true to themselves and true to their country, I believe they may await with firmest confidence and highest hope whatever fate the rolling years shall bring.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have listened for some time to the eloquent address given by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter). I am not going to attempt, at this late hour, to follow his remarks, but I prefer to leave them in charge of some hon. member who will follow in the discussion in coming days. We are engaged in a very important discussion: the trade policy of this country is always a very important question, as it is to every nation, and it should receive at the hands of the representatives their careful and serious attention. We have involved in this question also the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), with respect to our trade relations with the United States. But before proceeding to take up these two questions and discuss them, I will make some reference to remarks dropped by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. White) delivered a speech last night to which I listened with great pleasure, and I suppose that from his own standpoint it was a fair exposition of the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. He referred to the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he stated that it would have been better if it had been delivered on the floor of Congress.

Mr. PORTER.

I have had the pleasure of listening to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for a great many years, and as the representative of a constituency he is an ornament and a decided advantage to this House, and his views and opinions expressed on public questions have met with general respect wherever they have been delivered. It, therefore, ill becomes any member to characterise his able and very valuable effort last night in relation to the trade question of this country by saying that that speech should have been delivered on the floor of Congress. Another question always raised, or a port into which hon. gentlemen always betake themselves when cornered on the question of trade relations, is that we are disloyal, that we wish to hand over the country, body and bones, to the United States, that we are seeking a connection with the United States, which eventually will result in complete political union. It is very surprising how hon. gentlemen opposite can at the same time blow hot and cold. On the introduction of the National Policy in 1878 the Finance Minister stated, not only in this House but in this country, that the object of that policy was to secure trade relations of an advantageous character with the United States, that he wanted either reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariff, and he declared when we entered upon our National Policy, our protective tariff, that a very short time would elapse until we would obtain from the United States the trade relations we require. Hon. gentlemen opposite placed upon the statute-book of the country a statute declaring that when the United States were prepared to enter into trade relations with us in certain named products of our country and their country, the Government were prepared to meet them. I should like to know if, at this period of our history, it is considered to be disloyal to advocate unrestricted reciprocity, whether it was disloyal in 1878 for the leader of the Government to place this statute on the statute-book. It is standing there still, it has never been repealed. It is a standing offer, not on our part, but on their part. It is an absurd idea to so characterise our efforts to secure from the Americans more extended trade relations than we at present enjoy, when hon. gentlemen opposite have passed a statutory enactment declaring they were ready to accept improved trade relations with the United States. This question of disloyalty should be dispensed with without further consideration. Another question referred to by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) was, that the price of lands in the United States had receded very much. I am glad to find that hon. gentlemen opposite, although it has been hard work to bring them to it, are beginning to admit that the prices of lands have fallen in Canada. The farmers, I am satisfied, would not very much longer put up with the persistent statement that real estate is holding its own. Now hon. gentlemen opposite find it necessary to admit that it is not. The hon. member for Renfrew went on to state that in New York State real estate had fallen in price very much. The difference between our position and that of New York State is this: We quite admit that the prices of real estate there may have shrunk, the reason for which is that many of their people have gone west and taken up new sections; but in our country it is quite different, for when our people emigrate they go in a large measure to the Western States instead of going to our own North-West. We admit that a good many have gone to our North-West, but the fact is that in the Western and North Western States to-day there may be found large numbers of Canadians. We deplore that fact, we would prefer to have our people in our own country, but the unfortunate fact remains that they are not here. In the United States Americans do not leave their country and come here, whereas there has been a steady stream of emigration from our country which has gone to fill up and develop the Western States. I repeat that we deplore that. We say that a policy which con-

tinues such a state of things is a bad policy. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), also drew attention to the fact that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated some years ago that he was in favor of protection, and he quoted some extracts from a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in 1876. There are, however, very few great public men who have never changed their minds. Mr. Gladstone has done so on several occasions, as have other prominent men. But if hon. gentlemen opposite want to know a change, I would ask them to remember that the leader of the Government and Sir Charles Tupper were free traders up to a very short time before the introduction of the National Policy. The late Minister of Finance had on his desk a speech prepared to deliver on the broad question of free trade before the hon. member for Oxford came down with his Budget speech. He was a free trader up to that time, and then he became a protectionist. So if the Minister of Fisheries were present, I would ask him to put down the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as a protectionist in 1876 and the leader of the Government as a free trader in 1876, and deducting one from the other he would perhaps be better able to tell us the result than he was yesterday. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter), stated that yesterday the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had unhorsed his opponent. I watched the delivery of that speech and the hon. gentleman's style and gesture, and I must say that it was more characteristic of a horse jockey than of a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. HESSON. What kind of a jockey are you?

Mr. McMULLEN. I was rather surprised at the statement the hon. gentleman made in regard to the reduction in the prices of land. He said they had reduced 100 per cent. The next time the hon. gentleman undertakes to deal with a matter of that kind in this House, it would be well if he had a blackboard introduced here, so that he could set down the figures, and make the deductions, to show how he comes to a conclusion of deducting 100 per cent. from the value of lands, and let us see what is left. I can only say, from the manner in which he delivered his speech, that he showed considerable ignorance of public questions, and his ignorance was only equalled by his audacity in the manner of his delivery. The hon. gentleman said he could dispose of a great many of the statements that the hon. member for South Oxford had made, and he went on in his own style to dispose of them, but instead of disposing of them he actually confirmed those statements, and especially so by his admission that there was a decrease in the value of lands. I would draw the attention of the House briefly to the cost that this country incurs by having in our midst the family of the Tappers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think there is anything wrong in letting the country know this. I drew the attention of the House, a short time ago, to the amount that had been received by the High Commissioner last year. I will now give the amount that has been received by the several members of the family this year, and I may remark that it is rather singular that a young man who is virtually but a youth, should be admitted to the Cabinet over the heads of older, and graver, and devoted followers of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, but still it is a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am speaking to the question, and I am not wandering from it. We are dealing with the financial position of the country, and this matter bears directly on it. The year before last, the senior Tupper, the Hon. Sir Charles, drew \$14,500. Last year, he has drawn altogether, as I have shown from the public records in the evidence I presented to the committee, \$18,694;

then, again, we have a notable relative to that particular family who occupies the position of Commandant General, Mr. Cameron, who, I think, was once sent to the North-West on a celebrated occasion. He went there, but we cannot say of him, as was said of a noted general, that he went, and saw, and conquered, for he went, and saw, and ran away, but did not conquer. However, he is drawing a salary as Commandant General of \$4,000 a year. We have the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has lately been installed in his position, and he is drawing \$8,000 a year. We have also a person who has been brought to this country for the purpose of discharging the duties of secretary to that hon. Minister, or rather, as I have already said, performing the duty of a wet nurse to the hon. gentleman so as to enable him to discharge the duties of his office until such times as he comes to the years of maturity, when he will be able to carry them on himself—we have this secretary brought from London at a salary of \$2,800 a year. Looking over the items of law expenses last year, I find that we paid to a person named Wallace Graham, of Halifax, \$7,365 for law costs, and I understand that this man is a partner of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This all put together nets up to the sum of \$40,459 that the family have drawn from Canada last year. The hon. gentleman told us in his opening speech that the country was prosperous. No doubt it is. As far as the Tupper family is concerned, they are prospering. Talk about the country being in financial embarrassment. It would be absurd to expect them to talk in that way, for as long as they can maintain this condition of things and draw from the public Treasury the enormous amount they draw, they will always be willing to stand up for its prosperity and devote their eloquence to the continuance in power of the Government which enables them to draw at the public expense \$3,372 per month for their particular family. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was taken to task because he stated that some of the public accounts were cooked. Any person who will carefully look into the manner in which the accounts in the Auditor General's Report are put together, must come to the conclusion that the accounts were cooked, and abominably cooked, for a purpose. Take, for instance, the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway for last year, and you find in the neighborhood of \$28,000 charged for heating and lighting cars. I would like to know what that has got to do with capital account. We find the sum of \$38,000 charged for snow fences and snow sheds, and I would like to know what that also has got to do with capital account, unless those items are put in for the purpose of trying to keep out of the general expenditure amounts that should be charged to annual expenditure, and in order to try and show the country that the Intercolonial Railway is in a better condition than it really is. The Intercolonial Railway was looked upon as a necessity of Confederation and the people supported it in order to have an outlet to the seaboard without being compelled to go through the United States. Since the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches got into power, they have, unfortunately for the country, built branches and have added to the capital account in connection with that railway, until to-day we have something like \$57,700,000 sunk in that road, and upon this money the people of the country have to pay an annual interest. The road is now handled in the interests of the coal miners and for political purposes, and is not paying its own expenses. You will not find in the history of Canada anything of this kind in connection with any other line. It was said the other night by the Minister of Finance that when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had charge of the road that it did not pay running expenses then, but there is not a railway in this country that has in its inception paid running expenses. If you take the history of the Grand Trunk Railway,



you will find that it took many years to accumulate a traffic in order to make the road lucrative. It was the same with the Great Western and the same with the Northern. It took them some time to get traffic before they began to pay, and if the Intercolonial Railway had been managed properly and due regard for economy had been practised by hon. gentlemen opposite the Intercolonial Railway would be paying running expenses to-day. In place of doing that it is a drag upon the resources of the people of the country. The hon. gentleman also said that the North-West would fill up and that we could not deny that there had been an increase in the population. That is very true, but if it had not been for the maladministration of gentlemen opposite the North-West would have filled up much more rapidly. If the Government had handled the land and railway matters in a manner so as to secure the confidence of the outside public that country would have a million inhabitants to-day instead of about a quarter of a million. Very many more settlers would be there. Their land policy was objectionable. They allowed their friends to form all sorts of colonisation companies, and in many other ways to get hold of land in that country; and the public got disgusted, and the result is that we have not as many people in that country to-day as we ought to have. The hon. gentleman also spoke with regard to Mr. Mowat and Mr. Ross having made some speeches upon the progress of this country. Well, we are glad to say that our country has progressed and made some advancement, but that advancement has been made in spite of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and not because of it, because their policy has been against the best interests of the country instead of being in favor of them. He also told us that it was too late to discuss the question of free trade and protection. I believe it is. It is getting late in the day to discuss that question, and the reason is simply that hon. gentlemen opposite have within the last ten years added so enormously to the debt of this country that the necessary drain upon the people's resources to meet the annual demands in the way of interest is enormous. That drain has been seriously increased until we are now placed in this position, that were we offered free trade by the United States to-morrow, as was clearly shown by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) our revenue would suffer, and we would require in some way to provide for sums that we might possibly lose by an arrangement of that kind. The hon. gentleman also stated that we cannot help the manufacturers of the country without helping the farmers. Well, it is rather amusing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite make such statements as that. It is well known that the manufacturers of this country, particularly the manufacturers of agricultural implements, have a decided advantage over the farmers of this Dominion, and in many ways the farmers are seriously suffering. Take, for instance, the article of binders. We know perfectly well that they have been turned out of the shops in the last season at a cost of a little less than \$80, while they are sold to the farmers at \$150. What is the reason of that? Simply because you cannot import them from the United States, and pay the enormous duty and the freight. The manufacturers in this country are so well aware of what it costs to bring agricultural implements from the other side that they put the price up to the outside figure at which they can be laid down. The same is the case in a great many other things. Now, I would draw attention for a moment to the losses we have sustained for a year or two in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. The loss in 1888 was \$363,043.16, and in 1887 the loss was \$232,105.75. That clearly shows that, instead of the loss annually getting less, it is annually getting more; and hon. gentlemen charged to capital account this year, including the items I have referred to, \$742,385.38. Now, I was rather amused with the

Mr. McMULLEN.

statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we would yet succeed in making a treaty with the United States. He said there was a prospect now, that Mr. Harrison had come into power, of making a treaty of that kind. Well, Sir, I have no faith in the gentlemen who are so blindly and determinedly devoted to the National Policy ever making a treaty of extended trade relations with the United States, unless they are forced and driven to it by the people of this country. I am thoroughly convinced that the First Minister is able to turn a corner of that kind if he found it necessary in order to retain office; but I am satisfied that it will require very strong pressure and close watching on the part of the people of this country to obtain extended trade relations with the United States under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. The manufacturers of this country, it is well known, have contributed very largely to some things that were of vital necessity to the political existence of these gentlemen. We have all heard how they were invited, shortly before the elections, to provide the sinews of war for the Government which had given them the advantages they enjoy; and the probability is that as long as the First Minister can hold power under the condition of things as they are, he will do so; but the moment that his grasp on the country appears to become weak, and the people begin to realize that they are being duped and humbugged, I have not the slightest doubt that the corner may be turned and unrestricted reciprocity adopted. With regard to the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance, I listened with a good deal of attention to the statements he made. He followed very closely in the line of his predecessors, especially on the question of averages. Sir Leonard Tilley, who was his predecessor, some years ago, also paid a great deal of attention to averages. He said that the taxes of 1884 were \$4.82½ a head, from 1874 to 1879 \$4.88 a head; and from 1879 to 1883 \$4.81 a head. The present Finance Minister gave our taxation in 1888 as \$4.54 a head, but latterly, when he came to count up our total taxes, he admitted that the rate was \$5.66 a head. As I said, he followed very closely the course which had been adopted by his predecessor. We heard, however, a speech from the hon. gentleman in 1883. At that time he undertook to address the House in the interest of then Finance Minister. He told us that we had reached a point in our history when we could boast of the proud fact that we had exported more than we had imported, that the tide had turned, that the balance of trade was in our favor, and that now we were on the high road to prosperity. It happened that in the year 1880 we exported a few million dollars more than we imported. Well, we have heard nothing about the balance of trade from that day till now. Every Finance Minister who gets up to make his budget speech very cautiously avoids making any reference to the balance of trade. Now, I have the figures showing our exports and imports, and I will read them:—

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1881.....	\$105,330,840	\$ 89,290,823
1882.....	119,419,500	102,139,203
1883.....	132,254,022	98,089,804
1884.....	116,397,643	91,406,498
1885.....	108,941,486	89,238,361
1886.....	104,484,561	85,251,314
1887.....	112,892,236	89,515,811
1888.....	110,894,630	90,203,000
Total.....	\$910,554,918	\$744,134,814

Showing a balance of trade against us in those eight years of \$166,420,104. We have heard nothing more with regard to the balance of trade since 1880, when we exported a little more than we imported. The Finance Minister talked about the wise and vigorous policy which the Government had adopted. I cannot say much for the wisdom of their policy, but it has certainly been a vigorous one in the way of ex-

tracting out of the pockets of the consumer a very large amount annually. Sir Leonard Tilley boasted of having some twenty millions of dollars of surplus in the first four years of the National Policy, but when we take into consideration not only the surplus he had but also the amount of money extracted by the increased cost of everything manufactured here and consumed by the people, you can easily realise how vigorous the policy of the Government has been in extracting from the people a very large amount. Another thing to which the hon. gentleman referred was our debt. On 30th January, 1889, he said that it was \$236,650,000, but he forgot on that occasion to give us the benefit of the manner in which the prophecies of previous Finance Ministers had been fulfilled with regard to reducing our debt. His predecessor, in presenting his financial statement the previous year, said that he had been able just by a stroke of the pen to reduce the debt of the country \$53,000,000. He stated this reduction had been effected by a simple operation in interest. The Finance Minister has forgotten that move on the part of his predecessor, and we are disappointed this year that the announcement has not been made of a further reduction of \$53,000,000. The hon. gentleman also stated that the interest *per capita* has been only increased 14 cents. I cannot understand how an hon. gentleman occupying the position he does would dare make that statement. I cannot tell where he got his figures—certainly not from our blue-books. I defy him to show by any calculation of the figures taken from the blue-books that such is the result. Take the interest paid in 1878. We find that we paid \$6,513,314, which, taking the population then at 4,000,000, would give \$1.63 per head. Take the interest in 1888, \$9,823,313, and it would give for 5,000,000 of a population \$1.96 per head. So that that would mean 33 cents per head increase instead of 14. Now, either the Auditor General is falsifying the facts or the Minister of Finance is falsifying the facts, and I leave those two gentlemen to settle that question between them, contenting myself with saying that we have had a good deal of experience with the Auditor General and find him generally correct. The hon. gentleman also gave his figures with regard to the increased revenue, and the surplus we may expect in coming years. He told us that, after providing for all indebtedness, he expects to have a surplus next year of \$2,000,000. Well, if there is one thing in the world hon. gentlemen opposite do well, it is dealing out encouraging prophetic utterances. We have had any number of prophecies from them with regard to what is going to happen. We know that when the hon. the First Minister came to this House and asked for an additional sum with which to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, he brought to us, in apparent earnestness, a statement as to what we might expect in the North-West from the revenue to be derived from the sale of land and other resources. He said that by 1890 we would have \$71,000,000 revenue. We know how far we are to-day from realising that sum; we know that instead of the North-West giving us any revenue, there has been a positive loss this year of over \$150,000. Sir Leonard Tilley also gave a statement as to what we might look for in 1890. He told us that by 1890 he expected we would have in the pockets of the country a surplus in cash of \$53,000,000. That is a prophecy which bears no evidence of being fulfilled. We had another prophetic utterance of a different kind. The hon. the Finance Minister of the year before last gave us an idea of what we might expect out of the North-West when he asked the House to pass a resolution for the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway. You take, he said, one hundred thousand farmers, place them upon sections of land in the North-West, calculate each farmer cultivates 320 acres, which he sows with wheat, and admitting it will only yield 20 bushels to the acre, and it is more likely to yield 40,—taking the pro-

duct of that tract of land, the North-West will have to send to the outside world 640,000,000 bushels of wheat in a few years. But a very small percentage of that prediction has been realised so far, and by the light of the non-fulfilment of past predictions we may conclude that, with regard to the surplus promised by the Finance Minister, that prediction will not be realised. The hon. gentleman, in answer to some remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) regarding the Maritime Provinces, said that my hon. friend had belittled and insulted the Maritime Provinces. Well, I listened carefully to his remarks and did not hear a single word disparaging these Provinces. I consider that they, as well as ourselves, have suffered at the hands of the present Government. They have been compelled to pay a great deal more for what they have to consume by the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite, in order if possible to keep them in line, are good at making promises, any number of which have been made. They have promised increased railway accommodation, and in some cases have kept that promise. The Intercolonial Railway has been extended to meet the views of gentlemen down there. I believe the Maritime Provinces came into Confederation, although opposed to it in the first place, and they begin to realise now that, as they are in, they must make the best fight they can and get all they possibly can in the scramble for the division of the plunder among the several Provinces. Another question touched upon was the question of sugar. The hon. gentleman said sugar was a little higher in Canada than what it was in the United States. Well, at present, sugar in the United States, under the influence of a combine, has been raised  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents a lb. above what it would be if there was no combine, and in the face of this extensive combine he had to admit that in Canada we paid a little more for sugar than did the people of the United States. It is at the present moment about \$10 a barrel higher in the United States than it would be but for the combines. Another question I want to refer to, which was alluded to by the Minister of Finance, is the duty upon iron. In 1887 pig iron was imported at a duty of \$2 a ton. In 1887 the Finance Minister raised the duty to \$4 a ton, besides \$1 bounty. In 1885 we imported 43,759 tons of pig iron; in 1886, 47,360 tons; in 1887, 48,250 tons; and in 1888, 49,434 tons. We produced in Canada, in 1887, 24,829 tons, and the party who produced it admitted that he employed 250 hands in the production. In 1888 the amount produced was 33,314 tons. Admitting that it required 250 hands to produce the 24,000 tons in 1887, it would require 330 hands to produce the 33,000 tons in 1888. The duty and bounty in 1887 amounted to \$124,135. Take the 250 hands whom this party employed at \$400 a year wages, and that would give \$100,000. Deduct that from the bounty and duty, and the producer has \$24,135 left after paying his wages, and he has his pig iron for nothing. In 1888, for the production of 33,314 tons, 330 men, as I have said, would be required, and their wages, at the same rate, would amount to \$132,000. The duty and bounty on the amount of iron produced would be \$66,570. Take the wages from that and you find an amount left of \$34,570, after all the wages are paid, and they have all the pig iron they produce for nothing. I think that shows most conclusively that the way in which the duties are placed on pig iron is a gross fraud on the consumers. Who are the consumers of iron? Are they the lawyers? Are they the politicians? Are they those who sit in comfortable offices and use simply the pen with which they write? No, the consumers of iron are the farmers. When the farmers hitch up their plough, they are using iron. When they hitch up their carriage, they are using iron. When they use a harrow, they are using iron. To-day, pig iron is worth \$10 a ton, and we are paying a bounty of \$5, so it is 50 per cent. which the people are charged on pig iron. I do not know in what way that is

helping the farmer by the operation of such a duty as that, though the Finance Minister said that helping the manufacturer was helping the farmer. The Finance Minister also spoke in regard to binding the Provinces together. I was rather amused at some of his remarks with regard to the efforts which the Government had made in that direction. We know what has been the result in Manitoba. We know that, since Confederation, we have had two wars in that country, which have been the result of neglect and mismanagement. Experience has taught us that, had the Government discharged their duty to that country, we would not have had the difficulty we have had there, which has resulted in an increase to our debt of \$8,000,000, because the Government did not attend to the demands of the unfortunate half breeds at the time and so saved the country from getting into a trouble of that kind. Then again, the hon. gentleman made some reference to the amount of taxes which the farmers paid. The Finance Minister said—and it was only a repetition of a portion of his speech in a previous year—that the farmer grows wool on his own sheep, that he clips the wool with his own shears, that he takes the wool to the little mill which is driven by the rivulet at the foot of his own farm, that he takes it back and his industrious wife spins the yarn, that he takes it to the weaver and has the yarn woven, and that then he has it made into clothes for his own wearing; and he wanted to know what duty the farmer paid on all that. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if our farmers are to wear nothing but what they produce and make themselves. You would fancy, to hear the hon. gentleman speak, that a farmer's wife should not wear a bonnet of a decent kind or any other article of ornament. She should go to church, according to the hon. gentleman, with a cotton handkerchief on her head. A farmer's wife ought not to have any style. But what do we find is the fact in regard to what farmers have to pay. When the farmer sits down to breakfast, he has to pay 15 per cent. on the delf he uses. When he goes to put the harness on his horse, it costs him 35 per cent. If he has any proper trimmings on that harness, they will cost him over 100 per cent. He has to pay over 50 per cent. on the iron which is used in the various articles which he uses. He pays a very large sum for binding twine. We know the effort that was made to have an increase in the duty upon binding twine, but the Government were ashamed to consent to it. The farmers had been suffering for some time from the monopoly which certain people had in regard to binding twine. But the hon. gentleman would not allow a farmer's wife to wear a decent bonnet, or a decently trimmed dress, or mantle, because, if she were to do so, she would have to pay a duty of 35 per cent. The Finance Minister complimented the Government on having a surplus, and stated that we were to have no more debt at the end of three years than we have now; and still the country is to go on prospering. It is singular that, though for ten years we have been borrowing and spending over \$10,000,000 a year, we have the unfortunate condition of things that exist to-day. We have to admit that the country to-day is not in a flourishing condition. If we enquire from manufacturers and others, they will admit that things are not in as satisfactory a condition as they should be. If we appeal to the farmers one by one, they will say that their financial condition is not as good as it was some years ago. There is another evidence that it is not as good. I ask the hon. gentleman to look at the records. There are more mortgages recorded against farmers in the last two or three years than there were for years before. There are also large amounts on chattel mortgages recorded, and that is a still stronger illustration of the crippled position of the farmers of this country. In the face of that, for the hon. gentleman to say that the country is in a healthy condition, is aside from the truth. No one can maintain such a prop-

Mr. McMULLEN.

osition who makes careful enquiry into the condition of the people of the country. If the Government had taken the money they borrowed, and had placed it in the banks of this country, so as to allow them to discount for a less price than they do now, the farmers might have got money cheaper than they can; but probably it was to enable the banks here to keep up the rate of interest that they sent the money to New York where they only get 1½ per cent., while the banks here were paying 3½ per cent. If there is any reason why interest in this country has been kept up, it is because the Government have been competing with the farmers in borrowing money. Through the Post Office Savings Bank, and the Dominion Savings Banks in the Maritime Provinces, they have a large amount of money borrowed. It costs 4 per cent. interest and 1 per cent. to handle the money borrowed in this way, and if that money, in place of being borrowed by the Government, had been placed at interest among the people, the probabilities are that the farmers to-day would be able to borrow money at 4 or 5 per cent. in place of having to pay 6 per cent. on mortgaged real estate. We know that in Australia they borrow money at 4½ per cent. on good farm securities, in the State of New York you can do that, and even for less. I would like to know why we are not able to do this in the Province of Ontario where they have land security as good as you will get in any part of the British Empire. Simply because the Government are competitors with the farmers that have to borrow money and pay large rate of interest, and that is the way the rate is kept up. Now, I would say that the exports and the imports of a country are the only true way of judging of its prosperity. I contend that we must treat a country the same as we treat an individual. When we find that a man buys annually more than he is selling, we must come to either one of two conclusions, that he is buying beyond his means and borrowing to pay, or else that he has resources to draw upon without selling. I contend that when we are annually running into debt and adding to our responsibility by 10,000,000 and 12,000,000 a year, with the balance of trade annually against us, I say that is clear evidence that the country is not in that prosperous condition it ought to be. We know that it was said at the introduction of the National Policy that we were to have a home market for almost everything that we produced. There was to be a home market for the farmer, and I can well remember, on a previous occasion when the Finance Minister was delivering a speech on that question, he said that a home market would undoubtedly be provided for the farmer. He said: For instance, take a farmer that lives within two or three miles of a factory, and has chickens to sell; these he carries to the factory and is able to sell them to the operatives. And the hon. gentleman went on to show what an advantage it would be to the country to have these factories rising up all over the country where the farmers could sell commodities of that kind. Well, Sir, that was rather a ridiculous illustration to be put forth by a man in his position. We find that the highest sum that we have reached for our exports of manufactured goods under the National Policy was only \$3,577,000 in 1884. From 1876 to 1878 the average exports of manufactured goods amounted to \$4,500,000; but since the National Policy came into force in 1879, our exports of manufactured goods has decreased, for last year it dropped to \$2,700,000. Now, take for instance the amount of export of articles produced by the farmer. In 1887 the export of animals and their produce was \$24,247,000; in 1888, \$24,719,297. Then take agricultural products. In 1887 the exports amounted to \$18,836,000; in 1888, to \$15,436,000. This shows clearly that it is the agriculturists after all who bring the money into the country. When we consider that the manufacturers have only exported not quite 3,000,000 annually, while the

farmers have exported 36,000,000 to 40,000,000 annually, it is clear that they are the men who bring the money into the country, and in place of legislating in their favor, in their struggling efforts with financial difficulties, we are legislating against them. The Finance Minister said that the spirit of foreign trade is developing in this country. I think it is time that the hon. gentleman should realise that point, it is full time that his followers should also realise it, because in my opinion, if they do not act upon it, the people of this country will teach them a lesson as soon as they have an opportunity. People are beginning to realise that they have got to have more extended markets than they have at the present moment. The fact is that the farmers are beginning to realise that unless they can get the American market open to them to a greater degree than they have at present, their condition will not improve very rapidly. We know well that the farmers of this country pay about three millions annually for the privilege of selling the commodities that they have to dispose of to the United States. The hon. gentleman opposite spoke to-night in regard to horses. He said if the Americans come and purchase our horses, it is because they want them, and they have to pay the duty. But when they come over to buy a horse to take across, they know how much duty they will have to pay, and of course they deduct that sum from the price they pay for the horse. The result is that the Canadian farmer gets only the price of the horse, less the duty that the purchaser has to pay. We know perfectly well that the American market is the only market we have for horses; we also know that it is the only market that we have for lambs. We sent 365,000 lambs to the United States last year, and notwithstanding that it is our best market for lambs, every farmer in this country has got to pay 60 cents a head upon his lambs to meet the duty. We know perfectly well that when a buyer comes into the farmer's yard to buy his lambs he pays him a price less the duty and profits that he expects to get for them on the other side. The result is that he pays the farmer the duty less for his lambs. Our people are beginning to realise that fact, and I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will have great difficulty in showing the farmer that if the duty was taken off his lambs he would not get an additional price. I think the farmers are beginning to realise that if any change in the policy on the country can be made that will relieve him of that taxation, the sooner that change is made the better. Now the Finance Minister drew our attention to the fact that we are developing a trade with China and Japan. I turned up the Trade and Navigation returns to see the extent of that trade, and I found that it had reached last year the magnificent sum of \$56,000. Now there is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. Take two colonies in Australia, Victoria, a protectionist colony, and New South Wales, a free trade colony. These two colonies are side by side, they have the same climate, the same laws, the same relations to the parent state, and in every way they are in the same circumstances. In 1866 Victoria had a population of 636,982; New South Wales, a free trade colony, had a population of 431,412. In 1886 the population of Victoria had run up to 1,033,052, while that of New South Wales had run up to 1,036,762. The population of the free trade colony had increased at the rate of 139 per cent., while the population of the protectionist colony had increased at the rate of 62 per cent. Then, again, compare the increase between 1871 and 1881. Between 1871 and 1881 Victoria lost a population equal to her immigration, 53,000, and 15,000 of natural increase, while New South Wales showed a gain of 37,216 males between twenty-five and forty-five, Victoria losing 35,916 males between the same ages. In 1872 Victoria was ahead 52,136; in 1881 she was behind 16,494. From 1866 to 1885 the revenue of Victoria rose from £3,079,160 to £6,290,361, an increase

of 105 per cent. The revenue of New South Wales in the same period rose from £2,012,079 to £7,584,593 in 1885, or an increase of 275 per cent. The total insolvents from 1868 to 1885 numbered in Victoria 13,001 with liabilities of £5,266,890, and in New South Wales 11,552 with liabilities of £4,486,558. Take imports and exports. In Victoria in three years, 1869 to 1871, the average imports and exports reached £26,399,614 or £3,090,293 in excess of New South Wales. In New South Wales in 1883, 1884 and 1885 the average trade was £40,610,536 or £6,280,146 in excess of Victoria. In 1866 the tonnage inward and outward of New South Wales exceeded Victoria by 189,015. In 1885 the difference was 862,919 tons. In manufactures we have the following statistics:—Victoria, in 1886, had 2,813 factories, employing 41,542 males and 7,755 females, a total of 49,297. New South Wales had 3,612 establishments, employing 42,280 males and 3,494 females, total 45,783. Victoria, in 1877, had 510 new establishments. New South Wales had since that year 1,256 new establishments. Value of plant in Victoria, £1,643,893; in New South Wales, £5,801,757. In the former 20,160 horse power, in the latter 25,192. Victoria had letters, received and posted: 1866, 8,631,133; 1885, 36,061,880, or an increase of 318 per cent. New South Wales had letters, received and posted: in 1866, 6,678,371; 1885, 39,351,200, or 491 per cent. Property assessed in Victoria, £116,283,570; New South Wales, £197,028,429; giving in the former a *per capita* amount of £198, in the latter £241. The Minister of Finance made a comparison between this country and Australia, and it is surprising that an hon. gentleman should present statements that will not bear criticism. If the hon. gentleman will examine the statistics of Australia he will find that all the railway indebtedness is assumed by the colony and is a national debt. In our country it is not so, but if you add to our national debt the debts of our railways the amount will be much beyond the *per capita* indebtedness of Australia. I will now give some idea of what advantages the National Policy has given to the farmer. He has been taxed on his fertilisers. It was stated that this was done in order to protect him against buying spurious fertilisers. He is taxed on his exportation of logs which is understood to be done in order to prevent his giving away his property to the Yankees. His mower, reaper, and binder are taxed, lest he should be induced to purchase American machinery and be called on to pay more than it is worth. The iron he uses is taxed in order to keep out a spurious article; and, no doubt, it is stated that the article he can obtain here is better than what he can obtain elsewhere. His salt is taxed lest he should obtain a poor article elsewhere. In all these ways the farmer is taxed under the National Policy. Now, the only way by which we can aid the farmers is, by giving them more extended markets than they enjoy at present. Parliament can do nothing that would tend more to that end than to give them free and unrestricted access to the American markets. The tendency of the National Policy has been to increase the cost of everything consumed by the farmer and to reduce the prices realised by him for his products. He has now begun to realise that the National Policy has nothing for him; and that, notwithstanding statements made with respect to the home market, it means nothing to him. He realises that the National Policy cannot increase the price of barley or of wheat. In order to give millers an opportunity of bringing in the wheat they require, they were permitted the privilege of bringing it in in bond and grinding it for re-shipment. That could be no great advantage to the farmer. There is another point which the hon. gentleman would do well to note. The farmers are beginning to realise that there has to be some change made. In their Farmers' Institutes they have been discussing this question of unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union, and permit me to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that 40 out

of 60 of the Farmers' Institutes in the Province of Ontario have endorsed unrestricted reciprocity. That is a pretty good evidence that you will have very great difficulty in persuading them, in view of the restricted condition of the market, that it is not the best thing they could have under present circumstances. The best evidence we can give for the necessity of asking for unrestricted reciprocity is the fact that, year after year, our trade with the United States is growing, and it is becoming more evident every year that the United States is the most convenient and best market we have for those commodities which we have to sell. When we consider that we have to send to the United States some forty or forty-five per cent. of our entire trade we must realise that it is time that we should seriously consider the advantage of removing the barriers that stand in the way of our having free trade with that country. Last year we exported to the United States to the value of \$39,470,000, and to England \$41,084,845, which clearly shows that the Americans are a very desirable class of people to have free and unrestricted access to. The past history of our country has shown this. From the year 1854 to 1866 we had a state of things in this country that was a decided advantage to the farmers of this country, and I am sure that there are many farmers in Canada to-day who look back with an anxious desire to the return of the good times that existed between those dates. I hope we shall be able to secure that condition of things for them before many years are over.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before many Sessions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see why England could very well object to our getting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and I do not see why she should have any reasonable ground for so doing. She surely will not object to our trading with those people, when she does ten times the trade with them that we do. She does about \$600,000,000 worth of trade with the United States every year. I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is disloyal for us to trade with the United States, when England herself trades with them so largely. They have been talking with regard to Imperial Federation, and I will make a few remarks on that after a little while. It is said the United States is not our natural market, and I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite are now making efforts to secure trade with other parts of the world for us. I will be glad for the sake of the poor farmers of the country, if the Government can secure better markets, but I think it is wise and prudent for us to look nearer home for a market before we go further away, if we can get at our own doors, on moderate terms, the advantages that we are so badly in need of. I think it is stupid and insane for us in the embarrassed condition of our public treasury to subsidise a line of steamers to run in all directions around the world looking for trade. Our annual expenditure now amounts to a very large sum and I think it would be prudent that we should call a halt and look nearer home to get the cheapest, the most convenient and the best market we can. I find last year we exported to the United States \$15,000,000 of commodities, and in looking over the United States imports I find they purchased \$60,000,000 of the very things we are in a position to supply them with. We only exported 25 per cent. of what they consumed, and I think that it was a very clear indication that they want to deal with us. Take the city of New York for instance, as well as other cities of easy access to Canada, and we know they are large consumers of the stuff we have got to sell. The city of New York consumes 2,000,000 lambs annually and 250,000 calves, and those we cannot send across the Atlantic. If we had unrestricted reciprocity we could easily send those and other things to a splendid market in the State of New York, the wealth of which we know is three times as much as the

Mr. McMULLEN.

entire Dominion of Canada. The enormous productive power of the United States is a marvel to everybody who comes to investigate and realise it. Some idea of the extent and progress of the manufactures of that country was given to us by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last night—

Mr. HESSON. What has made it so?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell you in a minute if the hon. gentleman will permit me to proceed. The United States in 1887 manufactured to the extent of \$1,050,000,000 worth and England manufactured \$770,000,000 worth. The assessed value of the United States in 1887 was \$58,000,000,000, and the entire assessed value of Great Britain was \$48,000,000,000, so the United States is undoubtedly one of the greatest nations on the face of the earth and its markets are lying at our doors. If they are willing to give us those markets we would be fools not to accept those privileges. It is said that we should not go down on our knees to beg unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union from the States. There is no necessity for doing that. Is it by going on our knees and begging from them that they passed the resolution offering us commercial union the other day? Who was there to go on his knees for that resolution? I wish now to show that the United States is the largest manufacturing nation in the world. In the year 1880 they manufactured \$5,369,000,000 of articles, while in Great Britain they manufactured \$4,092,000,000, or the United States manufactured \$1,277,000,000 worth more than Great Britain itself. They have more railway mileage than any other nation in the world and a greater mileage than all Europe put together. That is a pretty strong evidence that they must be a progressive nation and a desirable people to trade with. I believe it would be judicious and prudent on the part of our Government if they were prepared to meet the United States Government fairly, and I am sure that we would easily secure those advantages which we are so badly in need of. I have no confidence whatever that the Government of to-day will adopt that course. I believe they will do as the hon. member for South Oxford stated the other night—they will badger and annoy the American Government in every way they possibly can by taking advantages of every possible petty difficulty in order to prevent the friendly feelings that would otherwise grow up between the two nations, such petty annoyances as the fruit basket tax of one cent a basket. Now, Sir, in regard to the question of Imperial Federation notwithstanding all the eloquence hon. gentlemen opposite and others in England have expended in favor of the project, my impression is that England has spent so much money to secure the trade relations throughout the world which she has at present, that she will never shut her doors against foreign trade with the view of increasing her own colonial trade. The fact is that we do not deserve any consideration of that kind at England's hands, because we have ourselves adopted a policy that tended to shut her goods out of our country. We have tried our own National Policy for ten years, and now when we go to England and ask for Imperial Federation, she will say: Gentlemen, you have adopted a policy of your own, you have shut us out of your territory, and now, when you find that your policy is not as advantageous as you expected it would be, and you have not the markets you require, you come to ask us to adopt a different policy from that which we have been pursuing for many years. England has opened up a trade with India, which is undoubtedly a lucrative one, and she has been compelled by the Governments of her own Colonies to take that course. Wheat is, to-day, carried from the very centre of India to Liverpool at a lower rate than it can be carried from Montreal to Liverpool. It is carried from the centre of India to Liverpool at 13 cents a bushel, and from Bombay to Liverpool at only 6½ cents a bushel, while the cost of carrying it from Montreal to Liverpool is

nearly double that amount. The reason of that is that the trade between Great Britain and Bombay has grown to such enormous proportions that the traffic both ways cheapens the carriage of wheat from India to Liverpool. There are many reasons why I do not think there is the slightest hope of England ever consenting to Imperial Federation. Her foreign trade has grown to enormous proportions. But it is rather singular that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding that they appear to be absolutely devoted to the interests of the manufacturing concerns of this country, are willing to sacrifice them to get Imperial Federation. We know perfectly well that, under that system, our manufacturers would be subjected to a greater reduction in the prices of their goods than they would under unrestricted reciprocity with the United States; we know that Imperial Federation would tend very greatly to wipe out our manufacturing industries; and yet the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is willing to sacrifice all the interests of our manufacturers for Imperial Federation—but he would not be willing to permit them to run the risk of a slight reduction in the price of the goods in order to secure unrestricted reciprocity, and give the farmers of the country the relief they need. Now, Sir, the course we have been adopting as a people for years has been a most insane and imprudent course. We have been increasing our debt enormously, we have been adding to our annual expense and drawing upon the resources of the people to such an extent as to cripple them financially; and to-day the country is in a most unfortunate condition, owing to the financial profligacy that has characterised the acts of the Government now in office. We have all sorts of expenses in all directions. I will give you just one or two items to show the recklessness which has characterised them. Take, for instance, the expenses for repairing Rideau Hall, which during the past few years have been as follows:—

1879.....	\$61,975 32
1880.....	69,791 91
1881.....	24,851 60
1882.....	32,904 52
1883.....	39,787 86
1884.....	44,657 31
1885.....	39,791 45
1886.....	35,215 40
1887.....	38,260 71
1888.....	31,928 71

\$419,164 79

We have spent, squandered, lavished, thrown away, this amount of money on repairs alone to that building. Then, take the matter of Government contingencies, and you find the same condition of things:

Year.	Amount voted.	Amount expended in excess of amount voted.
1879.....	\$ 177,202 00	\$ 16,202 00
1880.....	165,764 00	24,014 00
1881.....	153,400 00	6,843 00
1882.....	162,061 00	20,811 00
1883.....	184,429 00	42,141 00
1884.....	191,332 00	25,172 00
1885.....	204,755 00	22,157 00
1886.....	217,657 00	31,337 00
1887.....	213,807 00	19,395 00

In these years the entire sum spent for contingencies in excess of the sum voted amounts to \$238,291.98. This shows the direction in which our affairs are drifting. Now, I say, it is time that we should call a halt in our public expenditure. Every item of expenditure of this sort should be cut off, and the Government should bring the expenditure down to a point that would enable us to treat with the Americans if they were disposed to treat with us, without suffering any embarrassment; and we can do it if the Government choose to do it. But we have been educated in a very bad groove, and I am afraid that if the Government of this country remains in the hands of the hon. gentlemen

who now control it, we need hardly expect that they will adopt a system of economy. A very prominent gentleman who held the office of Finance Minister in the Government declared that we would at any time rather defend an increase of \$1,000 than attempt to defend a reduction of \$100, and that is the policy hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued for years. I referred a short time ago to the enormous sum drawn by one family, and if we went over the catalogue of their relations, their cousins and their aunts, and found what they all got, we would begin to realise that it is no wonder that the expenditure of this country has run up to the figure at which it stands at this moment. I say that the duty of every representative in this country is to set his face determinedly in opposition to the continuance of the present system, and endeavor to reduce it to something reasonable in the interests of the people, so as to secure for those who are now struggling with difficulties, particularly the farming classes, the advantages they require, and which they will insist upon having when they get the opportunity at the polls.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock, Midnight.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 11th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) to amend an Act respecting the Civil Service. He said: The first object of the Bill is to reduce the salaries paid to the gentlemen who examine candidates for Civil Service employment. The next object is to include in those exempt from the operations of the Civil Service Act, post office inspectors. The third object is to allow the Government to pay accountants in the Inland Revenue Department, whose salaries were limited from \$600 to \$1,400, up to \$1,600, and that special clerks whose salaries now range from \$1,400 to \$1,600, may be paid as high as \$1,800. Another object is to allow the Government to pay railway mail clerks mileage. Under the old Bill, the chief railway mail clerks were not allowed mileage while travelling on the road the same as other clerks. The last object is to amend the Act in order to make it agree with the Estimates, by allowing postmasters in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa, to receive the salaries provided in the Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. Why exempt post office inspectors from examination?

Mr. HAGGART. All our inspectors are exempted. The object of the Act was to allow post office inspectors, also, to be exempted, and they would have been if a semi-colon had not been inserted instead of a comma.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a Bill to remove the dot?

Mr. FISHER. Is it allowable to appoint persons outside the service as inspectors?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it is under the old Act.

Mr. MULOCK. This is not in order to meet a particular want?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know that the Government have any want in contemplation, either particular or general.

Mr. MULOCK. How is it the necessity of the change is only discovered now?

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the Act has had a more effective looking after lately.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This Bill proposes to make as a condition for obtaining copyright in Canada, that there should be publication or republication in Canada within three months after the first publication elsewhere. The three months may be extended by the Minister of Agriculture for a longer period, provided proof is adduced that satisfactory progress has been made in re-publishing in Canada. It is likewise proposed that if any person entitled to copyright under the Act fails to take advantage of its provisions, the Minister of Agriculture may give a license to any other person to re-publish, on such person filing with him an agreement and security to pay a royalty of ten per cent. on the retail price of every book sold under the license. It is intended the royalty shall be collected under regulations made by the Governor in Council. And after the passing of this Bill the importation into Canada of foreign reprints of works, of which the copyright is secured in Great Britain and has been registered in Canada, shall be prohibited.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THREATS, INTIMIDATIONS AND OTHER OFFENCES.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to amend chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting threats, intimidations, and other offences. He said: The object of the Bill is to make clear the meaning of the Act. I intend that the Act shall not apply to those who merely refuse to work with or for an employer who is objectionable, or a workman who is objectionable, to the members of the union to which they belong. I think the intention of the Act was that such persons should not be held responsible for conspiracy, but as they have, in certain cases, been prosecuted and found guilty, I deem it desirable that they should be clearly exempted from the operation of the Act. Section 13 of the Act, sub-sec. 2, provides:

"No prosecution shall be maintainable against any person for conspiracy to do any act, or to cause any act to be done, for the purposes of a trade combination, unless such act is an offence punishable by statute."

I propose to introduce the words, "refuses to work with or for any employer or workman." The balance of the clause is as it is in the statute at present. It has been found that the Act, as it exists at the present time, has resulted in members of a labor combination, who passed a resolution that they objected to work with or for an objectionable man, being brought up before a court, and tried, and convicted. The case went to the Quarter Sessions, but the Judge refused to quash the conviction, and when it was appealed from the Quarter Sessions to a Superior Court, the Superior Court held that the judgment was a correct one, and should be confirmed. If that is the correct interpretation of the law, I think it is unfair to these persons. I believe they have a perfect right, under the statute as it exists, to manage the affairs of their organisation as they think fit, according to law, if they do not interfere with the rights or liberty of other individuals, and I think it cannot be held that they are so interfering when they refuse to be employed by or

Mr. MULOCK.

with anyone who is obnoxious to the association. I hope the Minister will see that this should be provided for, because it is only fair, it is all they ask, and it is all they will be contented with.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON (for Mr. TUPPER) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal. He said: The Act proposed to be amended makes it obligatory for the Harbor Commissioners to maintain buoys. Under this Bill, it will be optional to do so under the supervision of the Governor General.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Dickey.)

#### ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PERRY. Before the Orders of the Day are called. There were certain returns ordered by the House on my motion—one from the Department of Public Works, and the other from the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The House ought to have these returns before it considers the subject-matter in Committee of Supply. If the Government have not help enough to enable these returns to be made in time, I know of lots of men who are looking for employment day after day, and why do not the Government, in the name of common sense, employ them? I tell my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that these returns will be of no service to me, or to my constituents, or to the public, if they are brought down after prorogation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to send me across the House a statement of what these returns are.

#### JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. BARRON. I desire to ask the Government if they will not consent to bring down the papers which I asked for, a day or two ago, relating to the allowance of the Jesuits Bill? I have a motion on the paper, but it is not likely that it will be reached before the debate takes place on the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), which I understand is likely to come on this week or next. I think it is important, for an intelligent discussion of that subject, to have the papers referred to before us when that motion comes up. I, therefore, ask the Government if they will bring down the papers in time for that discussion?

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 77) to further amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co. (Limited).

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Superphosphate Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island and Continental Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Landry.)

## NORTH-WEST LAND SCRIP.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What is the total amount of North-West land scrip (colonisation, volunteer, half-breed, police, and other kinds, if any) now outstanding?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The approximate amount of scrip now outstanding is in the neighborhood of \$700,000.

## EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA.

Mr. TROW (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What amount has been expended on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, from the 1st July, 1888, to the 1st February, 1889?

Mr. CARLING. The sum of \$44,888.12 was expended by the Department of Public Works on buildings, and \$25,793.55 by the Department of Agriculture—\$11,600 on capital account, and \$14,193 on maintenance account; in all, \$70,681.67.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CLAIMS AGAINST CANADA.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Government of Prince Edward Island given up all future claims against the Government of Canada for non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation, or otherwise, for the subsidy of \$70,000 a year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I really cannot say.

## ST. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF.

Mr. COUTURE (translation) asked, At whose request was the construction of the wharf of St. Anne de Chicoutimi decided upon? What is the amount voted for that purpose, the name of the engineer who conducted the work, the number of days he resided at Chicoutimi, the amount of his travelling and other expenses? From whom did G. A. Gagné receive orders to employ only his political friends? By whose orders has he refused to employ any persons except his political friends? By whose orders did he refuse to receive material required for the construction of the said wharf from persons other than his political friends? Did Civil Engineer Blais hire a steamboat for the journey from Chicoutimi to Tadoussac, and how much did he pay therefor? Is it the intention of the Government to continue the work on the wharf of St. Anne de Chicoutimi in the same manner? If so, why?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first enquiry of the hon. member, that is to say: At whose request was the construction of the wharf of St. Anne de Chicoutimi decided upon? I must state that it was at the request of the parson of the inhabitants of the parish and of Mr. J. A. Gagné, his predecessor in Parliament. To the second enquiry: What is the amount voted for that purpose, &c.? The amount voted last year was \$1,000 which, added to that of \$2,100 previously expended, forms a total amount of \$3,100. The work was under the superintendence of Mr. J. C. Blais, of the Department of Public Works; he conducted, besides, the works on the Saguenay, at Chicoutimi, St. Alphonse, Lake St. John and Tadoussac. His travelling and other expenses amounted to \$160.40. In answer to the third enquiry, I must state that no such orders were given to Mr. Gagné. To the fourth enquiry, which reads as follows:—By whose orders has he refused to employ any persons except his political friends? I may state in answer that the Department of Public Works is not aware that there were any persons employed other than political friends of Mr. Gagné. On the contrary there were many others employed. To the next enquiry: Did Engineer Blais hire a steamboat, &c., my answer is: He did not. To the last enquiry, I answer: Yes.

## THEFT OF REGISTERED LETTERS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates, a sufficient sum to pay to Samuel Boddy and J. F. Gordon, both of the village of Farmersville, in the county of Leeds, for loss sustained by them in having two registered letters containing \$40 which were mailed at said village of Farmersville, addressed to the Ottawa Post Office, traced to the said Ottawa Post Office, and stolen therefrom?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not yet come to a conclusion in the matter.

## BEER IN THE NORTH WEST.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Government is aware that four per cent. beer is now freely imported into the North-West Territories, and that the Department of Inland Revenue refuses the local brewers malt to make four per cent. beer; and if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to do away with this glaring injustice?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand that four per cent. beer is being imported into the North-West Territories. The Department of Inland Revenue refuses local brewers malt because there are no licensed brewers in the Territory. I am not aware of the intention of the Government with reference to the matter.

## THE BALLOT IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation during the present Session to provide for the holding of elections in the North-West Territories by ballot?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is the intention of the Government to introduce the ballot.

## PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. DOYON (Translation.) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compel persons holding, at one and the same time, office under the Dominion Government and under the Provincial Governments, to make choice of one or the other?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I must state that the Government have not yet considered that matter.

## MR. JUSTICE JAMES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria) asked, Has Mr. Justice James, of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, obtained leave of absence? Is he ill or unable to attend to judicial work? If not, has he, since vacation (the 15th September last), sat with the Court hearing arguments, or tried or heard actions at *Nisi Prius* or equitable actions, or gone on circuit, or sat at the regular Chambers at Halifax, or transacted any business except at his residence in Dartmouth, and that of an irregular character and in relation to uncontested business? If he has done so, to what extent has he performed the duties of his office?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Justice James obtained leave of absence last year for a short time, but he has not now any leave of absence. The learned Judge, having, I suppose, been advised by the reports of our proceedings of the question on the paper, telegraphed me the 9th inst., in these words:—

"In reference to Mr. John A. Macdonald's question on Monday next, I have to inform you that I obtained leave of absence for two months, a year ago, in order to seek a southern climate. I did not ask to renew it. I have been since then suffering from a wasting, and sooner or later, a fatal disease. I am, and have been, prohibited by my physi-



cians, from attending to any severe or continuous labor. I have been quite unable to take my place on the bench with my brethren. I have, however, been engaged with Supreme Court business, such as I have been able to perform continually, I may say daily, up to this day. I have held several lengthy and important arguments, and a large number of chambers applications, mostly at my own residence. The certificate of my physicians, Doctors Parker and Cunningham, is in your office accompanying my application for leave of absence last winter. I am not as well, by a good deal, as I was at that time, and my medical advisers continue their inhibition as to labor. I don't consider it necessary for me to ask for leave of absence under the circumstances, as if I should ask for it, I presume it will be granted as of course."

I had telegraphed the learned judge what the nature of the question was, and he telegraphed me again a more specific reply, as follows:—

"My telegram of this morning anticipates yours of this evening since received, and gives most of the information asked for. I must, in courtesy to you, add replies to your questions. I will answer them in detail. I am a confirmed invalid, almost confined to my house. I am unable to attend at the court house as one of the court. My physicians positively forbid it. I have, during the summer and autumn and until the last month, heard arguments and delivered judgments in contested causes of importance. I filed a judgment in an equity cause last week, and have others under consideration. I was unable to take my circuit last summer or in the autumn, but no inconvenience resulted. I have done a great deal of uncontested business at my residence; I suppose hundreds of cases. I felt bound to do all in my power, and it has been a relief to the bar. I have also attended to the divorce business. As for doing business at home of an irregular character, I am not aware of having done any business of an irregular character, and what I did was from a sense of duty and in a regular manner; at least I have heard no protest or complaints. It is quite possible that my health may improve with the advancing season. If it does the public will get the benefit and I will be most happy."

I telegraphed the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, and he replied as follows:—

"I regret that the health of the Judge in Equity had not permitted him to be present at any argument in banco since January, 1888, nor has he heard any cause at nisi prius, nor any equity cause, to my knowledge, since 27th April, 1888. Judge James was unable to take his regular circuit in the spring of 1888, nor could he take the criminal trials in October, 1888. He held the regular chambers in September and October last, and I understand he has been hearing chamber motions at his chambers at Dartmouth, and that he has for some time past declined to hear any contested matters."

I have also an intimation from the council of the Nova Scotia Bar Society wishing to inform me, before I should answer the question, that a remonstrance from them, complaining of the judge's inability to perform judicial duties and long-continued absence, is on its way.

Mr. JONES. Might I ask if the report is correct that Judge McDonald has obtained twelve months' leave of absence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The learned judge has obtained leave of absence, but not for twelve months; I forget whether it is for three months or six months—not longer than six months.

#### RAILWAY BRIDGE ACROSS ST. JOHN RIVER.

Mr. ELLIS asked, What was the cost of the iron railway bridge across the St. John River at Fredericton? What amount of money was advanced by the Government in aid of the construction of said bridge, under the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, chapter 26? Was any money advanced or subsidy paid by the Government in aid of the road to connect the bridge with the New Brunswick Railway? Was any money advanced or paid in aid of the bridge or connecting road beyond the amount allowed by the Act? Has any interest been paid on any of the advances made by the Government in aid of the bridge or the connecting road?

Mr. FOSTER. The answer to the first section of the question is, \$386,378.22; to the second section, \$297,000; to the third section, yes; to the fourth section, no; to the fifth section, no.

#### JESUITS' ESTATES BILL.

Mr. BARRON. I think the Government should be sufficiently courteous to me to answer yes or no to the ques-

tion I submitted a few moments ago. My motion on the paper is this:

"Return for copy of the Bill, 51-52 Victoria, chapter 13, Quebec, intitled: 'An Act respecting the settlement of the Jesuit' Estate'; for copies of the report made on the 16th January last, or any other date, to His Excellency the Governor General upon the said Act; and of all Orders in Council, reports, opinions or other papers showing the consideration and conclusion arrived at by the Government in regard to the said Act; and of all correspondence in relation to the said Act had between the Government and the Government of the Province of Quebec, or any other person or persons whomsoever, as well as of all petitions or written representations made to the Government for or against the said Act becoming law, and showing at what date the said Bill was received by the Government and approved of by them."

When that motion was reached, a few days ago, I happened to be out of the Chamber. On my return, I immediately proceeded to ask that I might move the motion. I did not intend to speak at that time, because I did not think it necessary, as the hon. gentleman for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) had given notice of his intention to move a motion on the subject. It is highly important, when the discussion arises on that motion, that the papers should be in possession of the House. I was in order, a few moments ago, in bringing this matter forward, and I should have an answer, yes or no, to my question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no intention of being discourteous to the hon. gentleman; but I expected the First Minister would be here, and I desired to speak to him on the subject. I will communicate with my colleague in regard to the hon. gentleman's request; but, as the hon. gentleman's motion is on the Order Paper, if we begin and take a motion out of its place, other members will ask that the same be done in regard to their motions. The other day we went through the Order Paper, and, according to my recollection, the hon. gentleman was not in his place at the time the motion was reached, and he therefore had no opportunity of saying what he wished in regard to it. Unopposed motions were allowed to pass, and then we came back to the Notice Paper, and we are there again. At all events I will mention the matter to my colleagues.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope, after conference with his colleagues, the Minister of Public Works will be prepared to lay these papers at an early date before the House, without waiting for the motion to be passed in its regular course. No doubt there is a motion on the paper, but it may not be reached for some time, and it will strike everyone as proper that all the papers on this important subject should be before the House before the motion of which the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has given notice comes to be discussed. Under these circumstances the Government will, no doubt, see the propriety of not waiting until the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) is carried in a formal way, but they will take steps to have the papers brought down without delay.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will mention the matter to my colleagues.

#### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved:

1. That the practice in the House of Commons of Canada of remaining in session past the hour of midnight is injurious to the health of the members of the House and is utterly unnecessary in the public interest; that it is calculated to prevent, rather than to promote, the due and careful consideration of public questions, and is more liable to be used as the means of forcing through legislation without due consideration, than as the means of securing full discussion and deliberate action.

2. That in future, and from the date of the passage of these resolutions, Mr. Speaker shall leave the chair at the hour of twelve o'clock, midnight, with the same rigid adherence to the rule as is at present observed in leaving the chair at six o'clock, p.m., declaring, as he leaves the chair, the day and hour to which the House stands adjourned.

He said: It is hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, to enter into any argument as to the desirability of adjourning the House

at midnight. Most of the members of this House are gentlemen of regular habits.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. At home they are in the habit of going to bed at seasonable hours, but when they come to Ottawa a complete revolution in their habits takes place which is detrimental to the health of the members of this House. I think, Sir, on the score alone of the requirements of our health, that the request to adjourn at midnight should be granted by the leaders of the Government. It is unquestionable that the mortality of the members of the House has increased to a considerable extent by the unnatural hours we keep, for when we remain here after midnight we are not only trenching on the hours of morning, but we are sitting in a Chamber the atmosphere of which is vitiated owing to its bad ventilation, and the physical consequences to us are of a very serious character. Those consequences are visited not only on the members of the House, but on the members of the Press gallery, upon civil employes engaged about the House, and upon the pages. I claim that the pretension that it is necessary to sit after midnight to facilitate business is not well founded. If we protract the sittings until an early hour in the morning the result is lassitude the next day, and a correspondingly smaller amount of business is transacted. I am convinced that the result of adjourning at midnight will be that, in the end, business will be transacted more expeditiously and more satisfactorily than if we continue those late sittings. The custom of all the legislatures in the United States is to adjourn at six o'clock, I know that in Congress they meet at twelve in the day and adjourn at six, and only on very rare occasions do they sit after that hour, and we know that they get through an enormous amount of business in Congress. The Imperial Parliament has adopted substantially the rule that I now ask this House to adopt in reference to this matter. I find in the Standing Orders of the Imperial Parliament the following Rules adopted on February 24th, 1888:—

1. RULE REGULATING THE USUAL SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

"1. (24th February, 1888.)

"That, unless the House otherwise order, the House shall meet every Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, at Three of the clock, p.m., and shall, unless previously adjourned, sit till One of the clock, a.m., when the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, unless a Bill originating in Committee of Ways and Means, or unless Proceedings made in pursuance of any Act of Parliament or Standing Order, or otherwise exempted as hereafter provided from the operation of this Standing Order, be then under consideration.

"That at midnight on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, except as aforesaid, and at half-past Five of the clock on Wednesdays, the proceedings of any business then under consideration shall be interrupted; and, if the House be in Committee, the Chairman shall leave the Chair and make his report to the House, and if a motion has been proposed for the adjournment of the House, or of the Debate or in Committee, that the Chairman do report Progress, or do leave the Chair, every such dilatory motion shall lapse without question put, and the business then under consideration, and any business subsequently appointed, shall be appointed for the next day on which the House shall sit, unless the Speaker ascertains by the preponderance of voices that a majority of the House desires that such business should be deferred until a later day.

"2. (5th August, 1883.)

"That the House do meet every Wednesday at Twelve o'clock at noon for Private Business, Petitions, Orders of the Day, and Notices of Motions, and do continue to sit until Six o'clock, unless previously adjourned.

"3. That when such business has been disposed of, or at Six o'clock precisely, notwithstanding their may be business under discussion, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without putting any question."

This, Mr. Speaker, is the rule in the House of Commons in England, to adjourn at six o'clock on Wednesdays, and midnight on other days, unless under certain circumstances, when it sits until one o'clock, a.m., and provision is made for suspending those Rules. I think, Sir, we might safely and properly adopt the rule of adjourning at midnight every day, instead of making an exception of adjourning at six o'clock on Wednesdays. I believe that if the rule that I now propose to the House were adopted, our business would

be transacted with as great promptitude, as great facility, and, on the whole, in a better manner than if we indulge in those protracted sittings in the morning, on account of which members are scarcely fit for the performance of their duty the next day; for they certainly cannot come to work the following day in a condition, either mentally or physically, that they ought to be in.

Mr. MITCHELL. I second the motion as a matter of courtesy to my hon. friend, as I am almost always ready to second any motion he suggests. I do it also for the purpose of having a free discussion on this matter, for I have really not made up my mind as to whether it is desirable to adopt it or not, but I shall be glad to hear the reasons *pro* and *con*. I explain this now, because it might be thought afterwards that I had tied myself to the principle of the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend has not tied himself to the principle of this motion, because I have some hope of having the hon. gentleman vote against the resolution, or, at all events, that he will not press his vote in favor of it. My hon. friend who moved this resolution evidently does not think he is coming on this side of the House very soon. I am quite satisfied that when the time comes when there shall be a change of Government, and that hon. gentleman shall be sitting on one of the front benches on this side of the House, as a practical parliamentarian, the first thing he will do will be to move the repeal of this resolution should it be adopted by the House now, because it really puts the control of the business before the House in the hands of the Opposition. They could talk everything out until twelve o'clock, and throw any measure over *de die in diem*. I do not suggest that such a course would be taken by hon. gentlemen opposite; but when a change takes place, and they come to sit on this side of the House, the other party may be very factious. I know that at the time we sat on the left, occasionally my good friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) told us we were factious. We disputed it, but still he said so, and we know what weight his opinion and his expression had in this country. I will remind my hon. friend of a conversation I had with him once, when I was very candid, as is my habit, when in the Opposition. I said I did not agree with some of our friends who wished to adjourn at twelve o'clock, as my experience was that the most important Government measures are always carried after one; and my good friend said, "Well, I will remember your advice;" and I think he carried it out practically on more than one occasion during five years. The hon. gentleman who moved the motion quoted the Standing Orders in England and the Standing Orders in the United States. Now, you know that in the United States Congress practically very few questions of importance arise. What questions do arise there are of great importance, but they are few in number, because the greater portion of the legislation governing life and property, and all that constitutes civilisation, are in the hands of the State Legislatures; and so the Congress can easily have that rule. Then it sits in the morning, because it has not the immense amount of committee work that is thrown upon this House owing to the larger and more multifarious duties and responsibilities that devolve upon the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman also quoted the Standing Rules in England. Now, in the first place, in England, they do not make long speeches as we do here. Here, in Canada, we have got into the habit of delivering essays and lectures. Well, those essays and lectures we can all find in books, and it is merely lecture and water that we get, as a rule, in long speeches. In England a twenty-minute speech is considered a very long speech, and there are few men other than the Ministers and the leading men of the Opposition who take up more than that length of time, for they would not be list-

ened to by the practical English mind; the impatience of the members puts down anything like long speeches. Then, again, you must remember that in England against an obstructive Opposition they have got the safeguard of the closure. At any time, when they think that a debate is protracted improperly, and not with a view of a genuine discussion of the subject, but with a view of throwing it over, the Ministry of the day have the power of moving closure, and, if they have a sufficient majority, that closure is granted. Now, I should be very sorry to see closure introduced into this country. It might at some time be necessary, but I have not yet seen the necessity, even in the long discussions which took place on the Franchise Bill, of that practice being adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It should be applied to the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the House did close upon it at the end, and closed upon it in a manner highly satisfactory to myself. I think that, really, it would not be well to have a cast-iron rule of this kind. My hon. friend, being the chief exponent of the views of those who sit on the left of the Speaker, like myself, who am considered the chief exponent of the views of the members on this side, has considerable power accorded to him by his supporters; but neither of us is a despot, and a single member, or two or three members, might join together if they chose, and in spite of the strong persuasions of my hon. friend and myself, they might persist in keeping up the discussion until the time came for an adjournment to another day. There is no necessity for this new rule, certainly in the experience of this Parliament. We have never had any difficulty. We have always tried on this side to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to discussions, and I must say that my hon. friend who now leads the Opposition, when we had a little quiet *pourparler* behind your Chair, Mr. Speaker, has always acceded to what he considered would be conducive to good feeling on both sides, and has not obstructed the public business. We have had no difficulty, and I do not apprehend any; but I must, on the part of the Government, resist the possibility of our being in a position to be made powerless at twelve o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is quite proper that this subject should be brought before the House. Speaking for myself personally, however, I would not be disposed at present, at all events, to agree to the principle laid down in the motion in the hands of the Speaker. I do not know what the views of my hon. friend are with regard to the future standing of parties in this country; but if he believes that the Opposition are not likely to be at some future or proximate day on the other side of the House, I do not at all agree with him. I see evidences, not a few, that quite a change has taken place in public opinion. I see signs of denial on the opposite side of the House. I only hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will remain in their present frame of mind, and will not be alive to the many evidences which are apparent, not only in the Province from which I come, but in the other Provinces of the Confederation, of a change in public opinion. Entertaining those views and feeling pretty sure that at no distant day we shall be on the other side of the House, I realise from experience as well as from what the Premier says, that there is a great advantage to the Government in having the present system continued. I think it is also sometimes of advantage to the Opposition. But, though technically it may be better that the present system should be continued, I should hope that some understanding should be come to by both sides of the House, that the House should adjourn at a reasonable hour, say twelve o'clock, unless engaged upon some important question that might suffer if put off to another day. But apart from these exceptional circumstances, I think there should be some unwritten understanding of that kind. The British Constitution, if we might refer to it on a question like this,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

is full of unwritten understandings, and they are always acted upon; and if there were such an understanding as I suggest, I think it would be conducive to the health of members and to the expediting of business.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one thing which I think the right hon. gentleman opposite forgot when he was speaking of the difficulties the Government was under if the members of the Opposition chose to talk out a subject. The right hon. gentleman adopted a method the other night of closing off a debate in a summary manner, by not allowing any of his followers to speak. I thought it was a judicious way of adopting closure. When I seconded the motion I did so as an act of courtesy to my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), who generally asks me to second any motion of his, and I always do so, no matter what it is, but I did not bind myself at all to support my hon. friend unless after the matter is discussed it approves itself to my judgment. I must say that the views expressed by the leader of the Opposition agree with those of the leader of the Third party. I do not think it would be judicious or wise to adopt this motion, and I think the arguments of the right hon. the First Minister have a great deal in them. It is true that sometimes the right hon. gentleman may insist on continuing votes in Supply when the House is tired out, but there are two or three ways of killing that kind of thing. I think the suggestions of the hon. leader of the Opposition are sound, and that an understanding should be had, so that the health of hon. members on both sides should not be injured. There is a strong desire expressed to have adjournments at midnight, and the Government ought to meet hon. gentlemen on this side if possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would only say that the unwritten arrangement has been carried out during this Session, and I think the best way of continuing to carry it out would be to have a friendly conference between the leaders of the Opposition, the Government and the Third Party, when some conclusion will, no doubt, be arrived at. I must candidly tell you, that I have a personal reason for desiring to carry out the proposition of my hon. friend. At my age, after 12 o'clock, I would rather be in bed than in my place in the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are other considerations beside those mentioned by the First Minister. It seems to me, we could facilitate the business of the Session a good deal, if the measures the Government intend to bring forward were submitted to us at an earlier period, so that we would be prepared to discuss them before any action is taken beyond the first reading is had upon them. It is quite true that when the Government introduce their measures at a late period of the Session, late sittings are of very considerable consequence. I think that the conduct of the Government in this particular, is altogether different from that of the Government in the Imperial Parliament. For the past half century, English Administrations have, during the first three weeks of the Session, submitted all the important measures. That has not been the rule here. The long sittings we had on the Franchise Bill were had upon a measure which was read the second time during the eleventh week of the Session. It seems to me that we might meet earlier than three o'clock, especially in the earlier part of the Session. I think it would meet the convenience of the House and of the Government if we would meet at two o'clock instead of three. That would give us four hours session before six, and we might then have a shorter session after eight. When hon. gentlemen propose to sit from eight to twelve, they propose to make that period of the day, when members are most wearied, longer than the period before six o'clock. That would seem to be reversing the natural order of things. To give six hours of constant attention to the work of the House, be-

sides the time given to committees and private correspondence, is imposing a great deal of work upon hon. gentlemen. Now, I think, if we had a shorter session in the way I have indicated, there could be no doubt whatever that hon. gentlemen would come here better prepared to discharge the duties that devolve upon them. As things are, the great majority of members have no opportunity of reading the Bills on which they are called to act until the second reading. If these Bills were better considered before the second reading, there would be very much less time spent in their discussion. There is another thing which I think the First Minister has overlooked. He knows very well that if we had the business brought before us at an earlier period of the Session, the impatience of the House would prevent those very long speeches of which he complains. The speaking would be more business-like and pertinent to the question. There can be very little doubt of that, and the extension of the sittings to two or three o'clock in the morning has a tendency to produce that very condition of things of which the hon. gentleman complains, and impedes the progress of public business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said. We, however, have been attempting in our humble way to expedite business. On the eighth day after the House met, we were ready to go into the Estimates, and immediately afterwards we introduced a number of Bills. We are trying really to expedite business as much as possible. After what has been said, I think it would not be a bad plan if, early in the Session, immediately after the Speech from the Throne is answered, and no great eruption takes place, we should have a committee to consider the Rules of the House. It would be strictly a parliamentary committee, and not a party one. When the hon. member for the West Durham (Mr. Blake) was on this side, we had a committee to revise the Rules, which, I think, was productive of much good. I think the time has come for a similar committee, which could go into all the subjects mentioned by hon. gentlemen.

Mr. LAURIER. No doubt that is a very good suggestion, and I am very glad to hear it from the First Minister, and still more to hear that he will go into all the matters suggested by my hon. friend behind me, including that referring to the late stage at which the Government measures are brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will put ourselves on trial.

Mr. CHARLTON. After the expression of opinion from the leader of the Government and leader of this side of the House—

Mr. MITCHELL. And the Third Party.

Mr. CHARLTON—and the Third party as well, it will be unnecessary for me to press the resolution, as I am content with the implied understanding between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, that, except under exceptional circumstances, we will adjourn at 12 o'clock. I, therefore, withdraw the resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

#### SHORT LINE RAILWAY—OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW, N.S.

Mr. KIRK asked, What is the total length of the "Short Line" Railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, N.S.? What amount of money has been paid on account of this railway up to 1st January, 1889?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Oxford Junction of the Intercolonial Railway to junction with Intercolonial Railway near Picton: length—main line, 67 miles, Pughwash Branch, 5 miles, total, 72 miles; expenditure up to

31st January—paid old claim, Short Line Company, \$149,233.09; for construction and equipment, \$1,001,179.20; total, \$1,150,412.29.

#### ST. ROCH DES AULNETS WHARF.

Mr. CASGRAIN (translation) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., which passed between the Department of Public Works and the late Charles Francis Roy, surveyor, and parties interested in the municipality of the said locality, respecting the wharf at St. Roch des Aulnets, in the County of L'Islet.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Government on the importance for them of assisting the municipality of St. Roch des Aulnets in the work of repairing a certain wharf opposite the lower crossing. The wharf was built by the municipality and, owing to accidents that happened, is in need of urgent repairs. It being available to the Government, who uses it for the purpose of loading and unloading everything they may require for the lightship of the lower crossing, I think it is as useful to the Government as to the municipality itself. Formerly the Government ordered a survey of the locality. I had been informed that Surveyor Roy had been ordered to report on the repairs to be made to the wharf, I heard since that Mr. Roy made no report, but merely made soundings and certain preliminary works. Nevertheless, there passed a correspondence between the municipality and the Government respecting the wharf referred to, and I think there were even petitions from the inhabitants of the locality asking for assistance. Since the Government uses the wharf, which, to a certain extent, is indispensable to them, in so far as it is a landing place for the crew of the ferry boat, I think it is but just that they should share in its maintenance, and I merely ask that they contribute to the repair it presently needs. Under these circumstances, I think my motion ought to be granted. With the permission of the House, I ask that I may be allowed to amend it by striking out the name of Mr. Roy and inserting the following words: "and parties interested in the municipality of the said locality."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I would suggest to the hon. member to leave his motion as it is and add after the word "surveyor" the words he has just read.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) I do not object.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The hon. member is mistaken in respect to the correspondence between the Department and Mr. Roy. It is true there was no correspondence, but there was a report made by Mr. Roy, and that is why I suggested to him not to strike out that part of his motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell me whether he can do anything for that wharf during this Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must previously consider the matter.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### WESTERN NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAYS.

Mr. BORDEN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Windsor and Annapolis and Western Counties Railway Companies relating to the consolidation, under Government control, of the railways of western Nova Scotia, together with copies of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, and the Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia, referring to the same subject.

He said: I gave notice of this motion in order to bring to the attention of the Government the unsatisfactory condition of the railways in the western part of Nova Scotia, between the city of Halifax and the town of Yarmouth. When I tell the House that the whole five western counties

and the city of Halifax are affected by the condition of these roads, and that those counties and that city have together a population of about 150,000 people, I think the House will agree with me that it is a question of sufficient importance to be brought up here. The city of Halifax is connected with Yarmouth by three distinct lines of railway—first, the Intercolonial Railway, extending from Halifax to the junction, a distance of 15 miles; then the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, from the junction, including the Windsor Branch Railway, to the town of Annapolis; then we come to a gap which is known as the "missing link," where there is at present no railway communication between Annapolis, the terminus of the Windsor and Annapolis, and the town of Digby, the terminus of the Western Counties Railway. Then from Digby to Yarmouth, 67 miles, there is the Western Counties Railway. The length of the Windsor and Annapolis and the Windsor Branch together is 106 miles, and the length of the gap over which no road is now constructed, between Annapolis and Digby, is 18 miles. Thus we see that the railways in western Nova Scotia are under three distinct managements, and apparently hostile managements. First, there is the Intercolonial Railway, and, although the Windsor and Annapolis Railway has an arrangement by which it is allowed to run its trains from the Windsor Junction into Halifax, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the full and free use of the terminal facilities of the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax are denied to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Co. That matter was brought before this House during last Session and the Session before, and the Government have been asked to take steps to rectify the great injustice which is being done to the people of western Nova Scotia, in denying them the facilities which are granted to the eastern portion of the Province in regard to the terminus at Halifax. What is the position in regard to the use of that terminus at Halifax? A few years ago the Intercolonial Railway was extended into the city of Halifax to what is known as the "deep water" terminus. The Intercolonial Railway cars are allowed to go into that terminus on a charge of \$1 a car, while the cars from western Nova Scotia, over the Windsor and Annapolis are denied that privilege unless they pay a charge of \$2.50. The answer given by the Government, when this matter was brought up, was: that there was no room even for the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and, therefore, cars coming from the west should not be allowed to participate in those facilities. I pointed out to the Government at the time when that reason was given that it was not a sufficient reason, because it did not explain why \$2.50 were charged for cars coming in from the west and only \$1 for those from the east. If there is no room for the traffic coming from western Nova Scotia, the Government should say so, and should not allow any cars to come in at all; but in fact they discriminate against the western trade by charging \$2.50 a car, when they only charge \$1 on precisely the same car from the east. This matter has been discussed a great many times by the Chamber of Commerce, and many other bodies in Nova Scotia who are interested in the commerce of that Province. I find that no later than March 6th—last week—the following report was made to the Chamber of Commerce in Halifax:—

"The Intercolonial management still refuses to carry Windsor and Annapolis freight past the old Richmond depot. All efforts to this end made by the chamber have so far resulted in failure. This favor is one so easily and cheaply granted that it is difficult to realise any solid reason whatever for withholding it. Can it be that this is another instance of the obstinacy of some official on the line? The Fruit Growers' Association have, with others, a common interest in this quarter, and it might be well, in conjunction with that body, to lay the plain facts once more before the Ministers at Ottawa."

So much for the terminal facilities at Halifax. It will be very clear to hon. members that over so short a line of rail-

Mr. BORDEN.

way as that between Halifax and Yarmouth, the management by two distinct companies, with a gap of eighteen miles of road not constructed, must result in very serious inconvenience and cost to the trade of that part of the Province. The facts are that freight rates over the Windsor and Annapolis and over the Western Counties, are altogether out of proportion to the freights over the road in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, and the people of the west feel that they are at a great disadvantage as compared with their friends and neighbors in the east. In order to show what the public opinion really is on this subject in the western part of the Province, I will read, with the permission of the House, an extract from the *Bridgetown Monitor*, a paper published in the county of Annapolis, which says:

"The difference in the rates upon the Intercolonial and the W. and A. R. is very marked. In fact it costs almost as much to bring freight from Windsor Junction to Bridgetown, as it does from Montreal to Windsor Junction. Now the W. and A. R. Co. say that it does not pay them to handle freight for less than their usual rates; it, therefore, only remains, in order that justice may be done, for the Dominion Government to buy the private roads at a fair valuation, complete the 'missing link,' and run the whole as Government property. A very large portion of the trade that rightfully belongs to our own Province is now diverted, and goes to St. John. Halifax merchants say they cannot pretend to do any extensive trade, after leaving Windsor, with towns along the valley, owing to freight rates."

A correspondent of the *Halifax Herald* makes the statement, that it costs three times as much to get a package of freight from Truro to Yarmouth, as it costs to get the same package from Montreal to Truro. The distance between Montreal and Truro is nearly four times greater than the distance between Truro and Yarmouth. Now, I propose to read a discussion which took place in the *Halifax Chamber of Commerce*, in January last, in regard to this subject:

#### "THE 'MISSING LINK.'"

"Edward Stairs speaks of the movement which had been recently started in St. John to form a company to carry on steam communication with bay ports. Halifax cannot trade with these bay ports to any extent because of the 'missing link' between Annapolis and Digby. To do business with ports in St. Mary's Bay and Digby it is necessary to send goods by the Intercolonial to St. John and ship them to their destination by water, and our merchants must place the goods at the same price as the St. John merchants do, notwithstanding their handicap in the shipment thereof. If the gap were built a trade could be opened up with that part of the Province by the merchants of Halifax. It was time the matter was pressed to completion, and he, therefore, offered the following resolution:—

"That this chamber, recognising the inconvenience to passenger travel and the great disadvantage the trade of Halifax and the western part of the Province is under through the non-completion of the railway system between Halifax and Yarmouth, do bring to the notice of the Government the advisability and great necessity of having that portion of the railroad between Annapolis and Digby (commonly known as the 'gap') completed at as early a date as possible; and that the committee on internal trade be instructed to deal with the matter.

"President Silver said it was certainly discreditable to the powers that be—whether the Government of Canada or the Government of Nova Scotia were to blame—that this gap of 19 miles should in great part destroy the usefulness of these two great lines of railway—the Intercolonial and Windsor and Annapolis.

"W. H. Harrington seconded the resolution.

"Conversational remarks followed by Mr. Kenny and others.

"Michael Dwyer said the system of traffic between Halifax and Annapolis was somewhat discreditable. There was discrimination, and the whole matter of the line and system of conveyance of goods from Halifax to the end of the proposed line needed looking into. We had been dealing with it for years, and Mr. Dwyer advocated the appointment of a committee to go into the whole subject and discover why there was discrimination against Halifax.

"Robert Pickford said there were two or three conflicting interests. The Windsor and Annapolis run their road to make the most money possible, and it is not to the advantage of this road to have the gap built. The Windsor and Annapolis have no terminal facilities at Halifax; their terminus is at Richmond. He was not advocating their claims, but they were used unfairly. They made a contract with the Government for terminal facilities. At this time both the Windsor and Annapolis and Intercolonial Railways had their terminus at Richmond, and when the Intercolonial terminus was brought into the city the Windsor and Annapolis were compelled to remain at Richmond. The Intercolonial Railway want \$2.50 for every Windsor and Annapolis car brought into the city, so the latter road runs its traffic to suit itself and Halifax suffers."

I thought it proper to read this in order to support my case with the best evidence I could bring of the state of public

opinion in Nova Scotia. I will further read a resolution passed by the Fruit Growers' Association, a large and influential association in the Province. The resolution was passed in January last:

"The following resolution, moved by W. H. Blanchard, seconded by B. W. Starr, after some discussion, passed unanimously:—

"Whereas, it is claimed by the manager of the W. & A. R. that this road must be run on commercial principles, and that the tariff rates are as favorable upon this road as upon any company road in this Dominion.

"Whereas, this tariff is unjust to us and places the agriculturists of these western counties at a great disadvantage as compared with residents on the Intercolonial Railway.

"Therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this association the Dominion Government should be strongly urged to consolidate the western roads of this Province and control them, in order that we may be placed in fair competition with the patrons of the Intercolonial Railway."

Now, Sir, the question arises: Is there any way of remedying this evil? The people of the west are looking towards the eastern part of Nova Scotia, and they see what has been done there under the very same circumstances. In 1884 this House, upon the recommendation of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, passed a resolution authorising the Government to take over the roads of eastern Nova Scotia, that is, the road between Truro and Pictou, which had been given to any company that would construct a road to the Strait of Canso, and the road so constructed, which road was known as the Eastern Extension. I have here the speech made on that occasion by Sir Charles Tupper, and I am sure I cannot present the case for western Nova Scotia any better than by reading the statements made by him on that occasion for the Eastern Extension; and I believe that every word that the hon. gentleman spoke applies with equal force to our condition as to that which he was then advocating:

"The House is familiar with the difficulties that arose between the contractors and the Government of Nova Scotia; and also with the facts of the transfer of the Pictou Branch. That was finally settled here, I think, by an Act of 1879, which provided that the branch would be handed over when the contractors had completed the line. That line has been practically completed from Glasgow to Pictou, and the question came up as to its transfer. The Government acquired the right to the Pictou Branch. Negotiation ensued between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government here in regard to that question; and looking at the difficulties that the Government of Nova Scotia would encounter in operating a comparative short line of railway, looking to the increase of the expenditure that would be involved, looking to the necessities that would arise of increasing the rates upon these roads, and looking to the dislocation of trade that was likely to result from the severance of the branch from Truro to Pictou, from the Intercolonial Railway system, it was finally agreed between the present Government of Nova Scotia and this Government, that we should practically take the position of the Government of Nova Scotia and pay the amount of money they were obliged to pay to the contractors for the Eastern Extension, and that, subject to the sanction of the Legislature of Nova Scotia and this Parliament, this Government should retain the branch from Truro to Pictou, and should acquire the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso. I may say that, although in that particular, I believe I entertain a different view from that of a large proportion of the party with which I am connected in the Province of Nova Scotia—I refer to that in connection with the administration of local affairs—I am of opinion that the arrangement that has been arrived at is in the interests of the counties through which this portion of railway runs. I believe this policy is also in the interest of the Province of Nova Scotia as well as of the Dominion of Canada. I believe it will not involve any additional expenditure on the part of the Government of this country. The portion of the I. C. R. between Truro and Pictou, is the only portion that pays a considerable amount of net profit over and above the expenses of operation; and I think the result of this transaction will be that we shall stand in quite as good a financial position at the end of the year as we should if we had lost the Pictou Branch. Regarding, also, the interests of the various industries of Nova Scotia, especially the connection between the coal mining counties of Nova Scotia and the harbor and city of Halifax, I think it will be found that the policy propounded in this resolution is a policy not only in the interest of Nova Scotia, but in the interest of Canada. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is necessary to discuss this question at any length, because I believe the policy which the Government have adopted will meet with the cordial approval of both sides of the House."

There was not a single argument used by the hon. gentleman on that occasion which cannot be used with equal force with respect to the condition of affairs which I have been pointing out as now existing on the Windsor Branch

and Western Railways. There is the double management, involving, in my judgment, an increased expenditure, there is the dislocation of trade, and all the other difficulties pointed out by Sir Charles Tupper at the time this resolution was passed; and I maintain there is not a single argument brought forward in favor of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway east which is not equally applicable to the extension west. There is no reason why the people of the western counties of Nova Scotia should not receive from this Government and this Parliament every advantage which the people in the eastern portion of the Province enjoy. It may be said: Why cannot some arrangement be made for the amalgamation of these companies? That has been attempted. No one knows better than the Minister of Justice, who at one time held a prominent position in the Government of Nova Scotia, the strenuous efforts made by the Legislature and Government of Nova Scotia to amalgamate these companies and secure continuous railway communication between Halifax and Yarmouth in the west. I do not think it is possible to bring about this amalgamation or consolidation by means of either one of these companies, and I have no doubt the only recourse we have is to look to this Parliament and to this Government, and we do so, as I have already stated, feeling that we are only asking what has already been granted to the people of eastern Nova Scotia. It was pointed out in that speech that the road between Truro and Pictou was a paying road. Even in that respect the analogy holds good, because the road known as the Windsor Branch, between Windsor Junction and Windsor in the west, is known to be a paying road, and I have no doubt it is quite as good a paying road as that to which Sir Charles Tupper referred. If that argument is good in regard to the east, it is equally forcible with regard to the west. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway, as shown by the annual report of the company—the last one I have is for 1887—makes a remarkably good showing, and it appears that that railway is one of the best paying roads in the Dominion, paying its interest on all the different securities and carrying enough forward to have paid a dividend even upon the ordinary shares. It is well known, and members of the Government from the Province of Nova Scotia will agree with me, that there is an enormous traffic developing in the west, particularly from the growth of the apple trade; and I may inform the House that whereas ten years ago the Windsor and Annapolis Branch only carried 10,000 barrels annually, during last year it shipped between 100,000 and 200,000 barrels. There is practically no limit to the extent to which the traffic may increase. With respect to this point, I may be allowed to read an extract from the report of the chief engineer of Nova Scotia railways upon the railways in that Province as to the manner in which those roads are paying. He says:

"It did not require much prescience in the forecast of railway operations to lead one to expect a larger annual traffic return from 1887 than was experienced for any one of the five previous years, because we know that our railway traffic has not reached its proper limit, and must necessarily increase, yet with the western counties lying still undiminished, with this probably nineteen miles of buffer separating its connections with the outer railway world, no one anticipated that the railways, disconnected as they are, would, at the close of the year, exhibit an improvement in gross traffic returns to the extent of 11 per cent. This recent, suddenly increased activity, as will be seen by the next following comparative statement of annual traffics, is largely due to two principal causes: First, increase in the passenger traffic, and, secondly, the carriage of internal productions, of which the movement of coal had been a prominent feature. There is no movement of freight or through traffic from abroad over the Western Counties' line. This hiatus or gap precludes such possibility. Out of \$16,566, the increase in receipts of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, \$13,588 of it is due to passenger transport alone, and out of an increase of \$6,417, earnings of the western counties, \$5,553 is due to the same resource. These items make up 83.3 per cent. of the bulk of the improvement realised, and are no doubt attributable to commercial animation, the growing attractions of our climate for visitors during the sultry season, and the successful efforts of the Hon. Lorán E. Baker in establishing the new popular steamship route between Yarmouth and Boston, and the one most conducive to Nova Scotia railway interests."

From this report it will be seen that there was an increased profit of 11 per cent. on the earnings of the road during 1887, and the bulk of that was from passenger traffic, because, owing to the missing link between Annapolis and Digby and the high rates charged for freight traffic, there was not the freight carried that could be carried under management such as that on the Intercolonial Railway. With respect to the gap between Annapolis and Digby, it is well known that, in 1873, this House passed a resolution unanimously, giving authority to the Government to hand over the Windsor Branch—from Windsor Junction to Windsor—to any company that would construct a railway from Annapolis to Yarmouth. Later on the Act of 1874 was passed, carrying into effect the arrangements which had been based on that resolution. Again and again, as we all know, legislation has been passed by this House with respect to this road. What we supposed would be a great inducement to a company to build that road proved to be quite the opposite, owing to the fact that an arrangement had been made by this Government with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway to give that railway the use of the Windsor Branch, and it was therefore worse than useless in the way of assisting the Western Counties Company to build their road. It is perfectly clear that the Western Counties have a claim on Parliament and on the Government for assistance in the completion of their road. It is clear, when we notice the agreement made in January, 1887, between the Minister of Justice and the Western Counties Railway to give to that company \$500,000 upon consideration that the company would give up their petition of right against the Government on account of their losses in regard to the Windsor Branch, that the Western Counties—it has even been admitted by the Government—has a moral and a legal claim upon this country for the construction of the missing link. But I desire to point out to the Government, if they entertain at all the idea of taking over those western roads, they should certainly do that before constructing the road between Annapolis and Digby, because the very moment they do that they add enormously to the value of all the roads which would be connected by the construction of that road. Consequently, in the public interest, it would be the duty of the Government, before constructing that missing link, to take over the roads between Halifax and Yarmouth. I have ventured to draw certain conclusions from those facts which I have very imperfectly endeavored to present to the House and the Government. They are :

"1st. The present unsatisfactory condition of the railway traffic of western Nova Scotia, seriously injures the trade of that section, and of the city of Halifax as well.

"2nd. When a similar state of things existed in eastern Nova Scotia, with respect to the Intercolonial, the branch between Truro and Pictou and the Eastern Extension, the Dominion Government promptly applied to Parliament for power to take over the two latter roads, and make them part of the Intercolonial system, which was unanimously granted.

"3rd. The Windsor Branch, and the Windsor and Annapolis are paying roads, and it is expected that the whole line between Halifax and Yarmouth, including the western counties, will be a paying one immediately upon the completion of the gap between Annapolis and Digby, and therefore the acquisition of these roads, instead of involving a loss, will prove to be a source of revenue to the country.

"4th. The Government of Canada, in view of its transactions with the Western Counties Railway Company, in respect of the Windsor Branch, is under obligation to complete the gap of 18 or 19 miles between Annapolis and Digby.

"5th. But the railways which would thus be connected, viz., the Windsor and Annapolis and the Western Counties, should be, together with the Windsor Branch, first taken over by the Dominion Government, and made a part of the Intercolonial system."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), in bringing this motion before the House has explained the matter so fully that it requires very little to add upon the subject. I must further express my very strong conviction that the view which the hon. member has presented to this House is one that ought to command  
Mr. BORDEN.

the assent and early attention of the Government. The principle laid down by the hon. gentleman was, in the first place, that a system had been adopted in the Province of Nova Scotia with reference to the construction of railways in the east which, in all fairness, should be applied to the construction or consolidation of railways in the western portion of the Province. The hon. member referred to the action of the Government when they purchased the Eastern Extension line, running from Pictou to the Straits of Canso, and assuming at the same time the ownership of the Pictou Branch, so called. He might have gone further in his remarks by directing the attention of the House to the fact that since that time the Government have further adopted the principle of extending, under very heavy expenditure, the Intercolonial system in the east, in the Island of Cape Breton. Last year this House was called upon to vote a very large amount for the completion of that road to Cape Breton, and this year we are called upon to supplement that appropriation by another amount. Therefore, the principle of extending the Intercolonial Railway system has already been accepted by the Government, and my hon. friend is only asking the Government to apply that principle to the western part of Nova Scotia which they have applied to the eastern part of the Province; so that, I presume, the Government can make no reasonable objection, particularly in the circumstances in which that part of the Province is placed. The hon. gentleman pointed out very correctly that, worked at present as three systems, the Intercolonial Railway, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and the Western Counties Railway, it was natural that the usefulness of those roads, generally, should be very much hampered, because hon. gentlemen know that when the traffic has to be exchanged from one road to another, and when there is an absence of a common agreement between those roads, the public are not served with the same convenience that they are when the railways are all run as parts of one system. The object of the hon. gentleman, then, is to induce the Government to obtain control of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, to put in the gap between Digby and Annapolis, and to obtain control of the Western Counties Railway as well. Now, it would appear that the hon. gentleman has presented to the House very good grounds why the Government should be willing to accept that responsibility on a financial basis. We have shown to the House that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, though handicapped as they have been for the want of through communication with other lines to the west, have been able to pay a very fair interest on their bonds during the last two or three years. He might also have pointed out to the House, but that, perhaps, his modesty prevented him doing so, that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway ran through the garden of Nova Scotia, a part of the county which the hon. gentleman so ably represents in this House; and I venture to say that in this Dominion there cannot be found finer agricultural districts, with more productive soil, and more prosperous communities, than those through which this road runs from Windsor to Annapolis. Therefore, the future of this railway is highly encouraging. It is developing its usefulness constantly by the enterprises to which it is giving use, and by the immense quantities of freight which it carries, which, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, has so largely increased within a short time; and if the efforts of the farmers of that district are successful, as I have no doubt they will be, it is not unreasonable to expect that within the next twenty years there will be a million barrels of apples exported over that road. Looking to the connection with Yarmouth, I think the Government would be justified on that ground alone of assuming this responsibility. Then, the Western Counties Railway has been very successful, considering its isolated position. When we consider that it has no connection with the Windsor and

Annapolis Railway, and only runs as far as Digby, the fact that its traffic receipts, both for freight and passengers, have been increasing, is a very encouraging sign of its usefulness, and I have no doubt that if the gap between Digby and Annapolis were built, the earnings of those roads put together would be very largely increased. That gap has been one of the difficulties which have stood in the way of this through route, and I am afraid that the Government have not been altogether blameless in the matter. Several attempts have been made, as was intimated by the hon. member, to consolidate the roads in Nova Scotia, one during the time my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was a member of the Provincial Government. That effort failed. A subsequent effort was made by the present Administration, and I am led to believe that if the Government of the Dominion had been willing to give the same consideration to the application of the contractors under the present Local Government, that is to say, if they had been willing to carry out the offers they made to the syndicate during the reign of my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, and had extended that agreement to the late contractor under the present Administration, those roads would be in a fair way to consolidation at the present moment. But, for some reason or other, that consent was withheld, and the agreement under the present Administration fell through. Then, pending these negotiations Mr. Plunkett came forward with an offer to build the road. We remember that a Bill for that purpose was presented to this House. We remember that an agreement was submitted to the House by the late Minister of Finance. It is true it was submitted in a minute of Council at a very critical time, preceding by a few days a general election. We are also aware that Mr. Plunkett failed in his efforts to raise money in England, as was announced by the Minister of Finance last year, and he was unable to carry out his agreement, very much to my regret, and very much, I believe, to the regret of the people of Nova Scotia. During the discussion which took place last year in this House, I took the opportunity of enquiring of the Minister of Finance what course the Government intended to pursue in the event of Mr. Plunkett not succeeding in his financial negotiations in London, and it is this point to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. I said to the hon. Minister of Finance:

"I would also like to ask in what position the negotiations are in reference to the Western Counties Railway, as to filling up the gap between Annapolis and Digby. Perhaps the Minister might tell the House at what time the operations there will be commenced.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret to say that the information has been somewhat unsatisfactory with reference to the arrangements that Mr. Plunkett was making in England within the last few days. A hitch has occurred. I was informed by Messrs. Baring that the matter had been arranged and that a very powerful syndicate had engaged to underwrite the bonds, that the money was all forthcoming, and that the matter was settled. But some legal question has arisen between Mr. Plunkett and the parties with whom he was making the arrangement, so that I believe the matter is not at this moment in so secure a position as I was led to understand by a communication from the Messrs. Baring a short time ago.

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am very sorry to hear that any hitch has occurred; but, in the event of satisfactory arrangements being concluded, is the hon. gentleman in a position to say what course the Government will pursue with respect to undertaking that work? The Minister of Railways informed us last Session that in the event of negotiations failing with private parties, the Government would immediately proceed to undertake the work themselves. A considerable time has now elapsed. We supposed, from the information we had of Mr. Plunkett's negotiations, that he would be able to carry through this consolidation scheme, and I regret very much that there has been any failure in that respect. But if such should unfortunately prove to be the case, and he should not succeed, will the Government then undertake the work?"

This was the promise made by Sir Charles Tupper last year. Well, another year has passed by; another season has been lost. The hon. the Minister of Finance was aware, a month after he made these observations, that Mr. Plunkett had failed, that he could not secure the money he desired, and, therefore, it was the Minister's duty, having given that

pledge to Parliament, or it was the duty of the Government of which he was then such a prominent member, to have immediately commenced the work of completing that gap. Had that been done, no doubt things would have been today in a more satisfactory condition. The general consolidation, which my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) is aiming at, and which is so desirable, would have been thereby secured, because hon. gentlemen are aware that the public cannot be so cheaply accommodated by a private road as by a Government road.

Mr. BLAKE. Why not?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend knows from his own experience that a Government road is run on a different basis and for different objects and considerations. While we do not expect to make money out of a Government road, private individuals are always looking for a very large return, and that is the reason the Government, with larger resources, should be able to work a road on more economical terms than others. Therefore, if the Government had carried out their pledge to have undertaken this work, one difficulty would have been partly removed; but I am sorry to say that up to the present time there appears to be no sign of the Government moving in that direction. I hope they are not going to leave the matter over for another general election. They made use of it in a Dominion election and in a local election, by sending people there a short time to survey, so as to convey the impression that the work was to be undertaken. I think it is now about time, if the Government are going to undertake it at all, that the announcement should be made, and I hope there will be no further delay on that point. Another great object in the consolidation of these roads is what was pointed out in the House last year when this subject was up for discussion. When the agreement was made between the Government and Windsor and Annapolis Road, in 1873 or 1874, there was a clause in the agreement which read thus:

"That those who have the right to so much of the Nova Scotia Railway, with the branches, appurtenances, buildings and conveniences thereto belonging, or attached, as lies between the terminus at Halifax and the Windsor Junction, both inclusive, together with any extension to Halifax hereafter to be made."

At the time that that agreement was made the terminus was at Richmond, about three miles from the city, and the Windsor and Annapolis used that terminus in common with the Intercolonial. Since that time, under the administration of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mackenzie), the road was brought further into the city about one and a half miles, and the Windsor and Annapolis people have always claimed, and claimed justifiably, that they had the right to use that road for all purposes. It is true that right had been allowed to us for passenger purposes, but that is a very small portion of its usefulness, so far as the usefulness of a railway is concerned. Its greatest usefulness is in the transport of freight, and when the cars come down to Richmond, if you require to bring them down to the deep-water terminus, about one and a half miles further down, instead of being hauled down there, as I contend the Government are bound to do under this agreement, the company are charged \$2.50 for each car moved, and all the general traffic of the Western Counties Road is now loaded and discharged at Richmond, a distance of three miles from the city. This is practically one of the great difficulties in the way of extending the usefulness and the value of the Windsor and Annapolis Road, because hon. gentlemen who are familiar with that subject are well aware that having to haul heavy articles of freight about three miles, at a very considerable expense, adds very much to the general expenses of traffic. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the want of general railway arrangements with the Intercolonial and with this point makes the expense so heavy of



transporting goods to the western part of Nova Scotia, that it is found cheaper to send them by the Intercolonial to St. John, and then by water across the bay, rather than send them by our own road. The object we are aiming at will never be properly acquired until that road is under one management, until the Windsor and Annapolis have the right to use all portions of the Intercolonial Railway facilities in the city of Halifax at the depot or deep water terminus, and any extensions that have been or may be hereafter made. They are entitled to that, under their agreement, and I think the Government have not the right on their side in refusing the Windsor and Annapolis Company the use of the extensions in the city of Halifax. I hope that when the Government come to consider the whole question, when they come to consider that they are advancing half a million of money to connect those two roads, the value of which will be largely increased by the action of the Government itself, they will deal with the question of consolidation promptly before they put in the gap, for, whatever the value of these roads may be at present, they will be very considerably increased when they are united by the gap it is proposed to complete. Under these circumstances, I think the Government are bound to take one step or the other. I think they are bound to adopt the suggestion embodied in this motion at once, or if they have made up their minds not to grant the western part of Nova Scotia the advantages which they have already granted to the east, then the only thing to be done, is to put in the gap with as little delay as possible, and see that the Windsor and Annapolis have terminal facilities under all circumstances. If this be not all we have a right to expect, it will be some improvement on the present arrangements.

Mr. KENNY. I agree with my hon. friend from King's that it is eminently desirable that the roads in western Nova Scotia should be consolidated. I noticed, when my hon. colleague was urging the Government of the day to spend more money in developing the railway system in Nova Scotia, that a smile stole imperceptibly over the placid features of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as they remembered that only a few nights ago the echoes of this House were awakened by the fierce, the almost ferocious onslaught on the Government for its expenditures on the Intercolonial and other railways in which that Province and people are interested. The Intercolonial, as hon. gentlemen know, is essential to our national existence. I will say further, that it has been of more advantage to the millers and manufacturers of the west than it has been to the people of the Maritime Provinces. Yet, when an hon. gentleman, occupying the position which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) occupies in this House, assails the Government for its administration of the Intercolonial, our national highway, what chance is there for the people of Nova Scotia to secure any further public funds for the development of their railway system? I agree with my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) that the management of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is eminently injurious to the trade of Nova Scotia, and that it is most desirable that the roads from Halifax to Yarmouth in western Nova Scotia should be amalgamated. If the Government can assist that in any way, it will be their duty to do so. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), and my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), have both referred to the efforts made to attain that very desirable end. I was, to a slight extent, identified with one of those efforts. In company with Mr. Baker, of Yarmouth, and Mr. Lovell, and my deceased friend, Mr. Duffus, I identified myself with the first of those projects, having satisfied myself that, if carried out, it would be eminently in the interest of Nova Scotia. That

**Mr. JONES (Halifax).**

project failed. I do not mean to say that it had all the inherent merits which deserved success. I never enquired very particularly into the commercial or financial aspect of it. I was satisfied that if it could be done it would be a benefit to Nova Scotia, and I was prepared to do what I could to facilitate it; but hon. gentlemen know that whilst the promoter of that measure was in London a change took place in the Government of Nova Scotia, and the new Local Government sent the Honorable Mr. Vail to London, as the result of whose mission the project miscarried. Now, I do not mean to say that that was solely due to Mr. Vail's mission, or that the Government of the country had any such intention when they sent him there, but I do say that one result of Mr. Vail's mission was, at all events, that this measure was miscarried. So much for the two projects started for the amalgamation of these roads. I should very much like to see the gap completed at as early a day as possible. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) has reminded us of the two discussions on this subject which have taken place in this House, during the two past Sessions of Parliament. I was not present during the last discussion, but I remember on the first occasion, when the hon. the Minister of Railways was in his place, my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) called his attention specially to the inconvenience which the people in western Nova Scotia, and also the merchants in Halifax, suffered from the large expense which had been incurred for taking the cars into the city of Halifax from the existing terminus at Richmond. The Minister of Railways then told us in reply that one reason for that was that he had not sufficient accommodation for his own freight, either at North street, or at the Deep Water terminus. If there was not sufficient room two years ago, I am afraid there is very much less room to day. It may surprise hon. gentlemen to hear, but it is a fact, that the trade of Halifax and the trade of the Intercolonial Railway is increasing, and I hold in my hand a return showing the inward and outward cars to and from Halifax during the months from 1st November up to the date of my departure from Halifax, and these show a steady increase in the number of cars coming full into Halifax and the number of cars going full out of Halifax. That is, notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Government has subsidised mail steamers, and that we are paying out of our Canadian Treasury to build up mail lines, which absolutely discriminate in their freight rates against our ports and in favor of the United States ports. They transfer a large amount of freight to Portland, which, I think, ought more properly to be landed in a Canadian port; and I hope that, in any renewal of our transatlantic mail subsidies, we will take care that the terminal ports shall be within our own territory. Still, notwithstanding all that, the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway has increased. Now, instead of calling upon the Government to spend a large amount of money in the erection of stores and warehouses, I think I can make a suggestion which will meet the views of my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), and accomplish the common object we have in view. It is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen that a sum has been voted to extend the Intercolonial Railway along the wharves of Halifax. If the Minister of Railways would use a portion of that amount in getting a right of way through some of the smaller properties whose proprietors might not be prepared to give it, I believe we could extend the railway to the wharves, where ample storage accommodation would be provided without the Dominion Government having to expend any money for the erection of stores either at North-street or Richmond. I think that is well worth the attention of the Government. This is a very important matter to us, though it may seem to be a trifle to hon. gentlemen living in the more populous portions of the Dominion; and, as my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), has said, I believe we may look for a

large development of the freight trade of Nova Scotia. I remember hearing questioned the statements of an hon. gentleman, not now a member of this House, respecting the millions of bushels of grain to be shipped from the North-West. I do not intend to discuss those figures now, but my hon. friend has estimated the quantity of apples to be shipped from Halifax at one million barrels. I hope that is true, though his figures are large, and I hope the Government will in every way utilise the Intercolonial Railway to develop this large traffic.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I consider this a very important subject, more particularly for Nova Scotia, and I think it is not altogether unimportant for Canada, for I regard Nova Scotia as being, as it were, the wharf of the railways of Canada, and as the wharf of the railways of Canada, it must of necessity be looked after perhaps a little more particularly than the main line of those railways. I agree very substantially with the remarks that have been made by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I believe, very thoroughly, that these railways should receive not only the due consideration, but the substantial consideration of the Government of the day, and I believe they are receiving that substantial consideration. It might appear to some, on seeing this motion on the paper, and listening to the remarks of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), and the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that this is the first time these things were ever mooted, or that it is the first time the building up of the gap from Digby to Annapolis, or the taking over of the line from Halifax to Yarmouth to make it a part of the Intercolonial Railway, was ever suggested. This has been on the carpet for some time, and it is not true, as the *Halifax Chronicle* stated two or three days ago, that they were the pioneers in this movement. I have had the honor myself of addressing letters to the Railway Department with reference to this very matter, urging upon them the necessity of looking after the western portion of that Canadian wharf; and I am fully satisfied that the Government of the day are taking all these matters into their consideration and are going to do what is just to western Nova Scotia. There is a great tangle in railway matters, as I understand it, in western Nova Scotia; and, although the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has placed the blame upon the Dominion Government, I say the blame does not rest upon the Dominion Government, but rather upon the local Grit Government in Nova Scotia for that tangle. The whole of the subsidy which was granted to the Western Counties Railway was allowed by the local Grit Government to be expended between Digby and Yarmouth, with scarcely a single dollar expended between Annapolis and Digby. Now they come here and blame the Dominion Government for not doing what they allege they should do for western Nova Scotia. I must confess that I congratulate the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Borden), and the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) on their conversion. I am proud to know that at last they have opened their eyes, and now they acknowledge that western Nova Scotia is not a place where blue ruin exists, but that it is a place capable of development, that it is actually developing, and that the farmers and the people generally in western Nova Scotia are not crying out in despair, and are not wallowing in blue ruin, as one would infer from reading the speeches that were made on the other side of the House last Session, in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. It is one thing to speak upon the question of unrestricted reciprocity, it is another thing to come into the House and ask the Government to grant railway subsidies, or to take over a railway. I am also pleased to know that now they have no thought whatever of the debt of the Dominion when they ask the

Dominion Government to take over the road from Halifax to Yarmouth. I suppose they have forgotten the campaign that they carried on in the county of King's and the county of Halifax, during the last election, when they held up the Dominion debt and made it appear as great as possible. Now, however, they lose sight of it altogether when they come into the House and ask the Government to take over a road that will cost quite a number of dollars, and will, perhaps, increase the debt of the Dominion. However, I do not think, myself, that it will increase the debt of the Dominion very much, even if these roads are taken over, or that it will increase it at all, eventually, because I believe that every dollar that is expended in western Nova Scotia the Dominion will recoup four-fold in the future. I believe there is a great future for western Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen must not think that because I am speaking entirely of western Nova Scotia I have not in my mind's eye the whole of the Dominion of Canada, for the building up of the western part of Nova Scotia, the building up of the Province, is the building up of Canada, is the development of Canada. I believe there is a great future in store for western Nova Scotia. We have in the King's and the Annapolis valley, one of the finest valleys in the world. I say unhesitatingly, we can whip the world on apples. There are no other apples in the world that can compete in the London market with the apples that are raised in this valley, nor can any other apples retain their price so well upon that market. We not only have steamers plying from Halifax to London carrying apples, but we also have vessels under private venture engaged in the same occupation from Annapolis to London. The raising of apples is a gold mine in itself. I do not think that the senior member for Halifax exaggerated very much when he said that in the near future there will be a million barrels of apples going from that valley. That may be, because the possibilities of that valley are hardly yet realised. I can take the hon. members of this House through a hundred miles of continuous apple blossoms in June and that you cannot do anywhere else in the world. Then only one-third of the valley is cultivated, only about one third is under fruit cultivation. But we have not only a gold mine there in the apples, we have actual gold mines lying between Liverpool and Annapolis that are just coming into notice. In looking over the statistics published by the Local Government lately, I took the trouble to cull out the different items that have been paid for prospecting licenses in the small district around Whiteburn and Malaga, and hon. members will be somewhat surprised to learn that the sum of \$3,500 has been paid out in one year for these prospecting licenses alone. Now, when I consider the smallness of the district occupied between Liverpool and Annapolis, I think that is a very large amount of money, and it shows that the attention of the outside world is being called to these gold mines between Liverpool and Annapolis. This is for only two mines. I have taken the trouble to go over the royalties for these two mines, and I find that they actually paid into the Treasury of Nova Scotia the sum of \$2,000 in the year 1883. These gold mines only need the usual railway encouragement of government to develop them and bring them prominently before the outside world. We have steam communication between Annapolis and St. John, which is one of the termini of the Short Line Railway. There is a daily communication, I am happy to say, being brought into existence by the present Dominion Government, between St. John and Annapolis, that makes a direct line from Montreal to Halifax. The shortest line that can possibly be run between Montreal and Halifax is by the way of St. John and Annapolis, *via* the daily boat that the Government is assisting to be placed on that route. We have also running from Annapolis a bi-weekly boat to Digby and Boston, and there is also a bi-weekly boat

running from Yarmouth to Boston and a daily boat from Annapolis to Digby, showing that the people are ready and willing to invest their money in the development of that portion of the Dominion. I strongly urge upon the present Dominion Government to take over the road between Halifax and Yarmouth and make it a part of the Intercolonial Railway system. I think that is the proper thing for them to do; it would be a paying investment in the near future, if they should undertake it; and I believe that instead of increasing the deficit that is from year to year appearing upon our Intercolonial Railway Public Accounts, it would help materially in making a surplus upon that railway. I know perfectly well that the Government have this matter under control, that they have it under their consideration, and that practical steps are being now taken, I am credibly informed, to complete the missing link between Digby and Annapolis.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When is it to be commenced? You seem to know.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am not the mouthpiece of the Government on that point. I presume if that question was put on the Order paper in proper form, it would elicit from the Minister of Railways an answer that would cause satisfaction to this House. I am quite satisfied to leave that matter in the hands of the present Administration, knowing that as their policy is one of progress and tends to develop every part of Canada, they will not leave western Nova Scotia neglected.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. JONES (Digby). When the House rose at six o'clock we were discussing the necessity for completing the missing link in the western counties, and I feel I would not be doing my duty to my constituents as a representative of the county which is more particularly interested than any other in the whole Dominion, if I did not unite with the rest of the members from Nova Scotia in urging the completion of that link at as early a date as possible. And while speaking on this question, I am happy to say that for once at least I can agree with the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in nearly all his remarks, and also with the observations of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden). This missing link, as it is called, has had rather a chequered career, and among all the different schemes which have been started for its completion, the one considered most likely to succeed, and that upon which the people of Nova Scotia mainly built their hopes, was that generally known as the Plunkett scheme, and until the close of last Session, we in the western counties, and in fact the people of the whole Dominion, were almost certain that the link would have been put in before this time. Unfortunately, that scheme failed as so many others have done. Notwithstanding that the trade had largely increased on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, and also on the Western Counties Railway, still for one cause or another that road remains unfinished. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) made one remark in which he is a little astray. He said nothing had been done towards the completion of the road since last Session. Last autumn I visited Ottawa, and called upon the Minister of Railways and urged him to have a survey made of the line between Digby and Annapolis. It has since then been made, and I believe the plans are about ready. In order to show how the traffic has increased on the Western Counties Railway, I may mention that the traffic, passenger and freight, is probably three times as large now as it was four years ago. This is principally due to the fact that a very fast steamship has been placed on the route between Yarmouth and Boston, and another is running between Digby and

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

Boston; a great many Americans have come there, and that fact has increased the traffic of the road. It has also been largely increased by the freight that has passed over it. Of course, in discussing this question, it is not intended that hon. members shall occupy the attention of the House for any considerable time; it is a question of most special interest to Nova Scotia, although the completion of the road would undoubtedly benefit the whole Dominion. I trust the Government will see their way clear to complete that branch at as early a day as possible. The time has certainly arrived when we need its completion, and I only voice the sentiment of the people of the whole of Nova Scotia when I say we trust that that branch will be completed before the next two years have passed away. With these remarks, I consider I have done what my constituents would expect, irrespective of party, and what the whole of Nova Scotia would desire to see done, each member rise and state his views in regard to the question which has long been a burning one in that Province.

Gen. LAURIE. I feel the question that has been raised by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) refers more especially to railways actually working and to counties that now have railways. But the mere fact of this discussion having taken a somewhat broader range, of having eventually led to a reference to the proposition made for dealing with the whole of Nova Scotia and making one railway for the western counties and opening up the broad principle of furnishing railway facilities, leads me to point out the peculiar position of the county I have the honor to represent. I cannot say, as some hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have done, that my county can produce an enormous quantity of agricultural produce for shipment to the other side of the Atlantic. I cannot refer to hundreds of miles of apple blossoms, but I can refer to what is of greater advantage to the Dominion, that is, the fish caught off our coasts. I can conceive it is of quite as great importance to the Dominion when I point out that the statistics of the year before last show that no less than \$750,000 in value of fish were caught as the product of the labor of the hard-worked toilers of the sea of Shelburne county. They have as much right to be considered as others. Their desire is to market their produce, not on the other side of the Atlantic, but among our own people, if possible; they desire to build up interprovincial trade. When I look at the Trade Returns, I observe that the Province of Quebec imported of fresh fish from the United States no less than 2,500,000 lbs. in 1887, and I presume the quantity is increasing. Quebec paid a duty on that fish. The consumers of Ontario also purchased a large quantity, on which they paid duty. That fish is caught off the coast in my county, mostly by my constituents, and it is hard that, while they catch those fish, they are unable to place them directly in the markets of our own people. Had we the means of railway communication to do that, the fishermen would not find it necessary to ship to Boston, where the fish are sold in open market, and are purchased for shipment to Montreal and large towns in Quebec and the eastern part of Ontario. We require railway communication, and we require it badly. The feeling of our people is very strong on the subject. I have lately received resolutions passed at a crowded meeting in Shelburne county, and while I will not read the whole of the resolutions, I will read the main portion, in order to show that our people are in earnest in this matter. After giving the reasons, the resolution proceeds to say:

"Resolved, that the Dominion Government be asked to grant a subsidy to aid in affording railway facilities to this county, one of the oldest settled counties in Nova Scotia and which has hitherto so thoroughly been left out in the cold, and that the representative of Shelburne county in the Dominion Parliament be requested to urge upon the Government the needs and the necessities of this county, and to insist that the said subsidy be granted without delay."

I can assure this House that the people of my county are in earnest, and will feel that until their interests are considered, as have been the interests of the inhabitants of the other portions of Nova Scotia, they will not consider they are obtaining that measure of justice to which they are entitled.

Mr. FREEMAN. As this is a little discussion in the interests of the Nova Scotia Railways, I will take the opportunity to say a few words, as I am deeply interested in railways for the western counties. I was very much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), and also those of the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). As I listened to them I remembered very distinctly the utterances of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last year, when the subject of commercial union with the United States was brought up. I remember when that hon. gentleman was undertaking to show us in what way the \$7,500,000 would be provided, of which we would be short in the event of commercial union taking place; he very distinctly told us savings were to be made on railway subsidies. He said: We will shut off that iniquitous bribe, the railway subsidy, we will cut off the whole thing and give no more subsidies to railways. I remember that when his resolution came to a vote in this House that two hon. gentlemen—the member for King's (Mr. Borden) and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones)—voted for his resolution. They declared that they were with him on the subject of cutting away subsidies for railways, and that the Government should not increase the debt by granting any more subsidies, whether in Nova Scotia or anywhere else.

Mr. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me to what resolution he refers?

Mr. FREEMAN. I will explain. And when this afternoon I heard them urging on the Government their duty with regard to granting additional subsidies to and building this link, and amalgamating the lines of railways from Halifax to Yarmouth, I said: "These men have become converted; what in the world has come over them." I was delighted, and I was pleased to see those hon. members favor this project. The hon. member (Mr. Borden) does not properly understand me, I am sure, because if he did he would not object to what I say.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not object. I want to know what resolution you refer to.

Mr. FREEMAN. I refer to the principle of granting subsidies to railways. It just struck me that possibly those gentlemen might change their minds again before the House meets next Session, but I hope they will not. I hope they will not come up here next year and condemn the Government for assisting the railways in the western counties of Nova Scotia. If they do so, however, I will help them a little bit. I will help them to get out of the difficulty if they have not cut the bridge behind them. They will say this, that the Government had already decided to build the link and it did not help them in any way, or that the Government were actually at work in building the link in the railway. That is the way to get out of it. It may be the case that they will condemn the Government for giving us this railway, but I will not suggest any wrong motives to these hon. gentlemen, and I am sure they would not listen to me if I did. But, Sir, what I desire to see built is this railway, this missing link. There is one thing I do not desire—I do not desire that the Government shall spend any more money in any way whatever on the railways of Nova Scotia until they do justice to the county which I have the honor to represent. Some of the gentlemen who have spoken on this motion have been advocating the expenditure of money in the way that will bring grist to their own mills. The senior mem-

ber for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has been talking about his city. He wants some more money expended in Halifax, as though Halifax were the first consideration of this Government, and, indeed, I consider that Halifax is the pet city of this Government. But what about the poor counties of Queen's and Shelburne. For the last 20 years we have been contributing to building railways in Nova Scotia, and yet, we have not one mile of railway in either of these counties. I regret exceedingly to see that the Government have found it necessary to fall in with the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that they have taken away the subsidy for a steamer that ran along the southern shore of Nova Scotia. I do hope, however, that the Government, before the end of the Session, will reconsider that action and that we shall have in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for a subsidy for this steamer. One of my hon. friends here from Nova Scotia, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has told about the million barrels of apples that we shall have from the Annapolis Valley, I believe he is quite within bound in his estimate; but let me inform the House that we have lands in Queen's County that are equally as fertile as the lands in the Annapolis Valley. We have lands there that astonished the Hon. Mr. McLellan, late Minister of Finance, when he came there to pay us a visit and looked around at our beautiful valleys covered with verdure and ready to yield almost any amount of produce. But, Sir, there is no use in our cultivating those lands for we have no railways and no outlet for the produce. Our own local Governments have proved traitor to us. They have made us promises, and promises, and promises, but they never fulfilled their promises. A short time ago, when Sir Charles Tupper announced that liberal policy in the House of Commons to assist the counties in Nova Scotia in building railways, why, Sir, there were hundreds of people in my county who threw up their hats for joy and they have never seen them since. I am proud to say, Sir, that I am here, in the House of Commons, for the express purpose of getting a subsidy for a railway in my county, and I am satisfied that this Government will never allow me to go back to my county and to have to say that they failed us in this the hour of our need. I am sure that before the Session of Parliament ends that we shall have a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile for our railways. I think, perhaps, that I have said enough on this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FREEMAN. I would just say this, Sir, that instead of encouraging this offer which the United States senators were proposing to make to the House of Commons to give them a trip through the United States in order to show them the glory of that country—I would make this proposal to the Government: That before this Session closes, if they give us a good subsidy for our railway in Queen's County, I believe that if we do not give a pleasure trip to all the members of the House of Commons over that road, we will at least give one to every member of the Government, and we will show them our noble land, show them the many opportunities for industries we have in Queen's County, and we will show them too, Sir, our more than noble women who grace our beautiful county.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, after all the arguments we have listened to to-day with respect to our Nova Scotia railways I feel that there is little more to be said. I must say, however, that I most heartily endorse the arguments which have been made before the House in favor of this motion by the member for King's (Mr. Borden), the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), and the other members who have spoken in favor of the acquisition by the Government and the consolidation of the railways in the western part of the Province of Nova Scotia. At present the railways in this portion of the Province are

disjointed and disconnected; they have different tariffs and as far as the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is concerned they are very extravagant. It would be a great boon to that part of the Province of Nova Scotia if the Government were to acquire and to consolidate and operate these railways. Reference has also been made to the syndicate of 1882. That syndicate, I believe, was a *bond fide* affair. The Hon. Mr. Creelman, of Nova Scotia, was in London carrying out the details of that scheme, but unfortunately, about that time, a change of Government occurred in Nova Scotia and that hon. gentleman was recalled. Mr. Vail was sent to London in his stead, and, I believe, in common with most of the people of Nova Scotia, that this gentleman succeeded in killing the whole scheme. This was unfortunate; because, I believe, it was the best piece of railway legislation we ever had in the Province of Nova Scotia. If the Government can see its way clear to take over these railways, in the western part of the Province there is another piece of railway which I think would receive a great impetus in such a case. There is a proposed line of railway through the County of Hants and known as the Hants Central Railway, which was embodied in the Plunkett scheme of 1882, and which was, of course, killed with the rest of that project. If the Government would acquire possession of those western railways, I have not the least doubt that they would construct this line through the County of Hants. If they did so it would shorten the distance between eastern and western Nova Scotia some forty miles.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would that make you solid?

Mr. PUTNAM. Yes; that would make us solid. It is the missing link in our railway communication and it would open up a splendid agricultural district, possessing valuable mines and minerals which, are now undeveloped because of the need of a railway. I consider it would be a very great boon, indeed, to the County of Hants if the Government would carry out this scheme, and I hope that they will see their way clear to do so, as has been proposed by the hon. member for King's.

Mr. LOVITT. The resolution of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) has called forth an expression of opinion from members from all the western counties, and, I suppose, I should have a word to say upon it. It appears to me that the subject is drifting very near to party lines, but I do not think it is necessary to go anywhere near party lines in discussing this question. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) spoke of the mismanagement of the Western Counties Railway, and I quite agree with him that there was considerable mismanagement; but I would like him to mention any railway that has ever been built that is not mismanaged. I think the first act of mismanagement was in not commencing to build the road from Annapolis, the hon. gentleman's own town; and I have no doubt that if it had been commenced there, the railway would not have stopped 18 miles short of Yarmouth. I do not understand that the Government is to blame for that. The Government made a bargain with the company to raise money to complete all of these railway schemes, but reserved to itself the right to use the money deposited in its hands for the purpose of finishing the link between Annapolis and Digby, provided the company fulfilled its agreement. The company has not fulfilled its agreement, and the Government, so far as I understand, is going to use the money to build the link, and no one is more pleased at that than I am. With regard to the consolidation of the railways, I cordially agree with everything that has been said as to the desirability of that, with the exception of the remark made by the hon. member for King's, that the Government should not commence to build the link until it makes arrangements for completing the consolidation. I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman in that, and I hope the

Mr. PUTNAM.

Government will not be influenced by what he said in that respect. I am aware that work has been going on upon this link; surveys have been made; and, so far as I understand, the Government intend to go forward with the work at once, and I shall be pleased to assist them in any way in my power. The hon. member for Queen's objected to the federal subsidy to the steamer being withdrawn, and I heartily agree with him on that question, and I hope his remarks will induce the Government to place the subsidy in the Estimates again. I do not know that I have any more to say on this subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present motion is only for the papers to be brought down, and of course there cannot be the slightest objection to its passing. I am only sorry, on this as on other occasions of a like kind, that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, is unable to be present and to give to the members who have discussed the question this afternoon, and who naturally feel a strong interest in it, any information as to what the correspondence itself details. The hon. gentleman who made the motion, and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) who supported it immediately afterwards, were good enough to make some reference to efforts which I had made in another place to remove or lessen some of the difficulties in connection with the railway system in Nova Scotia. They were right in crediting me with having taken some interest, and in possessing still as strong an interest as I ever did, in the welfare of western Nova Scotia in connection with its railway enterprises. We had to meet, in 1879, a somewhat peculiar state of affairs as regards the railway system of both eastern and western Nova Scotia. In consequence of the great efforts which had been put forth by the Provincial Government to carry on railway extension both east and west, the resources of the Provincial Government for those purposes had been practically exhausted. The Western Railway was left unfinished between Digby and Yarmouth, and the Eastern Railway had been practically abandoned for upwards of a year. We were fortunate enough, in the management of affairs in connection with the Local Administration, to make what we considered a satisfactory arrangement in regard to the eastern railways by which they were extricated from the difficulties in which we found them, and pushed on rapidly to completion. Immediately after that we addressed ourselves to the completion of the western line between Digby and Yarmouth, and were enabled also to make an arrangement by which that road was put in running order. But there were still two serious difficulties to be faced as hon. gentlemen representing western Nova Scotia fully understand. There was, in the first place, a gap between Digby and Annapolis, of about 20 miles, as expensive a piece of road almost as could be found anywhere in Canada, with practically nothing done upon it; and we had the disjointed system of three managements between Halifax and the western terminus at Yarmouth. Besides that, there were difficulties growing out of the arrangements made with the Government in 1873, and the Government that succeeded it in 1874, in connection with the Western Counties Railway. I will not detain the House this evening by repeating the details, which the House has probably heard before, in connection with the difficulties that arose and the efforts made to remove them from time to time. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), in addressing the House this afternoon, was somewhat mistaken in two or three particulars in regard to the present position of the undertaking. He stated that the Government were not altogether blameless, and he specified the points in which he thought they were worthy of censure. In the first place, he thought they were worthy of censure because they had not, after the failure of the Plunkett scheme in 1882, adopted the scheme which was subsidised by the

present Local Government, known as the Joint Stock scheme. I think in that the hon. gentleman was mistaken. The Dominion Government are not worthy of censure for not having concurred in that arrangement. It seemed to me, to my colleagues, and I think to a great many people in the Province, that it was not so advantageous a scheme as that which preceded it, or so advantageous a scheme as might be adopted with the assistance of the Dominion Government. Besides we were not altogether free to enter into that arrangement. One of its conditions, besides many other conditions which appeared burdensome to the Province itself, was that the Windsor Branch should be transferred to the new company, and we were not in a position to make that transfer, because, under the legislation of 1874, the Western Counties Railway Company had still a claim upon it; they had the reversion of the title and they had an Exchequer Court suit pending against us for damages for the non-delivery of the road. Under these circumstances we were unable to enter into the scheme the Local Government had put forward and the scheme subsequently adopted by this House in 1887 was substituted for it. The hon. member for Halifax was not quite correct in stating that the Order in Council to give that scheme effect was made only a few days before the election. It is true, the contract bears date a short time before the dissolution of the House. That, however, was the fault of the company in delaying the completion of its arrangements and getting the contract prepared. The Order in Council which was the basis of that contract and of the whole scheme had been adopted months before, but necessarily could not be put into the form of a contract until all the other arrangements of the company were completed, and until the company were able to give assurances that they were entering into an arrangement which they had a fair prospect of carrying out. But it is said that the Government were derelict in this respect, that the Minister of Finance last year had assured the House that the work of filling in the gap between Digby and Annapolis would be immediately proceeded with, and the hon. member for Halifax said that, the money being voted, it was the duty of the Government to have proceeded immediately with the construction of that work. In making that criticism, I think the hon. gentleman forgot for the moment the provisions of the contract itself. It was necessary, of course, that a reasonable time should be provided in the contract for the completion of the work. The contract had been entered into in January, 1887, and the time for the completion of the work did not expire until about the 1st of September last, so that notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's impression that we had the money voted and were, therefore, in duty bound to carry on the work by constructing the missing 20 miles, we were bound by the terms of the contract to wait until the month of September last before we could be in a position to spend a single dollar of money on the line. When the time had elapsed, the Minister of Railways requested me to prepare, and I did prepare, notices informing the company and Mr. Plunkett, who was likewise a party to the agreement, that their rights under the contract had expired, and that the Government would no longer negotiate with them on the basis of that contract, but held itself free to avail itself of the powers mentioned in the contract to build the 20 miles, and to expend the appropriation which Parliament had made for that purpose. I have no doubt that the understanding which was arrived at when that contract was laid before the House, and when the assurances which were given by the Minister of Finance last Session, will be fully and literally carried out. The Government were unable to do it last autumn, because the time of the company did not expire until early in September, and we felt that it was necessary to make exact surveys of the whole line and make the necessary communications with all those who were parties to the contract and whose rights require to be terminated. I understand that the result of

those surveys—the preparation of the necessary plans and reports—has only been completed within a few days, and the Government is now at liberty to proceed with the work at an early day, without any fear of reproach for being in default in this matter up to the present time. As regards the consolidation of the western railway system, it is, as the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has said, no new scheme at all. It has been urged upon the attention of the present Government, from time to time, by correspondence, as well as by personal interviews and solicitations of members who were interested in the completion and perfection of the western system; but although it would give us very great pleasure, if the requirements of other sections of the country would permit, to make the appropriation necessary for the acquisition of these lines of railway, when I tell the House that the last proposal made in connection with that subject, called for the expenditure of something like \$8,000,000, the House will understand that it is altogether too great an undertaking for us to propose in anticipation of the completion of the 20 miles which have so long remained unfinished from year to year, and which the Government are pledged to Parliament and by the contract, and took power under the contract, to build. I think, therefore, it will hardly be expected, as was intimated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that we ought to consider the propriety of undertaking the work of acquiring the western railway system before the completion of the 20 miles, which have been so long wanted. There is this to be borne in mind, that the acquisition of the Western Counties property, which was a part of the scheme of 1882 and a part of the subsequent scheme of the Provincial Government, was a task much more easily effected by the provincial arrangement than by any arrangement that could be made by the Government of Canada. There exists on the Statute-book, in connection with the origin of those works, powers of acquisition by arbitration and valuation on behalf of the Local Government, whereas the acquisition by the Federal Government would require a purchase by arrangement between the Government and the companies, and one that, perhaps, would call for an expenditure at present of a very much larger sum of money than the actual value would be estimated at by those who would be called upon to make a valuation. I do not for a moment, in saying this, mean to reflect on anything that has been said with regard to the capabilities of the section of country in question. On the contrary, to be truthful, I would have to go beyond the expressions which have been used by gentlemen representing that section in stating the facts as regards the fertility of that part of the Province, and the deserts it has for every kind of encouragement we can give for the expansion of its trade; but, as I said before, in dealing with a scheme like that involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, we have to consider the wants of other sections of the country as well, and it is more than advisable we should do the work which lies immediately at our hands—the completion of the 20 miles, which have so long been undertaken, and which the House was assured would be completed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BORDEN. I am very glad indeed, my motion has had the effect of calling forth such a general expression of opinion from the whole western part of Nova Scotia, and also of bringing out the policy of the Government in regard to this important question. I am sorry, indeed, to learn from the hon. Minister that he does not intend to undertake the consolidation of the western roads as part of the Intercolonial Railway. He stated that the expenditure was altogether too great, that it would involve an expenditure of money of something like \$8,000,000. Well, I think it was unfortunate that he should have mentioned a sum at all, in view of the fact that if those roads are ever

acquired, the cost of acquiring them will be a matter for reference to arbitration; and it is unfortunate that a gentleman occupying the position the hon. gentleman does, should give even an approximate value in advance. But I would refer the hon. gentleman to the estimate made by the leader of the Government of which he was a member, and who brought forward a scheme known as the syndicate scheme.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman heard me correctly or he would not answer me as he is doing. What I said was that the last proposal to the Government on the subject looked for an expenditure of \$8,000,000 for that undertaking. I was contrasting that with the power of expropriation possessed by the Provincial Government.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it would involve a cost of \$8,000,000 to acquire those roads, and I wish to remind him that the leader of the Government of which he was a member estimated, under the syndicate scheme, the cost of acquiring the Windsor and Annapolis Railroad at about \$2,000,000 and the Western Counties Railway much less. Now, it is a fact that the Government practically owns the Windsor Branch, and that they are bound morally, and, I think, legally, to construct the missing link, and, according to the arrangement which the hon. gentleman himself has made with the Western Counties Railway, the Windsor Branch, 32 miles of railway equipped in first class condition, is to be handed back to the Government on the payment of \$500,000. Assuming that the completion of that link will cost some \$700,000, upon the completion of that link the Government gets back the Windsor Branch, so that it is simply a question of what the expropriation of the Windsor and Annapolis and the Western Counties Railway will cost. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the link is to be constructed by the Government, as government work, no matter what it may cost. With regard to the point I made, that the railways should be taken over before the completion of the "link," and from which the hon. member for Yarmouth dissented, I can sympathise with the view taken by the hon. gentleman. He is anxious to have that built at once, and he is afraid that, if the Government wait for the acquisition of the roads, the missing link, so-called, may not be constructed; but I desire again to press upon the Government the extreme importance of hesitating before going any further without carefully examining into the question of the acquisition of these western roads. I hesitated to-day to state fully the strong position I entertained—believing it was not wise to state it in view of the possibility, and what I hope is the probability, that the Government will take a favorable view of the acquiring of the western roads—as to what those roads are worth. I believe there is an enormously strong case to be made in regard to that, and, instead of the Government acting as the hon. junior member for Halifax and I think the hon. member for Annapolis said, to the debt of the country, stating that it was an extraordinary proposition to come from this side of the House, I believe such a course would convert the deficit of the Intercolonial Railway into a profit; I believe that within twenty years at the most, perhaps within ten years after the roads were taken over, the whole complexion of the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway would be changed. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) was the only hon. gentleman who seemed to be rather in a bad temper in discussing this question, and I could not understand that, because he told us that we must not suppose for a moment that this question had never been brought up before, because he had written letters and a great deal had been done by him and his friends towards bringing about this desirable end of consolidating the western railways. I think the hon. gentleman should be thankful to

Mr. BORDEN.

me for having been the means of bringing this out, so that his constituents may know—what I am sure they never did before—that he had been exerting himself in their interests. I propose to put him under a still greater obligation to me in this matter by inserting the following words in my resolution after the words "Nova Scotia" in the last line:—

And of all letters addressed to the Government by any member of this House or any person referring to the same subject.

I am sure the hon. gentleman will be very glad that I should make that proposal, and I have no doubt that the House, in his interest, not in mine, will consent to have those words put in.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am quite willing that the words should be added.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman referring to the syndicate scheme of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, went out of his way to say that no doubt I had made a stump speech condemning that scheme.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Plenty of them.

Mr. BORDEN. If I did make a stump speech in reference to that syndicate scheme, I have not had the bad taste to bring it up here and repeat it, as the hon. gentleman did his speech, and I think with the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jones) that it is a pity that the temper of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) should have been displayed in this House. I thought this was a question which could stand on its own merits, and my only view in bringing it up was to ameliorate, if possible, the condition of the people of western Nova Scotia in regard to it.

Motion agreed to.

#### JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, ONTARIO.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for:

Return of copies of all petitions presented to the Government by the residents of the Township of the Front of Young, County of Leeds, Ont., praying that Jones' Creek in said Township be declared a non-navigable stream, and to allow the Municipal Council to build a low solid bridge across said stream. Also copies of the report of the Engineer on the same.

He said: I make this motion for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice in particular, as well as the other members of the Government, to a substantial grievance which exists in one township in the county I represent. Some thirty years ago, what is known as Jones' Creek was a small stream flowing over Jones' Falls and on five miles into the River St. Lawrence. At that time it was navigable for vessels of five or six feet draught, but of late years it has become filled with débris, so that it is now only navigable for small pleasure boats. The municipal council of the Front of Young wish to place a solid bridge across, which will cost only a few hundred dollars, but, owing to this being a navigable stream, persons owning land at Jones' Falls object to the bridge being put across the stream. I already presented a petition on that subject to the Minister of Public Works, and he sent an engineer out to report upon it. I believe the report has been made, but I have not seen it, and I understand that legislation is necessary before a solid bridge can be built across the stream. That legislation may possibly be necessary in the shape of a Private Bill, and that, of course, means money. The western side of that stream has of late become settled by farmers for a distance of five or six miles, but, to drive to their market town, Brockville, they have to drive seven or eight miles around, which would be saved to them if they had a solid bridge or a bridge of any kind. I want some scheme to be adopted by which the township may be permitted to build a solid bridge across this stream, which is not navigable for any

vessel of size or any sailing craft, and that without the expense for a Private Bill or for building a swing bridge. I bring the matter before the Government in the hope that some plan may be devised by which the grievance—and it is a substantial grievance—may be removed.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. JAMIESON moved for :

Statement or Return of the Government in answer to the request of the Home Government for information as to the working of "The Canada Temperance Act" in the several Provinces of the Dominion.

He said: I have no desire to make a speech in moving this resolution. I understand a return of this kind has been made by this Government at the request of the Home Government, and many enquiries have been made by parties interested in the working of the Canada Temperance Act, for copies of this return, if they could possibly be obtained. I think it is highly desirable that it should be printed and, if necessary, distributed, for the information of those who may desire to see it.

Motion agreed to.

#### SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. KENNY moved for :

Copies of the agreement of 14th December, 1885, between the Dominion Government and the International Railway Company, for the construction of a line of railway from the south bank of the St. Lawrence River, at or near Caughnawaga, to Harbor of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton, and through Township of Salisbury to Moncton. Also, for copies of any and all changes that may have been made in said agreement, and of the Orders in Council relating thereto. Also, for copies of any and all transfers or assignments of said agreement or contract, and of all Orders in Council relating thereto.

He said: The object of my motion is to call the attention of Parliament and the country to the very unsatisfactory condition of the Short Line Railway. In doing so I desire, first, to call the attention of the House to the agreement which was entered into for the construction of that road. It bears date December, 1885, and is an agreement between the International Railway Company and the Government of Canada, and provides for subsidies for the construction of a line of railway from the south bank of the St. Lawrence River, at or near Caughnawaga, to the Harbor of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton, and through the Township of Salisbury to Moncton. I will not weary the House with reading this agreement, but with your permission I will put it into the hands of the *Hansard* reporter. Merely, *en passant*, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the 8th clause, which reads :

"That the Company shall commence the works embraced in this agreement within six months of the date thereof, and shall complete the whole of said works on or before the first day of July, 1889, time being declared to be material, and of the essence of this agreement."

At page 47 of the Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals a synopsis of the whole transaction will be found, and a reference is there made to the provision :

"For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, after the report of competent engineers, a subsidy not exceeding \$170,000 per annum, for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on bonds of the company undertaking the work, per year for fifteen years, \$170,000."

"In 1885 it was amended by providing for a line of railway from the south bank of the St. Lawrence River opposite or near Montreal to the harbors of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury."

And the subsidy was increased to \$250,000 for 20 years. The report then recites :

"An application having been made for the said subsidies by the International Railway Company, and they having agreed to conform to

the necessary conditions and requirements, and having evidenced their ability to construct and operate the road, entry into contract with them was authorised by an Order in Council of the 19th November, 1885, and such contract was executed on the 14th of December, 1885, they undertaking to complete a line from a point on the south bank of the St. Lawrence at or near Caughnawaga, about nine miles above Montreal, to connect with the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton by the 1st of July, 1889."

Subsequently, I find that the International Railway Company disposed of their interests in this contract to the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company, and that company was accepted as contractor by an Order in Council dated 13th November, 1886, the arrangement made thereunder bearing date 6th December, 1886. The total subsidies payable amounted to \$250,000 a year for a term of twenty years, and it subsequently—

"Became necessary so to apportion this amount as to secure the building of the links to connect with the roads already in existence in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia leading to harbors named."

The sum of \$71,000 was appropriated for the section from the River St. Lawrence to Lennoxville, the sum of \$115,500 was appropriated to that portion of the road between Moose River and Mattawamkeag and for the portion thence to Fredericton and Moncton, the remaining distances by the Intercolonial Railway, \$63,400. I find further the charter of the Atlantic and North-Western, and then by an indenture dated 6th December, 1886, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have obtained a lease in perpetuity of the lines and interests of the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company. So, Sir, the contractors are the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and from the first it was understood that the road would be built by that company. Now, when I tell the House that although this contract will expire on the 1st of July next, and that on that portion of the road which passes through the Atlantic Provinces, on that section of the line from Harvey and Fredericton to Moncton, absolutely nothing has been done, that there has been no location and no survey, hon. gentlemen will recognise how the essence of that contract—time—has been adhered to. The non-fulfilment of this contract, or even delay in its fulfilment, is a palpable injustice to the Maritime Provinces, and I contend is a wrong to all Canada. I am so much impressed with the importance of the matter that I take this most formal manner to bring it before the notice of the House, and I have not done so until I have tried in vain to ascertain from the contractors, by repeated applications, when they proposed commencing work on that section which passes through the Maritime Provinces, and when they expect to have it finished. But as my efforts to obtain that information were fruitless, I find it becomes my duty to draw the attention of Parliament to it. We are not here to discuss the merits of the Short Line Railway. That was disposed of in 1885 by this Parliament. We are not here to discuss whether it is advisable in the public interest or not, but it is my duty to call the attention to the breach of this contract and to contend that it shall be carried out in its entirety. This is an arrangement in regard to which the present Minister of Public Works in his place in Parliament applied the most emphatic language; it is an arrangement to which the faith of Parliament is pledged; and I say that an arrangement to which such emphatic language has been applied by the Minister of Public Works, speaking in his place in Parliament for the Government, is an arrangement which Parliament should not allow to be slighted. If contracts entered into as deliberately as this was are allowed to be ignored or even slighted endless confusion must ensue. To-day it happens that the Maritime Provinces are sufferers by this breach of contract, to-morrow it may be some other portion of the Dominion, and I regret to say that the impression prevails in the Maritime Provinces that their interests in this matter have been ignored in a way that would not have occurred if the road had passed through a



more central or more populous part of the Dominion. We feel keenly in this matter, inasmuch as we had to contribute our quota to the very large expenditure incidental to and necessary to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we made that contribution recognising that it was a great national work; and, having submitted gracefully to that large expenditure, we consider we have not only been unfairly treated by this great company but we have been shabbily treated. This is a matter which to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may appear very insignificant, but it is a matter which concerns us very much indeed in Maritime Provinces, and I appeal with confidence to the Government to see that the wrong perpetrated shall be righted. The contractors, as I have said, are the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I profess the greatest admiration for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the splendid manner in which they built their wonderful road from Montreal to Vancouver. In point of time and excellence of workmanship it has never been surpassed, and in my opinion there is no single act since Confederation which has done so much to raise the status of Canada before the world as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has not only raised us in the estimation of foreign nations, but, what has been of equal advantage, it has given our people a spirit of self-confidence which they never possessed before, and the fact that the road has been managed under the direction of Canadians has added to our national prestige. I contend that the gentlemen connected with the road deserve well of Canada. It is to me a subject of very great regret to refer in the way in which I have been obliged to refer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a company which deserves so well of this country; and it is to be regretted that a company which has built so many thousands of miles of railway so satisfactorily should now hesitate or demur in regard to building some 100 miles of road, and thereby weaken their hold upon the sympathy of the people. I have referred before to the very large expenditure necessarily involved in the construction of that road. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was approaching completion at Montreal it was recognised as the great national highway, and that it would not be complete until it had access to the winter ports of Canada; and the Government of the day recognising this, and recognising that it was only a matter of justice to the Maritime Provinces that the road should be extended to their harbors, took the matter in hand. I find that the attention of Parliament was first called to it by Sir Charles Tupper in April, 1884, this being the first notice I can find of it in *Hansard*. He expressed himself thus:

"Then a very strong feeling has grown up in the Maritime Provinces, and not only in the Maritime Provinces but throughout Canada, because, I believe, that from British Columbia down through the North-West Territories, through the Province of Ontario, and in the Province of Quebec, there has been a strong and general sentiment that this great inter-oceanic line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be incomplete if we were obliged to have our Atlantic terminus in a foreign country. I believe that sentiment is not at all confined to the Province of Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or the Province of New Brunswick, but I believe it has taken just as deep a hold of the minds of our friends in the other Provinces almost as it has in the Maritime Provinces. Although every effort has been made to render the operation of the Intercolonial Railway as successful as possible, although more has been accomplished in the development of the country, in the development of the trade and business of the country through the agency of the Intercolonial Railway than any person on either side of this House a few years ago supposed to be possible, still we have found we were too heavily handicapped by the distance, and that we could not—reluctantly as we were driven to the conclusion, we have been driven to the conclusion, by the force of circumstances and by the practical results, that it is impossible for the ports of St. John and Halifax to compete with the nearer ports of Portland and Boston, in the United States. Under these circumstances, the attention of the Government has been drawn, as I have said on one or two occasions before in this House, to the best means by which we ought to secure a realisation of that which we all desire, the Atlantic terminus being in Canadian territory as well as the Pacific terminus, and thus be placed in a position to fairly compete for the great transcontinental trade and traffic that we

**Mr. KENNY.**

all know must flow over that line. Although that may involve the necessity of passing for a certain portion of that line through a foreign country, we believe that even that is a comparatively insignificant point compared with the great importance of having the ocean ports both on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts within the borders of our own country, and using the trade and business of that great railway to build up great ports and points of communication for the traffic of the eastern and western world, for the purpose of practically extending the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal, its present terminus, to St. Andrew's, St. John, Halifax and Sydney."

Again, in the course of the same speech, the hon. gentleman made the following reference to that work:

"In fact, I believe that, within a very brief period—I have stated four years as the term in these resolutions—this line of communication will be perfected, and we will have the satisfaction of finding that we have the complete realisation of our hopes and expectations in reference to the transcontinental traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to our ports. The House is aware that I have on former occasions discussed the propriety of this Government giving subsidies to local lines of railway. The questions with which I have been dealing up to this point, of course, have a broad and national consideration. They are founded upon a policy that is recognised and has been recognised from the first as the first duty we owed to our country, and that is to obtain by the construction of a national line of railway the closest possible intercommunication between one section of our country and another. The great disadvantage under which Canada has labored, if it may be regarded as a disadvantage, was the remoteness of important sections of our common country from one another, and we have all regarded it as a first duty we owed to the country to endeavor to remove and obviate that as far as possible by diminishing the distance between all the important points of communication in the several sections of our country, thus bringing them as closely as we could together. Not only commercially but socially, the greatest possible advantage may be fairly expected from shortening the distance of intercommunication between the great commercial centres of the country and the outlying portions of it.

I know that the reading of these extracts is very tedious to the House, but I am desirous of placing before Parliament what were the intentions of the Minister and what were the intentions of the Government when this matter was introduced. It was evidently not their intention that this road should end at Mattawamkeag. It was not their intention that Boston or Portland should be used as the terminus of this great railway. Sir Charles Tupper spoke not only with the prestige of a Minister of the Crown, but he spoke with an intimate personal knowledge of the whole transaction and his views are entitled to every consideration. I am much surprised, Sir, considering that the views of that hon. gentleman on this point were known to the directors and managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they did not receive more consideration at their hands. There is no uncertain sound about Sir Charles Tupper's utterances on this matter. Looking at the history of this transaction, I find that the chief engineer of railways, in his report dated 3rd of April, 1884, refers to the construction of the road from Montreal to Moncton, and not to Mattawamkeag. He makes the following report, which with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will hand to the *Hansard* reporter. It is quite evident from this that the chief engineer never contemplated that the road would end at Mattawamkeag. I know from my personal knowledge—and gentlemen who are now in the House are fully aware of it—that this matter received particular attention from the members in this House from the Maritime Provinces, and I find that those gentlemen addressed a memorial to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways in Canada, dated Ottawa the 6th February, 1884. As the memorial is very short I will read it:

"To the Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, O.B., K.C.M.G.,  
Minister of Railways and Canals.

"The memorial of the undersigned members of the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada humbly represents:

"That it is a matter not only of importance to the Dominion, but of justice to the Eastern Maritime Provinces, that the shortest and most advantageous railway connection should be established between the present eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal and the seaports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and your memorialists believing that such route is the one projected by way of the South-Eastern Railway line from Montreal to Sherbrooke, and thence by the International and Short Line Railways, connecting at Fredericton,

and the Intercolonial, respectively request you to recommend to the Government the granting of such aid to said railways as will secure the speedy construction and equipment of that line. And as in duty bound your memorialists will ever pray, &c., &c.

(Signed)

CHARLES H. TUPPER,  
JOSIAH WOOD,  
GEORGE E. FOSTER,  
JOHN WALLACE,  
HENRY W. PAINT,  
JOHN McDUGALL,  
P. LANDRY,  
THOS. TEMPLE,  
C. J. CAMPBELL,  
EDWARD HACKETT,  
K. F. BURNS,

W. BOWES DALY,  
C. EDWIN KAULBACK,  
J. R. KENNY,  
W. H. ALLISON,  
A. C. MACDONALD,  
D. B. WOODWORTH,  
WILLIAM McDONALD,  
JOHN F. STAIRS,  
H. CAMERON,  
FRED. C. BRECKEN.

"OTTAWA, 6th February, 1884."

This shows, Sir, what were the intentions of these gentlemen who carried on a long correspondence with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as regards the route to be followed by that road. I believe that during the recess between the Sessions of 1884 and 1885 my friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), my friend from York (Mr. Temple), my friend from Kent (Mr. Landry), and the then representatives of Halifax (Messrs. Daly and Stairs) prosecuted their correspondence and negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that effect was given to this in the following Session of Parliament, when this resolution was proposed. It was moved on 15th June, 1885, and formed part of the railway resolutions:

"Also for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead, Lake Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury, a subsidy not exceeding \$80,000 per annum for twenty years, forgoing in the whole, together with the subsidy authorised by the Act 47 Vic., cap. 8, a subsidy not exceeding \$250,000 per annum, the whole of which shall be paid in aid of the construction of such line for a period of twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work.

This resolution, as will be noticed, endorses the views expressed in the memorial. Subsequently the matter was moved in committee by the present hon. Minister of Public Works, and any hon. gentleman who takes interest in this matter, and who refers to *Hansard*, at page 2574, 1st July, 1885, will find that the Minister of Public Works gave us a very exhaustive explanation of the reasons which induced the Government to select the route which they then recommended to Parliament. The Minister goes on to say:

"I have only to see which of these lines is the shortest, which is the best, and which we should adopt, in order to carry out the policy of Parliament and this Government, of connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal with the harbors of the lower Provinces by the shortest route. The result of that examination is, that the Government have come to the conclusion to recommend that this line, the Mattawamkeag route, be adopted as the shortest and the best line."

Again the hon. Minister says:

"This vote is a heavy one, no doubt, but it is a vote which, after all, will give good return to the country, it will secure our connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific by the shortest route possible under the circumstances. Of course, if we do not build this direct line we would have to see our trade go from Montreal to Portland. Then all the advantages of the terminus of such a great railway in winter would be to the benefit of the United States. We do not wish that. In the same way that we have taken care that our railway shall not be tapped in British Columbia for the benefit of the United States of America, our enterprising neighbors, who have their own rival railway, the Northern Pacific, so we thought that we should not allow them to benefit at the Atlantic end of the railway; or, after all the sacrifices we have had to make, to obtain the terminus at Portland or elsewhere in the United States. We thought the railway should end on our own territory on the Atlantic shores, so as to give us the benefit of the cargoes which are to be sent abroad and the return cargoes which would secure to us the benefit of that foreign trade. Under these circumstances, we expect that Parliament will not refuse to make this sacrifice again in order to complete this system. After the large sacrifices the country has made for the opening of the North-West by the Canadian Pacific Railway, though this vote of \$90,000 a year for twenty years is considerable, nevertheless we think it is not such as to warrant a refusal on the part of Parliament. Parliament would wish to complete its work by linking the two oceans by its railway route, and therefore we believe that the vote which we are asking will be cheerfully granted by Parliament."

And again the Minister says:

"The Government will have to make an arrangement with the company undertaking this work, and will take such means as will secure the completion of the line and its working from end to end. I said the other day that we would take special care in the arrangements with the company that the portion of the line to Salisbury would be completed as well as the other portion. It covers the whole ground."

It will be noticed, Sir, that the reason given by the hon. the Minister for the selection of this route was because it was the shortest line to the harbors of the Maritime Provinces and that the Government policy was based on this. I find that the gentlemen who then represented Halifax in Parliament (Messrs. Daly and Stairs) and who had taken a very great interest in this discussion also addressed the House. Mr. Stairs spoke as follows:—

"Mr. STAIRS. This question is so important to the Maritime Provinces that I must ask permission to point out some of the reasons which induce me to support the line which has been chosen by the Government. . . . I think the chief engineer estimated the distance from Fredericton to Salisbury at 95 miles, and the distance as given by the Minister, I understood, was the distance which was necessary to reach St. John. But of course it is necessary to reach Halifax, which requires about 113 miles. But the whole length which it will be necessary to construct to reach the ports in Nova Scotia will be something like 300 miles.

"There is another important matter that should be considered. It is that the resolutions are to provide for one complete line to Salisbury, from the south shore of the St. Lawrence. It is absolutely necessary that it should be one line, not a line worked or operated by different companies and under different control. The Government have entered into a contract to give the people of the lower Provinces this one line to Salisbury, Nova Scotia, and connections with St. John and St. Andrews, and possibly, at some future day, with Louisburg. If that is the case, it would be wise for the Government to consider the advisability of providing, at some future stage, that a condition should be imposed upon the company which makes the contract for the construction of the line, that it should be completed and a junction effected with the Intercolonial, and that it should not be permitted to stop at any intermediate points. This is of vast importance to the lower Provinces, and I trust when the Bill is introduced such a condition will be inserted. . . . There is another most important point in connection with the interest of the Maritime Provinces, and it is that the line from Montreal to Salisbury shall be under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will read letters which have been received from the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which will throw some light upon this point, and will answer, to a certain extent, some of the objections urged to these resolutions by the hon. member for West Durham."

The letter referred to by Mr. Stairs, from Mr. Stephen the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, dated 25th February, 1885, and addressed to Mr. Daly, the former member for Halifax, was as follows:—

"I am in receipt of the letter of the 24th instant, signed by yourself and Messrs. Wood and Stairs, upon the subject of the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Maritime Provinces, so as to connect it with the ports of St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and Louisburg.

"With reference to the matter of the location of such extension as you refer to, I beg to say that my opinion remains unchanged by the various surveys that have been made. On the contrary, my previous opinion has been confirmed, and I am fully satisfied that the best line would be a long running line as directly as possible from Montreal *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead and Fredericton to Moncton, utilising existing lines as far as practicable. I may further say that if the Government should decide adequately to subsidise such line, it could, in my opinion, be completed within two years from the date of the contract.

"I estimate that a first-class road, thoroughly equipped, would involve a capital cost of \$12,500,000. While I am not now in a position to commit my colleagues to an actual offer to undertake the work, I feel safe in saying that with a subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 20 years the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company would be willing to enter into a contract with the Government to make the direct connection, as above stated. Speaking for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I may say that, in my opinion, if such a railway were built, the latter company would undertake to lease and operate it, provided suitable provision were made for the carrying of freight over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax.

"I may add that Moncton would be the proper point to connect the Louisburg Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway."

In addition, there is another letter from Mr. Stephen, of a later date. It is dated 16th June, 1885, and is as follows:—

"Replying to your letter of the 16th June on the subject of the proposed short line between Montreal and the sea-ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I have to say that the route indicated therein is, in the light of our present knowledge, the best that has been proposed, and this route is preferred by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to any other that has been suggested.

"I will say, further, that it is the desire of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to take up this scheme as a natural and necessary supplement to the Canadian Pacific Railway as it now exists."

"The company will be ready without loss of time to enter into negotiations with the Government for carrying out this project, as soon as the necessary legislation is obtained."

Mr. Stairs goes on:

"I think, in view of those two letters, there is a possibility, almost a certainty, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company being able to secure this line and work it to the Maritime Provinces. One of the reasons why I am supporting the present line is, because we have a better chance, in fact, the only chance, of securing their assistance in this work if we adopt it. \* \* \* In view of the expenditure that has taken place in the North-West and in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people of the Maritime Provinces have a right to ask for a sufficient subsidy to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to own that road."

I have read this speech of Mr. Stairs, who devoted a great deal of time, as hon. gentlemen who are listening to me know, to the consideration of the question, and his views are an important addition to its discussion. The letters of Mr. Stephen, then president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, are interesting to me in view of certain references which were made to some remarks of mine recently by a very high authority on Canadian Pacific Railway matters. It will be noticed that Mr. Stephen in the course of his correspondence expresses the opinion that the road could be and would be built within two years from the date of signing the contract. The contract was signed in December, 1886. Now, it appears that while this matter was under discussion in the House, there were some misgivings in the minds of some hon. gentlemen as to the very portion of the road on which no work has been done. By some very curious coincidence or by some remarkable fatality, misgivings were expressed in Parliament in reference to the construction of that very portion of the road to which I am now calling attention; and, Sir, these expressions of anxiety were met by the following statement from the hon. Minister of Public Works (*see* page 3258, *Hansard*, July 10, 1885):—

"I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the Government makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, and to take advantage of this vote of money, of \$250,000 during 20 years, the Government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith; the faith of Parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as Parliament wishes."

It will be noticed the hon. Minister of Public Works is most emphatic in his language. He then spoke with a perfect knowledge of the intentions of the Government, and he also had just heard read the letters of the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, announcing that the line selected was the one the Canadian Pacific desired, and that work would be completed within two years from the signing of the contract. The Minister of Public Works was then quite warranted in speaking emphatically as he did. But these positive statements did not appear to satisfy my hon. friend the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), who felt called upon, when the Bill was under consideration, to propose an amendment submitting that the work should be commenced, and prosecuted at both ends simultaneously. That amendment was met by the following statement from the Minister of Public Works:—

"I do not think that this is an amendment which should be made, as if it were carried instead of helping the enterprise it would throw obstacles in its way. Other hon. gentlemen may come forward and ask that work on other portions of the line shall be prosecuted simultaneously. That is not done anywhere; we see no such provision in any charter; no road is undertaken in that way. After the explanations I gave just now, that the contract which the Government will have to make, will be made in such a way as to secure the completion of the line, taking care that the heaviest portions of the line may not be left to be built, and paid with an amount only equal to the easiest portions of the line, but that the different portions may be paid according to the character of the work to be performed—under these circumstances I hope the hon. gentleman will not persist in his motion. If he does, of course, I must ask hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill to vote against the amendment."

The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) did proceed with his motion; the House was divided, and the amendment was carried.

Mr. KENNY.

ment, on this positive statement from the Minister of Public Works, was lost. Now, a very high authority on Canadian Pacific Railway matters has stated that in some remarks I made in the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax, I drew an unfair inference from some remarks of his and of Sir George Stephen. I can only say in reply, and I think hon. gentlemen who take an interest in the question will bear me out, that it is no incorrect inference to say that when the Canadian Pacific Railway signed that contract it was never intended or supposed that the road should end at Mattawamkeag. I may be told that the contract has not actually expired, and will not expire until the 1st of July next; but hon. gentlemen know it is physically impossible to complete that road by 1st of July next, and that therefore there must be a default in this contract. It is no "incorrect inference," at all events after reading the letters we have heard read and which were written by the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to say that at that time it was never supposed that the road would not be completed by the 1st of July, 1889. Otherwise, the hon. the Minister of Public Works would not have expressed himself as positively as he did, nor could it have been supposed that the road was to end at Mattawamkeag. Therefore, whatever change has come over the spirit of the dream of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, must have come subsequent to the date of this correspondence. Parliament then voted the money in accordance with the Bill which provided for the extension of the road to Mattawamkeag, and I do not believe that Parliament voted that money for a road that was to end there. It was purposely stated that the intention of the Government and Parliament was that we were to have a road which would carry the trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to our Atlantic ports, that the money was voted for the whole road, and that to take a portion of the money and only build a portion of the road would be violating the intentions of Parliament. I find that the 8th clause of this agreement specially stipulates time to be essential and to be the essence of the agreement. Now, it would be simply trifling with the House to say that, under any construction that can be put upon this document, the contractors would be warranted in throwing up the work at Mattawamkeag. The conditions of that contract, I contend, should in the public interest be adhered to strictly, and that no matter how influential a contractor may be, when a contract is entered into so deliberately as this was—because this was a matter of arrangement between the Government and this company intended to do simple justice to the Lower Provinces—a contract entered into under these circumstances should be strictly adhered to, and any deviation or delay in its fulfilment is a positive injustice to the people of the Atlantic Provinces. This matter has attracted a good deal of attention in the Maritime Provinces, so much so that public meetings have been held and resolutions passed which have found their way to Parliament. I attended, as a member of the Chamber of Commerce, one of these meetings called to consider this question among others, and I was called upon by the president to express my views. I am reported in the newspapers as having expressed myself to this effect:

"The next we heard of the matter was a few months later, the summer or autumn of '86, when Sir George Stephen and Mr. Van Horne visited Halifax. On that occasion they were called upon by the representative of the *Herald*, and they consented to be interviewed; and, among other things, they said that the construction of the road would be almost immediately commenced, at both ends simultaneously, and that within eighteen months the Hong Kong fast mail train would be running from Halifax to Montreal in 18 hours. Mr. Kenny added that he had not seen the paper lately, but that was his recollection of the interview."

Well, I was then speaking of what I had read in 1886, and this meeting was in 1889, but what I had read in 1886 had been such pleasant reading to me that it impressed itself vividly upon my mind. My attention was called, a few days afterwards, to the following article, which appears in

the *Montreal Gazette*, 11th January, 1889. It seems that the ubiquitous reporter had taken the trouble to carry to Mr. Van Horne a report of my statement at Halifax, and this gave rise to the following article:—

"A *Gazette* reporter called upon Mr. W. C. Van Horne, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, yesterday afternoon, with reference to the meeting of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, at which the Canadian Pacific Railway was denounced as having broken faith in regard to the short line to be constructed between Harvey and Moncton. Mr. Van Horne said it seemed to him that the people of Halifax were showing a little undue haste in accusing the Canadian Pacific Railway of not living up to its promises. It was hardly two weeks since the first section of the short line between Montreal and Mattawamkeag was completed. Mr. Kenny's inference of what Sir George Stephen and he had stated at Halifax was not correct. They did say that it was the intention of the company to commence work at both ends in order at completion to connect with the railway system of the Maritime Provinces at the earliest possible date, and they did commence the work in eastern Maine almost as soon as it was commenced in the vicinity of Montreal. They never thought of doing any work on the Moncton section until the line was completed between Montreal and Mattawamkeag, and they never promised to do so."

Well, I certainly had no intention of misquoting these gentlemen, and, recognising how easy it is to make a mistake when one is speaking solely from memory, I referred to what had appeared in reference to the matter in the public press, and I found in the *Halifax Morning Herald* of the 23rd June, 1886, the following:—

"A *Herald* reporter called on Sir George Stephen and Mr. Van Horne, yesterday, and was accorded an interview.

"What progress is being made with the Short Line to Montreal? Was asked of Sir George.

"He replied: The line from Montreal to the Maine boundary will be in operation by the first of December (1886). Our own engineers have examined the surveys and are now making the final location of the line across the State of Maine. We expect to let the contracts in a few weeks; work will commence at both ends, and we will have the whole road from Montreal to Moncton in running order by the fall of 1887.

"What time will you make between Halifax and Montreal over the Short Line when completed?

"We intend to run through fast express and mail trains in connection with the Hong Kong line in fifteen hours.

"The Hong Kong line?

"Yes. That is not an idle phrase but a perfectly true forecast of what is going to be. Why, the Canada Pacific will only be completed when Hong Kong is the Eastern and Liverpool the Western terminus. And Halifax can do a great deal towards speeding the accomplishment of that scheme."

As I said before, I regret exceedingly if my understanding of what those gentlemen said on that occasion was not correct, but really with the language now before me, with those very emphatic words of the senior officers, the president and the vice president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who told us that work was to commence at both ends, and that the whole line would be finished in the fall of 1887, I can only say that if I drew an incorrect inference of their views and of what they intended, I regret it exceedingly. Very great importance was attached to the visit of those gentlemen on that occasion, and still more importance was attached to their utterances. Their visit was a source of pleasure, and I hope they will come again and stay long, but still it would have been more pleasant for me to have heard the whistle of the Hong Kong mail express, as promised; but we did not hear it in 1887, and we have not heard it in 1888, and I am afraid we shall not hear it in 1889. However, we in the Maritime Provinces are a people of great faith, and we have heard that faith may move mountains, and we hope that it may move the Canadian Pacific Railway Company so that, up and down the hills of Nova Scotia and through the county of my hon. friend from Westmoreland, and through the lands of Albert and Sunbury and Queen's, and over that magnificent structure, that lasting monument of the zeal and energy of my hon. friend from York, the bridge at Fredericton, we shall hear the whistle of the Hong Kong express there even yet. The delay in this matter is to us in the Maritime Provinces incomprehensible. We know that a company that has done so much in the way of railway building and railway equipment and railway management as the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company has done could easily build, if it were so disposed, 113 miles of railway; and that very much aggravates the offence, because we know that the president has told us he could have built that road by the end of 1887, and here it is 1889, and not a blow has been struck in that portion of the road which passes through the Atlantic Provinces. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company adheres to its agreement as long as it is passing through the Province of Quebec, or even through the foreign State of Maine, but, as soon as it puts its foot in the Atlantic Provinces, the first time it is called upon to spend a dollar in the Atlantic Provinces, it breaks its agreement, and I say that is a palpable injustice to those people. The delay is incomprehensible, because it cannot be for financial reasons. I say that because it was only in January last that the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company issued an address which I read with a great deal of pleasure, which was copied into all the newspapers of Canada, and I think was also copied into the English press, announcing the position which his company occupied financially and otherwise; and, as he declared himself, it occupied a strong position. Well, the company which occupied such a strong position, as I believe that company does, need not be disturbed about the building of 113 miles of railway. Considering the amount of money that the people of the Maritime Provinces have contributed to the treasury of that company, it is not too much to ask them to carry out their contract as to the construction of that 113 miles. It is therefore not a matter of finance, and I say that again, because the manner in which the bonds of that road were issued proved it. I call the attention of the House to the fact that, for convenience in carrying out the contract, the subsidy was divided into three parts, and I find that the bonds have only been issued in the two sections which terminate at Mattawamkeag, and that the bonds have not been issued on the sections from Harvey to Fredericton and thence to Moncton. Now, Mr. Speaker, I remember very well that when these bonds were issued it was proclaimed that they had been placed on most advantageous terms, on terms more advantageous than any similar bonds had ever been floated before. Well, Sir in an ordinary commercial transaction, if a man gets all that he asks for an article, or more than he demanded, his usual habit is to dispose of all that he has for sale; and if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I must suppose, at that time fully intended to carry out the contract, why did they not issue all the bonds? Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with financial operations in London know that it is easier to float a large amount where you have perfect security to offer than to float a small amount, and as the terms of placing that amount were so favorable, I think it is exceedingly to be regretted that all the bonds were not placed at that one time. I hope it does not mean: no bonds, no road. I mentioned before that we are not here to discuss the merits or the demerits of the Short Line Railway. It has been contended that the economy of distance was not as great as was first supposed; but there can be no material change, there has been no upheaval of nature since the contract was entered into; the distance is just the same, no more and no less than it was when the contract was entered into, so I do not think that would be accepted by this Parliament or by the Government of the day as a valid excuse for not adhering to this contract. It is more desirable in the public interests and in the interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces to-day than it was when the contract was entered into. When it is completed to Fredericton at that point it will intersect a new line of railway from Fredericton and Woodstock, thence to Edmundston, and then to Rivière du Loup; and that is an inducement with the people of the Maritime Provinces to press for the construction of the railway. I referred to the fact that this question had excited great attention in the

Maritime Provinces, and that public meetings had been held. Many hon. gentlemen now listening to me and members of the Cabinet are aware that the chief magistrates of Fredericton, Moncton and Halifax made a pilgrimage up here in a most inclement season of the year to interview the Government and place before them the importance which their people attached to the early completion of this contract. I am glad to say that when these gentlemen returned they came back with heads erect and hearts elated, and satisfied with the assurance which had been given them that the contract would be carried out. So far as I am personally concerned I believe in the very positive assurances that were given in Parliament by the Ministers of the day, and it is for that reason that I have quoted the remarks of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, who were leading Parliament in these debates. I have quoted them, first of all, to show what the intentions of the Government were in bringing this matter to the notice of Parliament, and what Parliament intended when it adopted the suggestion. Therefore, in my own mind, I am quite satisfied that the road will be built. But I go one step further than that, and I say the contract should be carried out, that the road should be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that it was intended from the first to be one continuous line from ocean to ocean, that it was not to end at Mattawamkeag or any intermediate point, that it should be built, as I say, under the original contract, which ought now to be carried out. Now, Sir, I do not wish to conceal from the House or from the Government that, in the Maritime Provinces, we feel keenly the manner in which we have been treated in this matter. I have said before that we submitted as gracefully as people could be expected to submit to the very large expenditure incidental to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We viewed it on broad national grounds. I say we feel it keenly, and the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House feel it particularly so, because, I may say, that we risked our political existence at the last general election in defending that very policy which brought this Canadian Pacific Railway into existence. One of the greatest charges made against the Government of to-day, and one that we had to meet at every meeting, in every canvass, was the enormous expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We defended it on broad, national grounds, and having done so, it does seem unfair to us that the very first time this company, which has received such enormous sums of money from the Treasury of Canada, is called upon to spend its first dollar in the Maritime Provinces, is the first time it breaks faith with the people of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I made the statement that as yet there is no default. I admit that, and if the Minister of Justice were to tell me that there were no default I should be obliged to admit that there is no legal default; but I say it is absolutely impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry out its contract as it should. Not only that, but I regret to say—and I have endeavored to inform myself on the point—that I can see no disposition on the part of the contractors to carry out their contract. I should not have brought up this question here if I could have secured from the company a reply to the very simple question: When do you propose commencing work on this section of the road, and when do you expect to have it finished? But as I could not secure an answer to plain and repeated questions of that kind, I felt it my duty in this House, formally to call the attention of Parliament to the case, relying, as I said before, on the Government of the day to see that justice is done to the Maritime Provinces in this matter. I know that the Canadian Pacific Railway have done marvels, that their work has never been suppressed, and although I have animadverted in this matter upon the conduct of that company, I consider, nevertheless, that it is a

Mr. KENNY.

company which has strong claims upon Canada, which has done much to develop Canada, which has done much to make Canada known and make her respected abroad. Consequently it is a subject of extreme regret for me to be obliged to refer in the way I have done to the conduct of that company, when it is called upon to break ground and build its first line of railway in New Brunswick. Now, Sir, I know that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done wonders, I know they can do everything but impossibilities, and I know that the completion of that contract is an impossibility, but I feel it my duty to lay this statement of the matter before the House in order that justice might be done to the people of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a point of order. I did not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman while he was speaking. The hon. gentleman has stated that a document which he did not read he would put in and hand to the reporter. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware that we have hitherto objected to this practice. We have allowed it only in some cases, such for example as the financial statement, when the Minister of Finance, after having given a synopsis of statements, hands them to the reporters; but in all other cases we have always objected to such a practice being followed, and I think we should adhere to this rule. If we allowed this practice of handing in documents to be followed, it may lead to the introduction of the American practice here.

Mr. KENNY. The document to which I referred is a lengthy and uninteresting agreement dated 14th December, 1875. I only read one clause of it, and rather than inflict its reading on the House, I now propose to withdraw it. I have no desire to transgress any rules or regulations of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that that is one of the papers for which the hon. gentleman moved. Then it will appear in the return. I quite agree with my hon. friend opposite that we should not allow the American practice of handing in speeches or parts of speeches. As my hon. friend has said, it might be allowed and has been allowed, to the Finance Minister in his Budget speech to hand in a paper of figures which he has fully discussed and explained to the House.

Mr. ELLIS. As I assume the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is very likely to rise after the junior member, I will take this opportunity to offer a few remarks. If the hon. member succeeded in conveying any impression to the House it was a very wrong impression. He appeared to convey the idea that the ports of Portland and Boston possess advantages by reason of the fact that this railway now has reached Mattawamkeag, which they will not possess when the whole road is completed. The relation, as respects the ports of Portland and Boston, will not be altered when the railway is finished to Halifax; the position as regards that matter will be precisely the same. So the hon. gentleman's statement on that point goes for nothing. Nor is the impression which the hon. gentleman conveyed with respect to the Maritime Provinces wholly a correct one. The railway is now finished, as I understand it, from the foot of Moosehead Lake to Mattawamkeag. It is in a position, as soon as the snow disappears, to be operated as far as St. John and St. Andrews. So, at least two of the maritime ports contemplated in the original scheme will be reached. No doubt there has been delay, but the circumstances in which the company was placed have been peculiar. When the company sent surveyors over the route across the State of Maine from the foot of Moosehead Lake to Mattawamkeag, or at all events to Greenville, and after the surveyors had made their report and the work and actually begun on the road, they discovered that it was a much more difficult work than the company had pre-

viously supposed, that it was so to such an extent that the contractors were at one time on the point of throwing up the work altogether. However, a new arrangement had to be made with them which involved the expenditure of a large sum of money, much larger than was at first contemplated, and the work has also occupied a much longer time. The whole resources of the company had been put forth to complete this very difficult work across the State of Maine. In consequence of the reported delay, I last fall sent a man over the whole route to obtain an idea as to the progress of the work. He had some little knowledge of railway work, and further he met all the sectional and divisional engineers, and the impression left on his mind, beyond doubt, was that it was a very difficult work. This would account for much of the delay that has taken place with respect to the opening of the road to Mattawamkeag. When it reaches Mattawamkeag it will have struck that portion of the road common to the entire road through Harvey, whether the portion from Harvey to Moncton is built or not. When that part of the road is open the Maritime Provinces will have been reached. Further, when the road is completed from Harvey to Moncton seventeen miles only will have been saved. The distance from Harvey to Halifax will be only about seventeen miles shorter than the existing road from Harvey to Halifax over the New Brunswick Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, therefore no great interest can suffer by reason of the fact that the company have not built at a cost of some millions a road that will only save seventeen miles. All the advantages which Halifax possesses, and no doubt they are very great, as an Atlantic seaport, will still accrue, and I can imagine, therefore, that the case is not nearly so bad as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has endeavored to make out. Further, I have great doubt with respect to the earnestness of the Halifax members, although no doubt the senior member (Mr. Jones) will rise and back up the junior member (Mr. Kenny) to the best of his ability. But when the resolution was offered by my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) to which the junior member for Halifax has referred, the Halifax members did not vote for it. The hon. gentleman proposed that the work should be commenced at both ends of the line at the same time, and the members for Halifax, and also the member for Westmorland (Mr. Wood) voted that such was not necessary. I also think it was not necessary, and if I had had a seat in the House at the time I should have voted with these hon. gentlemen. I do not desire to detain the House further than to state that on the 1st July, and perhaps earlier, the road now contemplated will be opened to the Maritime ports so far as St. John and St. Andrews are concerned, and the road will be open to Halifax by the New Brunswick and Intercolonial roads; and when finally completed, as first contemplated, there will only be a saving of one hour in time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The subject brought before the House by my colleague is one in which the people of the Maritime Provinces, as he has justly observed, take very considerable interest, and, perhaps, nowhere is more interest manifested than in the city of Halifax. The hon. gentleman has furnished the House with very lengthy and exhaustive quotations from the speeches of hon. gentlemen who were in the House when this resolution was proposed guaranteeing the subsidy to the Short Line Railway. But it appears to me that the difficulty was at the very inception, that the appropriation of money was for a purpose entirely unwarranted and uncalled for. It was granted at that time under circumstances which left an impression abroad, I do not say on what it may be founded, that there was an hon. gentleman, in very near contact with the Government, who was very directly concerned in this appropriation, and that to the circumstance of that hon. gentleman holding a very important position, a position very near to the Government,

was due the fact that this money had been voted at all. I think the country generally, at the time this money was voted, looked upon the appropriation with great suspicion. They looked upon it with suspicion on account of the circumstances to which I have referred, and outside Parliament they very generally condemned that appropriation on the ground that it was unnecessary, because when the road was built it was going to establish a rival line to our own Intercolonial Railway line. It was also said when this money was first granted that the saving of distance to Halifax would be in the neighborhood of 130 miles. That was to be the saving in distance as stated by the Government organs and stated in Parliament, when this road was completed to Halifax by the way of Harvey, Fredericton and Moncton. Now, we find from the statement of the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Ellis), which corroborates a statement I had heard on a previous occasion from a very authentic source, that the whole amount of distance to be saved when this road was completed was only 17 miles. It would therefore appear that if at the commencement it had been known that the saving would have only been 17 miles I think that hon. gentlemen in this House would naturally have hesitated before they would have committed the country to such a heavy expenditure for such a small saving of a distance. The expenditure was proceeded with and the Government of the day and the members for Halifax and from the Maritime Provinces supporting the Government at that time, refused to recognize the representations made to them by the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax on this very subject. My hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) will remember that when the discussion took place in Parliament large meetings were held there, and the then mayor, a leading supporter of my hon. friend, took a very strong position on that point and remonstrances were sent to the Government and to the gentleman who represented Halifax County in that Parliament. It was pointed out to them at that time just what has resulted to-day. The people pointed out that so far as any advantage to the city of Halifax was concerned it was a misappropriation of the revenues of the country and my hon. friend will remember the emphatic telegram which came from Messrs. Daly and Stairs on that occasion after full consultation with the Canadian Pacific Railway people. They told us that we had the assurance of the Canadian Pacific Railway that this line would be built, that it was the best way to build it, that so much distance was going to be saved by the route, that they knew better than we did and they held "we are determined to have our way," and they had it. When this matter was brought before Parliament there was naturally a great deal of uncertainty with reference to the route, because, as my hon. friend has explained to the House, no instrumental survey had been made up to that time and it was merely an estimate of the distance to be saved that was given, so far as they could make that estimate without much accuracy. A great deal of discussion took place in this House which found voice in an amendment moved by Mr. Lesage:

"That the said subsidy be given to the company which will build a line which will be found to be the shortest and most practical after a complete instrumental survey of all the lines which may pretend to obtain this result."

That was a very natural amendment, and I think it was in the interests of the country that the money should not be specially granted to one company who were unprepared to say that they had obtained a correct survey, and that they were about building it over the shortest route. So determined were the Government and so subservient were their followers on that occasion, including the members for Halifax, I am sorry to say, that they voted down this amendment, and it was, of course, lost. That was, of course, a declaration that they were going to vote this money to the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. colleague has referred

to the amendment which was subsequently moved by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk). It was as follows :

"That the said resolution be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending section 24 providing that the work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the work on the portion of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine."

It would seem that my hon. friend, with a prescience that does great credit to his judgment, anticipated just what has taken place. He was not satisfied with the declaration of the Minister of Public Works, which has been quoted by my friend, because he went on to point out what was a very singular circumstance, and which has escaped the notice of my hon. friend. He went on to say :

"When these resolutions were first introduced into this House, there was no mention made of the section of road to which my motion refers; there was no reference made to the line to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury; evidently it was an afterthought that it should be included at all. The road, when built to Mattawamkeag, will have a connection with Salisbury; and we have no pledge from the Government that this section of the line will be built at all. The Minister of Public Works, in his speech the other day, pledged the Government to secure the building of the road from Mattawamkeag to Salisbury. When the road is built to Mattawamkeag we have connection, but the Short Line is not complete unless it is built to Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury. Unless this section is built, the road will be of no earthly benefit to the Province of Nova Scotia or to the city of Halifax. It may be built; but what we want is that, since the Government and Parliament have declared that it shall be built by this company, we want to take care that it shall be built as soon as possible. Therefore, I cannot, at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, withdraw my motion, and I shall have to ask the House to divide on it."

There were some gentlemen who seemed to have more faith in the Government and in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk); and Mr. Daly, who was one of the representatives of Halifax on that occasion, remarked :

"This Bill, we believe, and the measures the Government will take under it, will tend to accomplish an object the people of Nova Scotia have had at heart for a very long time, that is, that while Canada has been taxing itself, and Nova Scotia as part of Canada has been bearing its proportion of the taxation, for the development of the great west, we in the east wish to participate in the benefits which that great development is likely to produce. We believe a direct connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway system with the city of Halifax will be of great advantage to the whole Province and to that port particularly, and we believe that object can be accomplished by the measure now proposed. To hamper that measure with embarrassing details would, we think, prevent our accomplishing that object. The company will be obliged to seek in the markets of the world the necessary assistance to extend this railway from Montreal to Halifax; and to impose upon that company the necessity of commencing the work on each particular section of the line simultaneously, would, we think, involve the company in embarrassments which this Legislature should not impose upon them."

The member for Halifax of that day was very careful not to embarrass the company because he seems to be fully persuaded in his own mind that the company were going to carry out the resolution. If he had been so satisfied on that point I cannot see why he should have objected to the amendment of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) which only went so far as to give effect to the very sentiments which the hon. gentleman pretended to be so thoroughly interested in. Doubtless they were led astray somewhat by the emphatic declarations of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Now, if there is an hon. gentleman in this House who is usually very careful of his statements on public matters, I will do the Minister of Public Works the credit to say that it is he, and it is very seldom we can catch the hon. gentleman in a statement with which we can refer to afterwards as not being fulfilled as we can do to-night. Referring to this very subject the Minister of Public Works said, as has been quoted by my hon. colleague :

"I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the Government makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, and to take advantage of this vote of money, of \$250,000 during 20 years, the Government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith; the faith of Parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as Parliament wishes."

Now, Sir, it is worthy of remark that the hon. gentleman says that if the completion of the road from Mattawamkeag to Moncton is not secured, no subsidy will be given. Well, what position are the Government in to-night with regard to that matter? Have they not been paying that subsidy all along? Have they not been aware that the road was being constructed to Mattawamkeag, and has not the Minister of Public Works been paying out the money in direct violation of this solemn statement which he made to Parliament, and which carried weight with the members of this House? It seemed to have sufficient weight with the gentleman who then represented Halifax in this House and with other hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, to induce them to vote down the resolution of my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk); and I think the hon. Minister of Public Works owes it to this House and the country now to explain the position which he and the Government occupy, and under what circumstances they have been induced or seduced to pay the public money away for the construction of a line in a foreign country, in direct violation of the solemn terms and conditions with which this grant was obtained from Parliament. It is all very well for my hon. colleagues to place the responsibility of this matter on the shoulders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not for one moment pretend to say that that company are not to blame. They certainly are to blame, but their masters, the Government of this country, have to take the responsibility of permitting them to go on year after year, and of paying out to them the subsidies on the work as it progressed through American territory, and not taking care to see that the conditions under which this money was granted by Parliament were complied with. We have no return, but it will be interesting to see what money has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, in 1887 we had a very interesting meeting at the Drill Shed in Halifax, at which we were favored with the company of the late hon. Minister of Finance, and it was one of his boasts on that occasion what he had done—the bold act, he said, of coming to Parliament and asking for \$250,000 a year for twenty years to build this line; and he said, bold as it was Parliament had sufficient confidence in him to grant the money, and the work is going to be carried out, and is now under way, and will be completed in good time. In view of the predictions made by that hon. gentleman at that time, it is interesting to notice the position in which the enterprise is to-day. It must, no doubt, be very unpleasant to my hon. colleague to stand up here and denounce the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and inferentially, of course, the Government, when he had before him the statements made by the late hon. Minister of Finance with regard to this work at a time when his prognostication as to the business it was going to bring to Halifax, had a considerable influence on the minds of certain gentlemen in that city. Sir Charles Tupper said on that occasion :

"When I stated last night that the last act I did before leaving London was to sign, as joint trustee with Lord Revelstoke and Lord Wolverton, the bonds for the construction of this line of railway (the Short Line) by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that it is now in their hands; when I told him (Mr. Jones) that he felt that it was a death knell ringing in his ears. He felt that with the gigantic work in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, knowing their enormous resources and knowing that the moment they had expended their money in the construction of this short line of railway, and carried out the magnificent project of having running to Halifax as fast a line of steamers as crosses the ocean from England to New York, that this harbor must become the entrepot of the traffic and commerce between Europe and the East."

The old story—

"He knew that this would become a great transcontinental highway and that we would not only bring over it the traffic from Europe to Japan and China, but that we should be able to compete with Boston,

Portland or New York with regard to traffic and travel to the cities of New York and Chicago and the Western States.

After indulging in this glorious prediction of what Halifax was going to be if the Government were sustained, and the Short Line, which is yet unfinished, was completed, the hon. gentleman went on to say :

" I have already told you that this gigantic Pacific Railway Company, with between 4,000 and 5,000 miles of constructed railway now in operation, with an army of 25,000 men in their employ, and expending money to an extent that is calculated to sustain and develop a country of itself, if we had to rest upon it almost alone. When that company have declared by the most solemn, important and business-like act that it is possible for them to do—by putting their hand and seal to a contract binding them to build not only the short line of railway that comes to St. John, but also the short line of railway that passes St. John by coming from Fredericton to Moncton, because that is in the bond, and that is the work with which they are immediately to grapple."

Now, Sir, these were election promises, made during a time of political excitement when my hon. colleague and I stood on the platform expounding opposite views. My hon. friend, with that sanguine disposition with regard to the fulfilment of those promises and intentions of the Government of which he is such a strong supporter, no doubt expatiated on all those glorious prospects from one end of the country to the other at the time. Well, Sir, we had to point out the position in which this very work stood at that time. We had before us the evidence that the work was going on in a foreign country, that the money of Canada was being drawn day by day for the construction of that railway, and that not a blow was being struck to bring it to Halifax. Sir, I hold that the Government of this country are justly censurable for the present condition of things. If they had dealt earnestly and energetically with this matter at the time, they could have compelled the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to go on with that part of the road just as well as with the other. The money was in their own hands; they are not obliged to part with it; they could have said and they should have said to the Canadian Pacific Railway: Go on with the Short Line to Moncton simultaneously with the other portion. But no; after having called upon their supporters here to vote down the amendment of my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), after having, through the Minister of Public Works, solemnly and emphatically declared that the money should not be drawn, they went on from time to time and allowed this departure from the intention of Parliament for which to-day the country holds them responsible. I do not pretend to justify the Canadian Pacific Railway in any respect. It was a part of a contract they should have carried out in good faith, and if they had, my hon. colleague and myself would not have been compelled to denounce them here; but the difference between my hon. colleague and myself is that he wishes to put the entire responsibility on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to deal very lightly with the Government who control the Canadian Pacific Railway, while I hold that the Government are responsible and that the whole transaction is one not creditable to the Government. We shall look with a great deal of interest at the course the Government will take in the future with regard to the company. It is quite true the time has not yet elapsed, but it is utterly impossible for the road to be completed according to the terms of the contract. The road is built to St. John, and our brethren there have the advantage of a considerably short line to Montreal. I am very glad of any advantage which accrues to St. John, and they certainly have the advantage over us in some respects, with regard to shorter distances to the sea. Whether this will enable them to become the winter port of the Dominion with regard to certain shipments remains to be seen. I am willing to admit that in that respect they have gained, and it will be a great source of dissatisfaction for the people of Halifax and all along the line when they find that the saving in distance, which was first estimated at 120 miles,

has now dwindled down to the miserable figure of 17 miles. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who would have voted to support the Bill could he have foreseen this. The Government must have been deceived, and willingly deceived, perhaps, by one who, as has been observed, had a very near and personal interest in carrying out this arrangement; but the Government are much to blame for placing this expenditure in the hands of a company, leaving them to take their own route, and voting down a proposition made by my hon. friend. If my hon. friend's motion had been carried, other contractors would have entered the field and we would have known whether there were any physical difficulties in the way. As far as we are concerned, it is eminently unsatisfactory, looking at the distance to be saved and the large amount added to the burdens of the taxpayers, but such as it is the people desire to have it. They desire to have it, because it was part of the original contract and they expect the Government to compel the company to carry it out without delay. The Government may be sure of one thing, and that is that they cannot escape their responsibility, and that the country will look to them for the fulfilment of the contract. The people have nothing to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway. They stand simply in the light of contractors for public works, and if the Government advances a sum of money to contractors for public works more than they are entitled to, the Government are justly censurable. I cannot say that they have advanced more money on this road than the circumstances would warrant, but if the Canadian Pacific Railway have an amount at their credit for the construction of the remaining distance, there is less reason than there has yet been why they should not go on and finish it. The Government should take up this matter at once and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to take some action. We heard lately, as my colleague has mentioned, that a deputation came from Halifax, Moncton and St. John to confer with the Government, and they met the First Minister and went back about as wise as they came. The First Minister told them he had no doubt it would be finished in good time, but he did not say when, or whether the Government were going to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to finish. Without such an assurance by the Government, without such explanations from the Minister of Public Works with regard to his promise, and without the full understanding that the Government will hold the Canadian Pacific Railway to the terms of the contract, the country will not be satisfied at all.

Mr. TEMPLE. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has given thorough expression of my opinions on the subject, so I shall not weary this House by repeating them. I simply rise now to draw attention to the statement made by the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). He was of opinion that the saving at one time, which was to be 126 miles, has dwindled down to the miserable sum of 17 miles. This information he took from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). Hon. gentlemen opposite are just like parrots; what one says the other repeats. I do not know how they can make 126 miles out of 113. The hon. gentleman has made a mistake somewhere. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) makes the statement that it is only 17 miles shorter by Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury. That is the St. John version of it, which we all understand very well. The distance that has been saved has been 30 miles at the very least. That, however, makes no difference with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a contract, and all we ask is that the Canadian Pacific Railway people should carry it out, which I have no doubt they will do. I merely rose to correct the statement of the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and set him right upon the point.

Motion agreed to,



## LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. JAMIESON moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, together with any papers, reports and documents in reference to the issue of permits or licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors, beer or other intoxicants in public houses or otherwise in the North-West Territories; also, copies of all regulations, documents or other proceedings issued or adopted by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, under which licenses or permits for the sale of beer or other intoxicants in public houses have been granted in the said Territories.

He said: In submitting this resolution to the House, I desire to call attention to the condition of things in the North-West Territories, which has been brought to the attention of the public through the press and otherwise, and in a very few words to refer to the legislation which has taken place in reference to the liquor traffic in the North-West Territories. It will be recollected by the older members of this House that, in 1873, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Customs, introduced into the House a Bill for the purpose of regulating the Customs duties in the North-West. That Bill, which afterwards became law, being assented to on the 23rd May, 1873, contained a most important provision in reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the Territories. I will read a part of the second sub-section of section 1 of that Act, which was considered at the time a sort of departure from the recognised state of things in this Dominion, and I understand was regarded as an experiment. It provides as follows:—

"Spirits or strong waters, or spirituous liquors of any kind are hereby prohibited to be imported into any part of the North-West Territories, under the like penalty and forfeiture as are provided by the Customs laws of Canada with respect to articles the importation whereof is prohibited; nor shall any such spirits or strong waters or spirituous liquors of any kind be manufactured or made in the said North-West Territories or brought into the same from any Province of Canada except by special permission of the Lieutenant Governor of the said Territories."

It goes on further to provide penalties for any breach of this law. I recollect at the time that this law was passed that there was a good deal of congratulation indulged in, in reference to the fact that, in a certain portion, at all events, of this Dominion, we had secured a prohibitory liquor law. I recollect subsequently, and since I have had a seat in this House, Sir Charles Tupper congratulating the House and the country upon the fact, and taking to himself credit for having been instrumental in introducing and aiding in the passage of that law. Afterwards, those who are conversant with the legislation of the country will be aware that it became a part of the constitution of the North-West Territories under the Act passed by the Government led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). On the revision of the Statutes of Canada made in 1886, it continued to be a part of the Act in reference to the North-West Territories. Section 92 of that Statute reads as follows:—

"No intoxicating liquor or intoxicant shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the Territories except by special permission of the Governor in Council; nor shall any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant be imported or brought into the Territories from any Province of Canada or elsewhere, or be sold, exchanged, traded or bartered, or had in possession therein, except by special permission, in writing, of the Lieutenant Governor. Intoxicating liquors or intoxicants imported or brought from any place out of Canada into the Territories, by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant Governor, shall be subject to the customs and excise laws of Canada."

Section 93 provides that:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall make an annual return, up to the 31st day of December in each year, of the number of such permissions so given by him and the quantity and nature of the intoxicating liquors and intoxicants in each case, to the Minister of the Interior, who shall lay the same before Parliament."

Now, in the administration of the Government in the North-West Territories, from 1873 until the middle of the year 1888, a certain construction was placed upon that statute.

Mr. TEMPLE.

So far as I can ascertain it was never dreamed by anybody that general licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors should be granted under the provision of that law; in fact the construction which was placed upon that statute during all this time was that in every case of the importation or sale of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territory, a special permit should be received from the Lieutenant Governor. It is well understood that during the term of office of the present Minister of the Interior, that was the construction which was placed upon that statute, and in my judgment that was the only reasonable construction which could be placed upon it. However, after the present Lieutenant Governor assumed the duties of his office in the Territories he placed a different construction upon the statute altogether; after the lapse of some fifteen years we have a new interpretation given to it. I am informed, on the very best authority, indeed, I do not think that it is questioned by anybody in the Dominion, that licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors have been granted under the hand of the Lieutenant Governor in the Territory, in my judgment, in violation of not only the letter, but of the spirit of this statute. Now, Sir, it may be regarded in some quarters as a very slight matter, but I consider it as a very serious matter, that a statute, which is part of the constitution of a large section of this Dominion, should be violated with impunity in the manner in which we are led to believe it has been violated in the administration of the affairs of the North West. Of course, I know that it is contended that under the present system there is less consumption of intoxicating liquors than there was under the former administration of this law. Whether that is the case or not, it is not my intention to discuss; however, so far as I can learn, such is not the case. I have learned from the very best authority that the consumption of intoxicating liquors under the present administration of the law in the North-West, is much greater than it was under the former administration; not only that, but I am informed on the very best authority that under cover of these 4 per cent. licenses which have been issued by the Lieutenant Governor, the very strongest kinds of liquor are being sold in the North West. No longer ago than to-day I was informed by gentlemen who are at present visiting Ottawa, that the state of things in several of the larger towns in the North-West Territories is far from what it should be in reference to this traffic; that the crime of drunkenness is increasing at a very alarming rate. Now, if such be the case, I think it is high time that this House should enquire into that state of things, and ascertain whether, in the issuing of these licenses, and the manner in which they have been issued, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories has been acting within the statute law of the country, or has been acting in the violation thereof. Now, let us look for a moment at the wording of this statute. It provides that no intoxicating liquors shall be imported into the North-West Territories, "nor shall any liquors be sold, exchanged, traded or bartered therein, except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant Governor." Now, can it be reasonably contended under the reading of this statute, that the Lieutenant Governor has power to issue a general license? In my judgment such a contention is a most unreasonable one, and is not warranted by the language of the statute at all. Why, Sir, such a construction of this statute would be clothing the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories with a power which is not possessed by the Lieutenant Governors of the older Provinces of this Dominion, and I do not think that it was the intention of Parliament that such should be the case. I have to say further, that if the Lieutenant Governor has the power of controlling the whole liquor traffic in the whole North-West, and to grant licenses to whomsoever he pleases, to reject the application of whomsoever he pleases, all I can say is that

if he has only granted permits for the sale of 4 per cent. beer, I am very much astonished at his moderation. But, Sir, I contend that not only under the strict letter of the statute, but by the spirit of the statute, he has no such power, he is not clothed with any such power as to be able to grant a general license to men holding public houses for the sale of liquor in the North-West Territories. If we look at the 93rd section of this Act, this construction of the statute law will seem the more reasonable and proper one. The Lieutenant Governor, we are told, is required to make a return up to the 31st December in each year, of the number of permissions so given, and the quantity and nature of the intoxicating liquor given. This shows conclusively that these permits are to be special and not general permits, because there is to be a return in each case of the nature and quantity of the liquor sold. Consequently it could never be contended that under the construction of this statute, general licenses or permits for the sale of liquor were contemplated. Now, Sir, I do not desire to take up too much time in discussing this question, because I want to hear other members of this House say something upon the matter also. Let me add, however, that I look upon this action of the Lieutenant Governor as a very dangerous precedent. If we are going to have a license system in the North-West, by all means let us have it in a legal and constitutional manner, and not in the manner in which I have indicated, and which is brought about by a breach of the statute law of this Dominion. I am informed that both parties in the North-West Territories, both those in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic and those who are opposed to it, are in favor of a popular vote being taken in the Territories for the purpose of deciding the question. That is a very reasonable proposition, and in my judgment I see no reason why the wishes of the people of the North-West Territories should not be carried out in this respect in regard to the traffic.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You voted against such a proposition.

Mr. JAMIESON. We are informed that the Lieutenant Governor has assumed power and authority to issue licenses even without the consent of the people's representatives, and in my judgment in the very teeth of the statute law of this Dominion. I trust this motion will be adopted, and we shall have a return of all the regulations and correspondence respecting this question. I say further that if the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, I, for one, will condemn his conduct as most reprehensible and as deserving the censure of this House; and further, that if the construction of the statute or the instructions received by him came from another source, I have no hesitation in saying that that source whatever it may be, should receive the censure of this House.

Mr. FISHER. I am rather surprised, I confess, that although five or six members of the Government are present in the House, none of them have taken upon themselves to offer some explanation in regard to the serious facts which the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has laid before the House. I regret the First Minister is not present to give that explanation, but we have present the Minister of the Interior, who for a long time had the management of liquor laws in the North-West, and I confess I am surprised that he should not have chosen to give an explanation of this most extraordinary series of actions in the North-West. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) placed this motion on the notice paper largely in consequence of a resolution passed by the Council of the Dominion Alliance, who assembled in Ottawa during the early part of the Session. I may say that in that Council a resolution was proposed and adopted condemning the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West in no measured terms for his action re-

specting liquor licenses in the North-West Territories. The Legislative Committee of the Alliance, however, were not instructed to lay it before Parliament, but their action was left to their discretion. It was thought desirable to first move for the papers. I regret extremely that this motion had not been introduced earlier, not that the fault rests with any one, because the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) was anxious to have it adopted as soon as possible. But it has come up at such a late period of the Session that I fear the papers will not be laid before the House before the close of the Session, and consequently we will not have an opportunity of proceeding upon the official record. It is partly for that reason I had hoped the Government would have given some explanation in regard to this matter. But I do not think we need wait for those papers, because we have not only in the public press but from people of the North-West quite sufficient data to enable us to judge as to what has occurred. Not only is this an offence against the temperance sentiment, but it is a grave offence against constitutional government in the North-West in regard to the issuing of licenses there by the Lieutenant Governor. I am not sufficiently versed in the law to say positively or to give an opinion that would be worth anything upon the strictly legal aspect of this question, or to be able to take up the statute and give a legal opinion upon its exact wording; but I venture to say that until last year no one had any thought, any expectation or idea that a definite system of licensing could be allowed under the prohibition section of the North-West Territories Act. We know that under the late administration of the North-West Territories a great number of permits were issued. We had a return of them for one year, and it appeared a great many had been issued; but at no time that I am aware of did the Lieutenant Governor undertake to issue licenses to sell liquor there. What occurred last season? We find that the new Lieutenant Governor as soon as he took his oath of office issued licenses. I say deliberately licenses, not permits, in the sense that permits were issued before, but licenses were issued on the Lieutenant Governor's own account; and, so far as we know, without any sanction by the representatives of the people, he undertook to introduce into the North-West Territories practically an elaborate license law. In all portions of the Dominion the Provincial Legislatures have the right to deal with the licensing of the sale of liquor in the various Provinces. The Dominion Parliament has not the right and although they attempted to exercise it, the attempt was a failure. Every one held that as regards the North-West we had a clear law, that prohibition was the law there. What is the heading of the section to which I allude in the North-West Territories Act? "It is prohibition of intoxicants." No one can pretend to say that under the section prohibiting intoxicants that a license law can be introduced. But the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is not to-day issuing permits as before, but he is issuing licenses for the sale of liquor; they are licenses, just as licenses are issued in other Provinces, upon certain terms which are laid down. They are not given to individuals to enable them to bring in liquor for their own use, but they are permits given to individuals, on certain terms and conditions clearly prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor as to how they shall sell, when they shall sell, and to whom they shall sell. What are those conditions? I take a summary of them from the *Regina Leader* of 24th July last, as follows:—

"Permits to sell 4 per cent. beer, containing only 4 per cent. alcohol, only issued to hotel keepers who have accommodation for 12 persons and 5 horses. Not to be sold on Sundays, except at meals. Not to be sold to any person under 14 years of age, nor to dissolute persons. Total quantity of liquor, under permit, to be brought into Territories at one time, and to be inspected and passed by police. License only issued on recommendation of representative of the district in which licensee resides. Fee to be paid."

If this is not introduction of license law into the North-West, I don't know what is. If in regard to these matters, which are under the control of Parliament, the Lieutenant Governor, on his own responsibility, without the endorsement or the authority of any representative of the people of that country, should thus deliberately undertake to introduce a totally new system into those Territories, without authority from the people of the country, he commits a grave violation of the spirit of the constitution. Suppose, Sir, in any other part of this country the Lieutenant Governors were to introduce any such changes or innovations into the laws of the territories which are under their control, would not the people of this country rise in arms against such an invasion of their prerogatives and their rights? I say it on the floor of Parliament that this action should be censured and should be criticised, and that it should be defended if it can; and, Sir, the persons who should defend this action, if it is defensible, are the Government of the day. What are the facts of the case in regard to this? I have spoken hitherto entirely and solely of the Lieutenant Governor of the North West Territories, and I have laid the responsibility upon him. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories is a servant of the Government here, he is their nominee, and he is responsible to them, and we find that under the North-West Act:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall be appointed by an instrument under the Great Seal of the Dominion of Canada and shall hold office during pleasure."

And the second clause of the same section says:

"The Lieutenant Governor shall administer the Government under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council or by the Secretary of State of Canada."

In other words, this gentleman is not an irresponsible individual. He is responsible to the Government here and the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches here are responsible for his acts, because he is obliged to act under their instructions and by their directions, and if he does what is wrong he is liable to censure by the Government. If the Government do not choose to censure him, I say it is necessary that this House should censure the Government. The Government may say that they have not been responsible for this and that they knew nothing of it. They have not deigned however to tell us why this occurred or under whose authority it occurred. I find in the public press last summer that there was a visit of Lieutenant Governor Royal to the eastern Provinces, immediately after his accession to his present position. What was said then? I find that the *Ottawa Journal* of 28th July says:

"Governor Royal of the North-West Territories, is in town; his business is to interview the Government regarding the question of granting permits for the sale of beer. He is here to make arrangements for regulations governing importation of such beer."

I may be told that this is not an official utterance, and I know that it is simply an interview between a *Journal* reporter and Lieutenant Governor Royal. Governor Royal explains what was his business here in Ottawa and what he was trying to do. Until the Government show that they have not been consulted in this way, until they show that they have not been instrumental in the issuing of these licenses, and until they show that they do not intend to sustain this action I contend that they are responsible for the action of their servant. The *Ottawa Journal* of 30th July says:

"Mr. Royal had consultation with Messrs. Costigan and Miall and as a result arrangements will be made to inspect all liquor passing through Winnipeg destined for the Territories, and to place an excise stamp upon it."

Now we find that one of the departments of the present Government is counteracting and making regulations to facilitate and carry out the arrangements which Lieutenant Governor Royal has the responsibility of inaugurating.

Mr. FISHER.

The fact of the matter is that the Ottawa Government control and rule the North-West. Last year they chose to introduce and have passed an Act in this House giving the North-West a new Legislative Council, and that Council was to have a voice in the ruling and regulating of the affairs of the North-West. The result was that last summer there was held an election in the North-West Territories, and again I can quote from the *Regina Leader* to show that at that election every individual who was elected to that Assembly pledged himself to his electors to have no change made in regard to the selling of liquor in the North-West until there had been a vote of the people of the North-West upon it. When the Legislature met there was a good deal of discussion in regard to this very question of liquor dealing in the North-West, and the result was that a motion was passed in that Assembly, by a majority of 14 to 6, which said that a vote ought to be held as to the question of liquor selling in the North-West. I say that the people of the North-West desired, that before any change should be made in the then existing laws, that they should have a voice in the matter, and we who are advocates of prohibition, and we who in this House have passed a local option law, certainly must believe and contend that those people have a right to decide for themselves as to whether there shall be liquor sold in their midst or not. Without any reference to the representatives of the North-West the Lieutenant Governor has chosen to introduce a license law and to make a license law on his own responsibility. This should be condemned. There is another point to which I wish to allude before sitting down. Beside this 4 per cent. beer licence there was issued in the North-West a licence for the sale of wine and beer at the Banff Hotel. A few days ago there was a question asked of the Government as to under whose authority this licence was issued and the answer of the Minister of the Interior was a reference to this North-West Territories Act. But I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the Rocky Mountain Park Act, in which I think he will find that everything regulating trade and traffic of this description in the Rocky Mountain Park is taken out of the North-West Territories and out of the power of the Governor of the North-West Territories and put into his hands. The hon. Minister shakes his head, but I find in section 2 of that Act:

"In said park the land is hereby reserved and set apart as a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada subject to the provisions of this Act and to the regulations hereby mentioned and shall be known as the Rocky Mountain Park Act."

It goes on to say:

"The park shall be under the control and management of the Minister of the Interior, and the Governor in Council (not the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories) may make regulations for the following purposes."

Among these purposes under sub-section e of that same section is "Trade and traffic of every description." Now, Sir, I do not think the Minister of the Interior will pretend to say that liquor selling is not trade and traffic, or that there is any special provision in that Act which exempts liquor selling out of the other trades and traffic which may be carried on in that Rocky Mountain Park. I believe, and I am sure, that the Minister of the Interior is responsible for the trade and traffic that are carried on in that park. The Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories has no right to control traffic of any kind whatever, and consequently the Government here, and not the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, is responsible for the issuing of that license in the Rocky Mountain Park. I only say this to show where I believe the responsibility rests, and I say it because of my surprise to find four or five Ministers sitting in their seats without their attempting to justify the action of themselves and their

servants in the North-West Territories during last summer, I think, Sir, that when the people of the North-West Territories have themselves an opportunity of deciding on the question as to whether liquor should be sold in their midst or not, it will then be for us in the Eastern Provinces to say nothing on the matter; but until that time comes, I think it is our duty, as members of this House, who sit here discussing affairs under the control of this Parliament, to look into this matter, and try to find out under what authority, and at whose authorisation these things have occurred, and lay the blame where it belongs, if there be blame, and see what justification there is, if there be justification. I trust that before this motion is passed we may have some word from some of the Ministers, so that we may ascertain the facts before the papers come down, which, I fear, will not be before the end of the Session.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no objection to the papers being brought down, and I may tell the hon. gentleman, that since the motion has been on the paper, I have taken the opportunity to see what papers there were on the subject, and I can assure him that they can all be copied in half an hour, so that they can be brought down to-morrow, when the hon. gentleman can ascertain the facts.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that the answer of the hon. Minister is not at all satisfactory. It is complete, so far as words go, but surely when such a charge is made as that made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), that the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories is not merely granting licenses, but has actually introduced a license law, and is distributing licenses right and left, and deciding where and to whom they shall be granted, surely we should have a statement from the Government as to whether this charge is true or not; and surely it is no answer to say that the papers can be copied in half an hour and will be laid before the House. We have a right to know whether the charge made by the hon. member for Lanark is true or not. Is it true that Lieutenant Governor Royal has not only issued licenses, but has actually made a law of his own, to suit his own convenience? It does not do for the Government to answer that they do not know, or to wash their hands of the matter. If they are not prepared to say to-day whether this charge is true or not true, there is but one conclusion that every member of the House can come to, whether he sits on this side or on that side, and that is, that the charges are true, and that the law is violated in the Territories with the knowledge and connivance of the Government.

Mr. KIRK. This motion should not be allowed to pass without some member of the Government making some explanation with regard to it. It has been perfectly understood, ever since the North-West Act was passed, that we had a prohibitory liquor law in the North-West Territories, and so far as the hon. Minister of the Interior is concerned, when he was Governor of the Territories he carried out the law strictly. But it seems that the present Lieutenant Governor has undertaken to issue licenses contrary to the spirit of the law, contrary to that which everybody in this Dominion believed to be the law. He not only issues licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, but he actually goes so far as to perform the functions of a legislature by making regulations for hotels to which he gives the right to sell liquor. Now, surely that is a violation of the law. We know that the late Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper, has taken credit to himself as being instrumental in placing on the Statute-book the first prohibitory liquor law enacted in this Dominion, that which is now the law of the North-West Territories. We know also that Sir Adams Archibald, when he was running an election recently in Colchester, took credit to himself as being the first Lieutenant Governor to carry such a law into effect, and he claimed the votes of the temperance people of Colchester on that account.

Yet we find that we have no prohibitory law there at all, but, on the contrary, the most lax license law to be found anywhere in the Dominion; and to-night we have Ministers sitting here in silence hearing one of their own supporters, the hon. member for Lanark, charge that this law is violated, and insinuate that it is violated with the connivance of the Government. Now, I think the Government should not allow this resolution to pass without saying something to satisfy this House that the Lieutenant Governor, if he is violating the law, is doing so without their knowledge or instructions. But I believe he is not violating it without instructions. I believe the Government have given him instructions to issue those licenses. An officer of the Government to take upon himself to do such an important act without the authority of the Government! I do not believe Lieutenant Governor Royal does it. Therefore, I charge the Government with having instructed him, and call upon them to deny the charge.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this motion is carried I should like to make some remarks, because it illustrates the anomalous state of things which exists in the Territories. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who made the motion, nor with the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), that Governor Royal is violating the law, and I think the hon. and learned gentleman who leads the Opposition, when he reads the clause of the Act, will agree with me. I am not now saying whether or not he is violating the spirit of the policy that was understood to obtain in the Territories; I am simply dealing with the question whether or not he exceeds the power given to him by the statute. The law is this:

"No intoxicating liquor or intoxicant shall be manufactured, compounded or made in the Territories, except by special permission of the Governor in Council; nor shall any intoxicating liquor or intoxicant be imported or brought into the Territories from any Province of Canada, or elsewhere, or be sold, exchanged, traded or bartered, or had in possession therein, except by special permission, in writing, of the Lieutenant Governor."

Therefore, that clause gives the Lieutenant Governor the power of granting special permission in writing to sell intoxicants. Very rarely have I used a permit, unless when I had friends visiting me whom I wished to entertain, and I do not suppose I had, during the six or seven years I have lived there, five permits. I have recommended scores of people for permits, but I have always considered the whole system a bad one.

Mr. LAURIER. The permit to get liquor and the license to sell liquor are two different things. The one is covered by the section; the other is not.

Mr. DAVIN. The clause reads "or elsewhere or be sold except by permission in writing of the Lieutenant Governor."

Mr. LAURIER. A special permission for each selling, but not a general permission to sell.

Mr. DAVIN. It was sold in the Territories before Lieutenant Governor Royal went there. Permission was given by my hon. friend, who is Minister of the Interior, for the Canadian Pacific Railway to sell on their cars, and nobody ever objected to this as against the law. I do not consider that Lieutenant Governor Royal has at all exceeded the power given him under the Act. The question as to the policy is another matter, and it is one which may fairly be discussed. But I would point out this anomaly: Beer of four per cent. strength is admitted into the Territories, yet our people are not allowed to manufacture it. We did not complain, so long as it was excluded, that our people were not allowed to manufacture malt beer, but it is not to be borne that it can be imported and yet that our people are not to be allowed to manufacture it. At Moose Jaw and at Medicine Hat, there are men who invested \$5,000 to \$10,000 in this business, and who have been ruined, not by design on the part of the Lieutenant Gov-

error, but because of this interpretation of the Act. At Medicine Hat a man was manufacturing beer. His plant was seized by Mr. Barrett, the agent of the Inland Revenue Department. He was brought before a magistrate and fined \$300 for making beer, while a hotel keeper was selling the same beer across the counter a short distance away. This is an anomalous state of things which cannot be allowed to continue. Here you have an Act which you say is a prohibitory Act, yet a Mr. Buchanan imports a lot of beer and imports it on a permit, got by whom?—by the man who above all others is charged with carrying out the Prohibitory Act—by the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police! The permit is in his name, and was given on his advice; and Commissioner Herchmer was charged before the judge in Regina for having liquor unlawfully in his possession:

"This case was heard on Friday, the 22nd inst. before Mr. Justice Richardson. For the prosecution, Messrs. Johnstone and Secord; for the defendant, Mr. Haultain. Witnesses called for the prosecution were Col. W. Herchmer, Supt. Gagnon, Capt. Constantine and Corporal Horne, of the Police force, F. Wall, of the Canteen, J. C. Pope, Chas. Wilson and W. C. Fowler.

"It was shown that about the 30th of January a car load, consigned as beer, was seized at Broadview, amongst it 1,000 gallons consigned to W. F. Buchanan, and a telegram was sent to the Barracks on the morning of the 31st, and a permit (produced) obtained on the written application of Commissioner Herchmer, left for that purpose before he went to Ottawa. This permit was accompanied to Broadview by an officer of the Police, and the supposed beer (the 1,000 gallons) released.

"It was acknowledged from the witness-box that some liquor was spilled about that time, "not any of the 1,000 gallons."

"The beer reached Regina consigned "W. F. Buchanan, advise Col. Herchmer." Delivery at the Canteen of fifty barrels of four per cent. beer on February 2nd was proved by the Canteen manager.

"The defence called no witnesses, resting their case on the missing link between the defendant and the beer."

As a fact, it would be most instructive, as emphasising the anomalous state of things that exists in these Territories, to have the judgment in this case, because I believe what the judge held was that the beer was actually the property of the Crown and therefore could not be confiscated. This illustrates the anomalous state of things, as nothing else can, which exists in the Territories, and it will probably sharpen the wits of hon. gentlemen on both sides when other questions come up which I cannot now touch on without being irrelevant, and when my hon. friends from Saskatchewan or Alberta may seek to show you that there are other anomalies existing there in which you do not take as deep an interest as you do in this. I have always held that the proper thing to have done under that Act was to carry out prohibition, but you see that the Act contemplates that the Lieutenant Governor will give permission. That was the weak point of the Act. It was a weak point that the Act did not define to what extent this permission should be given. The most difficult task the hon. the Minister of Interior had to do was to issue permits, and I will bear my testimony that he refused permits over and over again, at the risk of his popularity, because he could not conscientiously give them to the men who applied for them. But it was most ludicrous. A permit was first given for medical purposes, and everybody wanted a gallon or two for medical purposes. Then the wording was changed for domestic purposes, and to those gentlemen who hold strong opinion on this subject with regard to prohibition, I want to point out that, notwithstanding that permits were issued, notwithstanding we had a most efficient body of police enforcing the Act, liquor was brought in contraband wholesale. Liquor was brought in contraband; and there is one town in which the police were never able to enforce the Act at all—the town of Calgary. In that town there is more of the western spirit, as it is understood in the United States, than in any other town in the Dominion. It was imported wholesale, but especially into that town where, as I said, there was more of that kind of freedom, if I may use the mild term—

Mr. DAVIN,

Mr. LAURIER. License, not freedom.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, license is the better word. I remember once hearing Prévôt Paradol speaking in English in London, and I have often observed that one will use with more precision a language which is not his own native language than another, and, therefore, I sometimes feel how nicely and admirably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) selects the words of that tongue which I speak myself a little off-hand and somewhat imperfectly. Well, as I was saying, the liquor was brought in wholesale. I was in one of the towns in which that took place. I said to one of my friends: "You tell me liquor is sold here?" He said: "Yes, it is sold in this place, and in that place, and those who are known, and are known not to be detectives and not to be standing in with the police, can get it." I said: "How can they get it in?" He said: "Oh, they bring it in from Montana, they bury it and then some fine moonlight night they go out with a buckboard and bring it in." That shows how prohibition would work in the Territories. If it had been sought to thoroughly carry it out, we could have decided the question as to whether it was possible to work a prohibitory liquor law. I do not think myself it could have worked very well. As to the permits which have been given, I do not think that they have greatly helped the matter, one way or the other, and I must say that, as to what is called "Royal's 4 per cent. beer," I do not think the effects have been so serious as my hon. friend who introduced this question has stated. I think before that system was introduced, there was just as much surreptitious selling of liquor as there is to-day, and I do not think there is a larger sale of strong intoxicants since the 4 per cent. beer has been introduced than there was before, but, of course, I am not in a position to speak as to that.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am informed there is more sold in your own town.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I have not noticed it. There are some of my friends who are in the town at present, and they have not informed me in regard to it, but things may have changed since I left. Perhaps the absence of my example may have injured the morality of the town. I rose merely because I wished to make these few desultory remarks. Of course, what I say on the subject is said by a man who has been observing the matter as it has taken place, and I do not think it would have been right for me to allow the question to go by without making these remarks, because it is calculated to illustrate a circle of questions which belong to the Territories. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) spoke of the vote. There is no doubt that there is a strong desire all over the North-West Territories to have a vote taken on this subject in order to see whether the people there wish to have prohibition or not. What they say is: Give us a chance, and if the teetotalers vote in favor of prohibition we will have to be content, and the teetotalers say the same thing on the other side. The members of the Assembly were, as my hon. friend expressed it, pledged at one time to this course, but, now, the members of the Assembly have sent a memorial to the Government of Canada upon it, and I was glad to hear one remark of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) when he used a word which is not often used in this House, a word which is often used in Great Britain, a word which goes to the very basis of parliamentary institutions, and that is the word "control." The first idea of Parliament in England was that of controlling the affairs of the country, and controlling the action of the Executive. It is our business here to control everything, to sift everything, to test everything, and, if this is a matter which should be enquired into, it is a very proper matter for the hon. gentlemen to move in and for us to discuss. I, there-

fore, say to this Parliament that the representatives in that Assembly of the North-West, elected almost by manhood suffrage, for constituencies which exclude no part of the Territories, as some parts were excluded before, have themselves expressed the opinion and the strong desire of the people that the opinion of the people should be taken on this subject by plebiscite, as we understand, or that power should be given to them to deal with the question themselves. If that power is given to them, it should be on the condition that they would not act on the power until they should have gone before their constituents and consulted them upon it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know that I would have risen at all in reference to this matter if my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) had not said that the late Minister of Finance had taken to himself the credit for having dealt with this question. If my hon. friend looks at the Statutes of 1874, he will see that chapter 7 deals with this subject, and that Act was put on the Statute book by the Mackenzie Administration. If he compares that Act with the law as it now stands, he will see that the provisions then made were much more stringent than those in force at present, and that they leave no room to doubt the intention of Parliament at that time. The hon. gentleman who has introduced the motion to the House has informed the House as to the propriety of leaving this question to the people of the North-West Territories, and my hon. friend from the North-West who has just taken his seat has spoken in the same line; but a few evenings ago both the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had an opportunity to leave this question to be decided upon by the whole of the people of the Dominion, and neither of them voted for that course. Both of them seem to think that it is more fitting that the people of the North-West should choose for themselves in that matter than that the whole people of the Dominion of Canada should. I do not agree with those hon. gentlemen. It is rather singular, and I think they would have some difficulty in satisfying the House and the country that what was a proper course to adopt in regard to the North-West Territories in this particular, was an improper course to adopt with regard to the Dominion at large.

Mr. DAVIN. If I may correct my hon. friend, I would say this, that in stating what the Legislative Assembly did, I did not say that I approved of the plebiscite; I approved of giving them the power of dealing with the question, and then letting them go to their constituents.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to argue the question with the hon. gentleman as to the best mode of taking the opinion of the country upon a question of this sort. This House has expressed its opinion in favor of the abstract proposition of temperance, it gives as a reason for not adopting that opinion which it has expressed that the law would be inoperative if the public opinion of the country did not sustain it after it was upon the Statute-book. That, being the case, it seems to me that the question of prohibition is taken out of the class of questions of mere policy in dealing with this subject, and is left to rest upon the moral support of the country at large. When Parliament proposed to refer a question of this sort to the country in order that the people may have an opportunity of saying whether it shall come into operation or not, Parliament has already pronounced its opinion upon the question and approved of it. It says that while we approve of this course being adopted, we at the same time admit that the law would be inoperative, unless public opinion sustained it; and a vote is wanted not for the purpose of deciding as to whether the principle is sound in itself, but whether it is expedient, and whether it would, if adopted, be sustained by the country at large. For that purpose it seems to me that a plebiscite is a more direct and a more

efficient mode of ascertaining the opinion of the nation than the indirect and remote method of a general appeal to the country through a representative assembly. But I rose more particularly for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the original provisions of law, and as to the policy adopted. That policy has been well understood; it was to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in the North-West Territories as a beverage, it was to prevent their use by the community. It was well known that we had a large Indian population there, who would become a dangerous population if the free use of intoxicants were permitted amongst them; and in order to give security to the white population, and to encourage the colonisation and settlement of that country, it was believed to be in the public interest that the exclusion of intoxicants as a beverage should be the policy of the country in that territory. That policy was not only acquiesced in but it was approved by both sides of the House, and hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, then sitting on this side, sanctioned that policy, and they have never yet intimated that they proposed to alter it, or to depart from it in any particular. Although the statement is less clearly drawn and the principle is less clearly expressed in the law as it now stands, it seems to me that it will admit of but one construction, and that is that there was to be no licenses for the sale of intoxicants in the North-West Territories. There were to be permits given to persons who were thus enabled to bring it in for special purposes, medicinal and manufacturing purposes, and when it was brought in they were not at liberty to sell it except to those persons and in the way authorised. The Lieutenant Governor was not authorised to permit the manufacture of intoxicants in that territory, that was left to the Governor General in Council. That being the case, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories has undertaken to establish a license system there, I do not care how strict that system may be, he is adopting a policy at variance with the spirit and intention of the law, and one for which not only he but the Government here are responsible. He is the officer of this Government, he is subject to the policy of Parliament expressed in this Act. He is in the same sense an officer of this Government that His Excellency is, who, besides being Governor General, is an Imperial officer; and if he violates the law, if he acts upon any principle contrary to the policy and the spirit of the law, he is responsible for his conduct, and the Administration here as well as the officer himself are responsible. Well, Sir, it is rather surprising to observe the present conduct of the hon. Minister who now has resting upon him the important and responsible duties of the Department of Finance, who was at one time the apostle of temperance beyond almost any other hon. gentleman who sat in Parliament, who several years ago declared that the country was ripe for prohibitory legislation; he was not prepared to sustain a government that did not support the principle of prohibition, he regarded it as one absolutely necessary for the moral advancement and the moral elevation of the people of this country. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has entirely fallen from that high position; he no longer occupies the high moral ground that he did before he became a member of the Administration. The hon. gentleman a few years ago, before he entered the Government, would not for a moment sustain a proposition which declared that the public opinion of this country was not ripe for prohibition; he would hardly have voted down the proposition to appeal to the country to ascertain what the public opinion was upon this particular question. . . But the hon. gentleman has not only done those things that he ought not to have done; but he has also become a party to the opening of the North-West to the sale of intoxicants as a beverage, a condition of things that did not exist before he became a member of the Administration. Now, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman, since he has

had light, ought to have explained to the House how it was that he has arrived at the conclusion that the views which he formerly entertained, were erroneous; how he has reached the conclusion that the North-West may be safely opened to the sale of intoxicants; how it is that those who were not permitted to import, are now authorised to import, that those who were not permitted to sell, are now authorised to sell? Then let me say, Mr. Speaker, further, that I do not think that the Minister of the Interior can escape responsibility in the way that he has suggested, with regard to the sale of intoxicants within the Banff Park. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman's predecessor told this House that the object of this Rocky Mountain Act was to take that territory out of the control of the Government of the North-West Territories and to put it under the control of the Government here. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act he will see the second section says: "The said tract of land is hereby reserved and set apart as a public park," &c. Then in sub-section *e* of section 4, we find these words: "The park shall be under the control and management of the Minister of Interior and the Governor in Council, who may make regulations for the following purposes: Trade, traffic of every description." Does the hon. gentleman propose to submit to Council regulations for "trade and traffic of every description"? The trade and traffic in intoxicants is not a traffic of every description, but of one description. It is one embraced in the general proposition "every description," and if the Governor in Council and the Minister of the Interior can make regulations for trade and traffic of every description, there is no description of trade and traffic that remains to be regulated by the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Would he not have power to issue any permit?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think not. This power was given to him for a purpose, and he must exercise it in accordance with the policy of the law. He exercises that power under the direction of the Government whose officer he is and to whom he is responsible, just as the Government is responsible to Parliament, if he neglects his duty or adopts a policy contrary to law. It is, therefore, inconsistent that, so far as Banff Park is concerned, any portion of that power should remain with the Lieutenant Governor. The Governor in Council regulates trade and traffic of every description. If they do, they can say that the sale of intoxicants shall there be prohibited. If they are prohibited, what becomes of the power of the Lieutenant Governor to grant permits? Surely they can say the Lieutenant Governor shall not grant permits in that territory. They regulate trade and traffic of every description, and in doing so they exclude every power whatever remaining to the Lieutenant Governor. I think what the mover of the resolution and the seconder of the resolution have stated is perfectly correct, and that the Government are highly censurable for the course which they have permitted their officer to take in the North-West Territory. Every Lieutenant Governor in the Territories is subject to instructions. The business of the Government is to issue to him instructions. They are to state upon what terms and conditions those powers with which he is entrusted shall be exercised, and he is as much subject to control and instructions as the Governor of any British Colony is subject to the instructions given to him with his commission, and further as to how his powers have to be exercised by him.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has failed to point out in what particular the law of 1874 was more restrictive than the law now on the Consolidated Statutes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will read sub-section 2, chapter 7, 37 Victoria, I think he will find out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read, and it would have been fair to the House if he had read that subsection, he would have found out that the power to enforce either the sale or manufacture could be exercised by special permission of the Lieutenant-Governor, and under the present law it states that that can only be done by Order in Council, and the permission to sell be given by the Lieutenant Governor. So, really, the Lieutenant Governor under the law placed on the Statute-book, when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was a member of the Government, was given much greater power than he now possesses under the Consolidated Statutes.

Mr. LAURIER. You gave more limited powers, but you allowed the evasion of them.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has made a statement that is not warranted by the facts. He has made a statement which I am quite sure, if he knew the facts, he would not have made.

Mr. LAURIER. Give us the facts.

Mr. BOWELL. When a gentleman makes a charge against another he has to prove it.

Mr. KIRK. What the Minister rose to correct was the statement that Sir Charles Tupper claimed to be the author of that law.

Mr. BOWELL. He said a great deal more than that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Statutes of 1874 were simply an amendment of 1873. If the hon. gentleman will look at chapter 39, section 13, he will find that all the provisions which are embodied in the Statute of 1874 extended to Manitoba and the North-West, and the Act of 1874 simply continued those powers.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:25 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### REPORTS—PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills will expire on Thursday next, 14th inst., the same be extended until Thursday, 28th inst., in accordance with the recommendation contained in the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

### SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act. He said: The object of this Bill is, in the first place, to make provision for the class of cases in which a judge who has been appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada has been interested in a cause, to the extent of having heard it in the court below, and the Bill provides that, in that case, four judges of the Supreme Court may constitute a quorum. There is also a provision

enabling an appeal to be taken for assessment purposes from the Province of British Columbia, when the appeal involves a sum which the House will fix.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: This Bill is a very simple and a very short one. It provides that Canadians shall have the preference for appointments in the Civil Service; that foreigners, or even those from the British Islands, shall not be placed at an advantage over Canadians, that is, native-born Canadians, who we claim have the right to the first place in the Civil Service of this country. At all events, the Bill provides that a man shall be a resident of the country for five years before he can enter the Civil Service. In introducing this Bill, I am only carrying out the principle adopted by this Government in 1878, when they declared their policy to be "Canada for the Canadians," but I regret to say that, in this particular, they have not followed the dictates of their consciences, or of their utterances. I am now proposing to put this on a footing which will not allow them to have the option.

Mr. BERGIN. Is there any chance for an Irishman under this Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has no Irishmen in his constituency.

Mr. COOK. I have plenty of them, and they all vote for me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will not after this Bill is proposed.

Mr. BERGIN. After this, no Irish need apply.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### PROVINCIAL JUDGES' SALARIES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that on Thursday next the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts and to provide that the salaries and allowances of the functionaries hereinafter mentioned shall be as follows:—

In the Province of Ontario:	Per annum.
The Chief Justice of Ontario .....	\$7,000
Three Justices of Appeal, each .....	6,000
The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench .....	7,000
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, each .....	6,000
The Chancellor of Ontario .....	7,000
Three Judges of the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, each .....	6,000
The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas .....	7,000
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Common Pleas Division, each .....	6,000
In the Province of Quebec:	
The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench .....	7,000
Five puisné Judges of the said Court, each .....	6,000
The Chief Justice of the Superior Court .....	7,000
Thirteen puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, each .....	6,000
Sixteen puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed elsewhere than at Montreal or Quebec .....	4,500
The senior puisné Judge residing at Quebec, if the Chief Justice resides at Montreal, or the senior puisné Judge residing at Montreal, if the Chief Justice resides at Quebec, in addition to his other salary .....	1,000
In the Province of Nova Scotia:	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court .....	6,000
The Judge in Equity .....	5,000
Five, and on the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of Judge of Equity, six puisné Judges of the Supreme Court, each .....	5,000
In the Province of New Brunswick:	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court .....	6,000
The Judge in Equity .....	5,000
Four puisné Judges of the Supreme Court, each .....	5,000

In the Province of Prince Edward Island:

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, being also Judge of the Court of Vice-Admiralty .....

One Assistant Judge, being also Master of the Rolls in Chancery .....

One Assistant Judge, being also Vice-Chancellor .....

In the Province of Manitoba:

The Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench .....

Three puisné Judges of the said Court, each .....

In the Province of British Columbia:

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court .....

Four puisné Judges of the said Court, each .....

In the North-West Territories:

Five puisné Judges of the Supreme Court, each .....

That the salaries of five County Court Judges in British Columbia shall be \$2,400 per annum, each, and that each such Judge may, in addition, receive a salary from the Province for acting as a Stipendiary Magistrate.

That there may be paid to each Judge of a Provincial Court, attending, as such, any Court held at any place other than that at which he is directed to reside, for travelling allowance, his moving expenses and such sum as is allowed from time to time by the Governor in Council, for each day he is absent from his place of residence.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Since I have had the privilege of a seat in this House, which is now for the seventh Session, strange to say I have always found that for one or two weeks of the Session the House has been transformed into something akin to an Irish wake. You will all know what that means, when I tell you that the chief mourners and the professional mourners vie with each other as to the volubility and dolefulness of their lamentations. Judging the hon. member who spoke the other night from this standard, I would say he is entitled to promotion, which would bring him down from his present seat, and place him beside the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House appear to have usurped the office of the traditional Banshee, whose privilege it was to sit upon the curbstones of the house and torment and alarm the inhabitants within, by his wails and cries of lamentation, prognosticating all kinds of mischief and all kinds of alarm. Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen have gone on year after year, since I have had a seat in this House, and during all this time I have looked up and down this country from one end to the other, I have searched the public records, and I am unable to find a corpse which called for these lamentations; nay, Mr. Speaker, I have not even found a sick patient. I have found some whom these hon. gentlemen have, by their persuasive eloquence in this House, almost convinced that they were commercially ill, but when I applied the unerring test of illness or health, I have found at all times that no disease was existing within their system. Now, this being the case, and hon. gentlemen, by the elections of 1882, and by the elections of 1887, having been told in the most unmistakable way that there was no commercial sickness in this country, I think it is high time that they should give up these lamentations, that they should give up this wailing, that they should give up this bemoaning the condition of their country, and join with us in praises and laudations of this land of our birth, or of our adoption. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us that had the colonies of British North America been sufficiently associated with the other colonies in 1774-5-6, they would, in all probability, have been a part of the great American Republic to-day. I can tell the hon. gentleman that had we then had a voice in what took place at that time, there would have been no separation from the British Empire by the colonies of those days. I can tell the hon. gentleman that



it was but by a very small majority that the colonies of New England at that time separated from the British Empire, and the voice of this little and insignificant land, as he chooses to call it, would have decided the question the other way. I think, Sir, it is a pity, from this view of the case, that we had not a voice at that time in deciding the action of the colonies; it is a pity for the Americans, too, because had they not separated from England at that time, they would to-day have been rejoicing in the glorious traditions of the history of that great Empire, the greatest the world has yet seen, or, perhaps, ever will see. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk must give us credit, at all events, for being a most magnanimous people. I have been at elections and attended election meetings on the other side of the border. I have the privilege of living on the border, and, Sir, no man in the United States, free as they choose to call it, would dare to make the utterances against his country that the hon. member for North Norfolk has made. They would give him about five minutes to pack his grip-sack and emigrate. Now, Sir, that hon. gentleman says that they have pinned unrestricted reciprocity to the masthead, and they are going to stick to it. Let me give him the opinion of a man who has been, and is now, very high in the counsels of their party, a man whose political opinion, from the Reform standpoint at least, is not only worthy of notice, but is worthy of a great deal of credence, and worthy of much attention. I will read the opinions of this gentleman who inspired, if he did not write, this article, on the 31st of January last, in the *Galt Reformer*, in the town of Galt, that place of active business, that place of Scotch loyalty, in the centre of the county of Waterloo, and I read it as a warning for the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston) to trim his sails that they may not be shattered at the next election. It says, after quoting the *Globe*, denying that the hon. leader of the Opposition had abandoned the policy of "Unrestricted Reciprocity:"

"But we do hesitate to say that a large section of the Liberal party would have been glad to learn that it was true. \* \* \* It surely must be apparent to every clear-sighted Reformer, that 'Unrestricted Reciprocity,' apart from its merits or demerits, is quite impracticable, at least at present. \* \* \* We have long felt and now consider it our duty to say it, that for the Liberal party to go on crying for what the Americans bluntly and sometimes insultingly tell us they won't grant, appears to us a weak political position, at variance with the natural spirit of our people, and certain to land us in a false and unpopular position. \* \* \* As a Liberal journal we regard it as our duty to state frankly that public opinion, as we find it, regards Unrestricted Reciprocity as impracticable, \* \* \* and the sooner our party leaders recognise the fact, the sooner will they be able to enlist popular sympathy in the overturn of Tory misgovernment."

Now, Sir, that is the opinion of one of the most prominent Reformers in this country, a man who never yet, on any question, has wavered in his allegiance to his party. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this clearly shows that, in the estimation of the thinking men of this country, the Liberal party are now further away from their duty to their country than they have ever been before in its history. Now, Sir, I desire to deal with some figures given by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Hon. gentlemen opposite spend the whole year ransacking blue-books, for the purpose of gathering up something to throw in the teeth of this House, in the teeth of the people, derogatory to their country; so it is difficult for us to ransack the blue-books and journals for the purpose of correcting their figures, and I may here say, that in nearly every instance the figures are not given as they ought to be given, truthfully and candidly to the House and the country. Now, I make a quotation from the speech of the hon. gentleman, where he says that Canada produced in 1881, \$309,676,000 worth of goods; the United States, in 1880, produced \$5,369,000,000 worth of goods. Other industries—and this is what I desire the House to remember, because this speech will go to the people of this country, it will go to the people of the

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

United States, and to the people of England. And let me say here, that I think it is a pity, and something that ought to be corrected by our Government, that the telegraph lines of this country are owned and controlled by a gentleman who propagates these seditious words to the people of this country, and to the people of the world. This gentleman is Mr. Wiman—I mention his name, and perhaps the word seditious is too strong, but you can use a milder term—he sends these words and the speeches throughout the length and breadth of America, I am told, free of charge; and the contradictions that are made from year to year by us on this side of the House, have to be paid for, and if they are sent, are sent in a garbled condition. Other industries in the United States, according to Mulhall, amount to £2,281,000,000 sterling. I have Mulhall, and I will show that that amount is the whole trade and wealth of the United States; it includes manufactures, transportation, commerce and agriculture, everything in fact, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) gave it as a little side issue. I desire to give the facts from Mulhall, the very authority from which the hon. gentleman derived his information, and I think I will show to the House that the hon. gentleman, by a slip of the tongue, or from a desire to misrepresent this country, made an error, and certainly did misrepresent it. Mulhall distinctly states that the figures expressed in million pounds, are showing the aggregate business of the United States to be £2,281,000,000; agriculture, £604,000,000; manufactures, £1,112,000,000; commerce, £313,000,000; and transportation, £252,000,000; which gives a gross aggregate of £2,281,000,000; which the hon. gentleman gave as a little side show on the part of the United States. The hon. gentleman gave the House also, and I will take the hon. gentleman's own figures, although I believe accurate statements would show differently—and unfortunately for this country we have not a bureau of statistics from which we can obtain statistics—as the annual operations of Canada, £167,000,000. I desire the House to pay attention to these figures, because it is desirable that they should be correct. The hon. gentleman desires to show that the United States has advanced and progressed at an inordinate rate as compared with Canada. I take the hon. gentleman's own figures, £2,281,000,000 as the aggregate output of the United States for 1881, and £167,000,000 as the aggregate output of Canada. When you take those together you multiply £167,000,000 by 13½, and you obtain a sum equal to the aggregate output of the United States. Do hon. gentlemen not see that the population of the United States being twelve times as great as this country, the amount of business done by them is only thirteen and a half times more than ours, according to their own showing? I leave that fact in the hands of the House, simply stating that, in my opinion, it is a good showing. Leaving that point, which I think will be satisfactory to every lover of this country, at all events, I will go on a little further. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that the United States had doubled its business, wealth and population in 25 years. The figures which he quoted with respect to Canada, £167,000,000, were those of the condition of the country when we had enjoyed only one year of the National Policy, while the United States had enjoyed thirteen years of its protective policy. But if the hon. gentleman will allow us to continue, if he will cease decrying this country, we will, in the space of 25 years, I undertake to say, under the National Policy, double our population, and double our resources, and double our output. But it is difficult to do so, because we have enemies to contend with in this country who are not found in the United States; we have enemies within the country, while they have only enemies without, and one enemy within the ranks is worse for the country than a thousand enemies without. I dealt with the whole question of our markets very fully last year, and I showed that

Buffalo is no market for Canadians; that Rochester is no market for Canadians, for it is supplied by the Genesee valley; that Albany, situated at the outlet of the Erie Canal, where everything can be sent from Chicago and the west at lower prices than they can be sent from Ontario, is no market for Canadians; that Detroit is no market, flooded as it is with the products of Michigan. How can Cleveland be a market for Canada, when the city is flooded with overflowing exports from the west? How can Chicago, which has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman, be a market for Canadians? It cannot, and this must be evident to every honorable man in this House or out of it, both in this country and in the United States. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred to the reduced price of farm lands in New York State, and apologised for it and gave reasons therefor. Would he spend as much time and exercise as much talent in explaining a similar point in regard to Canada? Would the hon. gentleman come to the rescue and endeavor to prove that the farm lands of Canada had fallen in price for good and substantial reasons? No, he would not do it. We do not object to hon. gentlemen opposite crying for unrestricted reciprocity, if they will do it fairly; but when they decry this country we are bound to object, not only on the floor of this House, but throughout the country. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Chaulion) had changed his mind since 1876, and that was a sign of greatness. I wish the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would give us that sign just now. I propose to show to this House that the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is based entirely upon false premises. The premises upon which they based their argument is that we are in a destitute condition and gradually and rapidly growing worse, that no country has prospered but the United States, and for that reason we should become a part of the United States. I propose to show that we have kept pace with the United States, and this notwithstanding the cries that have been raised with respect to the exodus. In doing so I will use figures and statistics that can be obtained by any hon. gentleman. The following figures show these facts:—

	1871.	1881.	Increase.
Prince Edward Island.....	94,021	108,891	15½ per cent.
Nova Scotia .....	387,800	440,572	13 "
New Brunswick.....	285,594	321,233	12 "
Maritime Provinces.....	767,415	870,696	13 "
State of Maine.....	1870. 626,915	1880. 648,936	Increase. 3 per cent.
Quebec.....	1871. 1,191,516	1881. 1,359,027	14 per cent.
Vermont and New Hampshire..	1870. 648,881	1880. 679,277	4 per cent.
New England States.....	1870. 3,487,924	1880. 4,010,529	14½ per cent.
Quebec and Maritime Provinces	1871. 1,958,931	1881. 2,229,723	14 per cent.
State of New York.....	1870. 4,382,759	1880. 5,082,871	15 per cent.
Ontario.....	1871. 1,620,851	1881. 1,923,228	18½ per cent.
Manitoba.....	1871. 18,995	1881. 65,954	247 per cent.
Minnesota .....	1870. 439,708	1880. 780,773	77½ per cent.

I am unable to make comparisons with respect to the North-West, because nearly all the population of the North-West Territories have gone in there within the last three, four or five years since the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I undertake to say that the North-West

Territories have grown space with any territory there is to the south of them. I will now compare the increase of Toronto and a few other cities, with that of cities in the United States. From 1871 to 1881, Toronto increased 54 per cent., from 1870 to 1880, Rochester increased 43 per cent.; Buffalo 31 per cent., Detroit 46 per cent. During the last eight years Toronto has increased 92 per cent.; Chicago, from 1870 to 1880, increased 68 per cent., Boston has increased 44 per cent., and Montreal 31 per cent. Montreal in the last eight years has increased 62 per cent; Ottawa, from 1881 to 1886, increased 35½ per cent., London increased 32 per cent., Hamilton increased 16½ per cent., and the town of Galt increased 80 per cent. within 7 years. I would take the population of Quebec from so far back as 1812 and show that from that period to 1880, the Province has kept pace in every particular with the United States.

The population of the Province of Quebec in 1812 was.....	225,000
do do Ontario in 1812 was.....	75,000
Total in 1812.....	300,000
Population of Quebec, 1880, was.....	1,359,027
do Ontario, 1880, was.....	1,913,228
Total.....	3,272,255
(Almost 11 fold.)	
Population of the United States, 1812, was.....	8,000,000
do do 1880, was.....	50,155,683
(6½ fold.)	
Between 1812 and 1880 Ontario and Quebec multiplied their population by.....	10.9
United States, in the same period, only by.....	6.3

Now, Sir, I will give the House a few more statistics, to show our progress and development:

The assessed value in Toronto in 1881 was.....	\$ 56,686,039
do do 1888 was.....	113,183,828
(Increase, 100 per cent. in the short space of 7 years.)	
The assessed value of Winnipeg in 1881 was.....	\$ 9,196,435
do do 1886 was.....	19,286,405
(109 per cent.)	

I shall give figures to prove still further that Canada is progressing and prospering, and that it is progressing and prospering at a ratio that is not exceeded even by the land to the south of us. The hon. the Minister of Finance dealt somewhat with this the other night, but I wish to cull out a few statistics and give them in a concise form to the House.

The number of letters and post cards in Canada, 1880.....	53,600,000
do do do 1887.....	90,656,000
(About 7 per cent.)	
Number of registered letters, 1880.....	2,040,000
do do 1887.....	3,560,000
(74 per cent.)	
Number of postal money orders, 1880.....	306,088
(Amounting to \$7,207,337.)	
Number of postal money orders, 1887.....	574,899
(Amounting to \$10,328,984.)	
Money orders issued in other countries and payable in Canada, 1880.....	\$ 698,651
Money orders issued in other countries and payable in Canada, 1887.....	1,495,674
(Increase, 114 per cent.)	
Number of newspapers and periodical posted in Canada, 1880.....	45,120,062
do do do 1887.....	64,246,326
(Increase, 42 per cent.)	
Amount of deposits in savings banks under the control of the Government on 1st July, 1880.....	\$ 9,207,683
Amount of deposits in savings banks under the control of the Government on 1st July, 1887.....	37,173,813
(Increase, over 300 per cent.)	
Amount of deposits in chartered banks, 1880.....	\$ 84,818,804
do do do 1887.....	114,483,190
(Increase, 35 per cent.)	

The amount of life insurance in Canada—and Mulhall says that there is no truer test of the prosperity of a people than the amount of life insurance they take, and there is no higher authority than Mulhall—

The amount of life insurance at risk in Canada, 1880, was... \$ 90,280,293  
do do do 1887, was... 191,679,852  
(Increase, 112 per cent.)

Now, if life insurance is a true and proper test of the progress, prosperity and advancement of a country, what better increase does one want than 112 per cent. in the space of 7 years. The number of tons of freight handled by Canadian roads increased from 9,938,000 in 1880, to 16,000,000 tons in 1887, or an increase of 67 per cent. in 7 years. The number of passengers carried on Canadian rail ways increased from 6,000,000 in 1880, to 10,000,000 in 1887, an increase of 63 per cent. in 7 years. What further evidence do you want of the progress of this country, and what more rapid progress does any candid man ask for than an increase of 60 to 112 per cent. in the short space of 7 years. I propose to show you that the United States is not the only country that was prosperous during the last few years, and in fact that they have scarcely kept pace with other nations in the march of progress. The United States have fallen far short in many essential elements of progress and prosperity. They have hoarded up their means, they have put the money in their coffers at Washington; and by doing this they have failed, as I said before, in some of the most important and essential elements of national greatness and national prosperity. I will prove this from Mulhall's "Progress of the World," and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will examine this work. At pages 45 and 46, under the head of "Commerce and Shipping," we find in 1830 the United Kingdom has £88,000,000 sterling, and in 1878, £601,000,000, or, in 50 years the increase was seven-fold. The British Colonies have increased in commerce and shipping fourteen and a half fold; France has increased nine-fold, Germany eight-fold, and the great land of promise, the United States, only six and a half fold. Why, Sir, the United States have increased at only one-half the rate that Canada and the other British Colonies have increased. Now, Sir, I will take the figures further and continue to compare the rate of increase in other countries. Russia has increased five and a half fold in 50 years; Austria, thirteen-fold; South America, seven-fold; Italy, nine-fold; Scandinavia, eight-fold; Turkey, in the east, six-fold; Spain and Portugal, three and a half fold, and the Low Countries, nine-fold; so that of the important countries, in commerce and shipping, there are nine that have a greater ratio of increase than the United States, and only three countries lower than the United States; yet hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the great prosperity of that country.

Countries.	1830.	1878.	Increase.
	£	£	
United Kingdom.....	88,000,000	601,000,000	7 fold.
British Colonies.....	21,000,000	322,000,000	14½ do
France.....	42,000,000	368,000,000	9 do
Germany.....	39,000,000	319,000,000	8 do
United States.....	35,000,000	225,000,000	6½ do
Austria.....	12,000,000	160,000,000	13 do
Russia.....	24,000,000	128,000,000	5½ do
South America.....	14,000,000	101,000,000	7 do
Italy.....	11,000,000	98,000,000	9 do
Scandinavia.....	8,000,000	66,000,000	8 do
Turkey and the East.....	15,000,000	85,000,000	6 do
Spain and Portugal.....	11,000,000	39,000,000	3½ do
Low countries.....	30,000,000	275,000,000	9 do
World.....	350,000,000	2,787,000,000	8 fold.

At page 50, in Mulhall's "Progress of the World," we find between 1868 and 1879 that the shipping and tonnage of the following countries have increased at this rate:

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland)

British Empire.....	27 per cent.
United States.....	4 "
Scandinavia.....	50 "
Italy.....	58 "
Germany.....	14 "
Spain.....	85 "
France.....	1 "

And the United States stand at the bottom of the list, except France. It is easy for those people to have hundreds of millions of dollars in their coffers, while other nations are laying out their surplus in productive commerce and shipping.

Mr. KIRK. How much has Canada increased in shipping?

An hon. MEMBER. Read it up for yourself.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If the hon. gentleman will seek a little information he will change from that side of the House in less than five minutes, if he is candid, and he will be over here sitting beside me supporting the Government, whose policy has tended to the progress and prosperity of the country. I want to give, also, to the House, the percentage of the aggregate industries.

Mr. KIRK. What about the shipping of Canada?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If you are uncomfortable, Sir, you will be more so before I am through; I would advise you to get your seat cooled off a little. Now, I want to show the aggregate annual value of the different industries. Hon. gentlemen opposite jeer and sneer at manufacturers. The only people who have their particular protection are the farmers. Well, Sir, I represent a farming constituency, and they might bring the whole host of them to be candidates against me, and they could not elect one of them. I am essentially a farmers' representative, but I recognise that it is just as important to the farmer to have a market, as it is to raise his grain. But hon. gentlemen opposite scoff at every industry but that of farming. Now, I want to show you the value of agricultural industries in comparison with the value of manufacturing and other industries. We will take first the United States, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will accept that country's condition as a most unerring guide to their conclusions on all matters of this kind;—I am taking the year 1881:

	U. S. Value.	Canada Value.
Agriculture.....	\$2,935,000,000	\$323,000,000
Manufactures.....	5,404,000,000	\$318,600,000
Add Raw Material.....		153,300,000
		469,900,000

You will also find by these figures that the product of agriculture in Canada amounts to one-ninth of that of the United States, while their population is twelve times greater than ours. Now, that is an important fact. We find that manufactures in the United States are only thirteen times greater than they are in Canada, after enjoying a Protective Policy for thirteen years, while we enjoyed it only one year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Enjoyed?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Yes, enjoyed; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the country to which he points, and upon which his own thoughts are expended, has grown to greatness under a protective policy. Now, the value of the aggregate annual industries of the world amounts to \$50,456,000,000, which is made up as follows:—

Agriculture.....	\$18,135,000,000
Manufactures.....	18,604,000,000
Commerce.....	11,644,000,000
Transport.....	4,072,000,000

We find that manufactures stand at the head of the list; and still these hon. gentlemen ridicule manufacturers, and call them all kinds of nasty names. Now, Sir, the percentage of agriculture to the gross industry in different countries is as follows:—

Russia.....	54 per cent.
Spain.....	47 "
Austria.....	46 "
Italy.....	42 "
Australia.....	36 "
Germany.....	34 "
Canada.....	34 "
France.....	33 "
United States.....	26 "
United Kingdom.....	14 "

From this we see that the higher the condition of civilisation, prosperity and progress, the lower is the percentage of agriculture. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House talk about our national debt. I want to show you, as the hon. Minister of Finance pointed out the other night, that our national debt has been brought about by expenditures upon productive public works in this country. I want to show you that the United States, with all its prosperity, its greatness and its population, has expended very little upon productive public works, while we have spent a great deal. By the American Almanac—that red book which, I have no doubt, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has in his desk—you will find that the United States, from the year 1779 to the year 1879, or one century, have expended the following sums on public works :

Railways.....	\$ 84,627,181
Rivers and Harbors.....	66,209,118
Canals.....	9,197,473
Public Buildings.....	115,364,928
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$275,398,700</b>

Equal to \$5.50 per head of the population of 1880. Now, the expenditure of Canada on public works in 20 years, since Confederation, has been as follows :—

Railways.....	\$97,056,433
Canals.....	29,876,800
Public Buildings.....	10,418,390
Public Works.....	11,547,019
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$148,898,622</b>

Add expenditure prior to Confederation :

Railways and Canals.....	\$52,944,175
Public Works.....	10,690,917
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$212,533,714</b>

Equal to \$42.50 per head of a population of 5,000,000, as against \$5.50 per head in the United States. These public works have given employment to our people, and the money is in the country, and has been spent here. The digging out of the Welland Canal in the earlier days of this country furnished ready money to the immigrant who came to this country; and the building of all these canals and railways, the opening up and developing of this country, has been productive, is productive, and will be more productive in the future. Now, with regard to the United States as a market, I want to show you what is a most remarkable fact, that if the United States furnished an advantageous market to the people of this country from 1854 to 1866, that advantage has disappeared, and I will show you why. The reason is that the producing power of the people of the United States has increased at a greater and more rapid ratio than has their consuming power. The consuming power of the United States, as indicated by the increase of its population from 1860 to 1880, has only increased 56 per cent., while its producing power has increased, in wheat 333 per cent., in corn 450 per cent., in bacon and hams 443 per cent., in cheese 333 per cent., and in wood and manufactures of wood 65 per cent. So that, if that country was of any value to us as a market during the twelve years of reciprocity, that value has disappeared by reason of the fact that their producing power has increased so enormously over their consuming power. Now, Sir, let us see what the imports and exports of the United States were in 1887:—I take the figures from the report of the

Ontario Bureau of Statistics. I do not vouch for their correctness, beyond that I think hon. gentlemen opposite will take them as being correct. In 1887, the exports of Canada to the United States, and of the United States to Canada, stood as follows :—

	Canada Exports to U. S.	U. S. Exports to Canada.
Mines.....	\$ 3,085,431	\$ 4,460,260
Fisheries.....	2,717,509	156,909
Animals and their Produce.....	7,291,369	7,071,498
Agricultural Products.....	7,969,716	12,342,800
Manufactures.....	1,285,584	7,159,115
<b>The Forest.....</b>	<b>\$22,349,600</b>	<b>\$31,180,682</b>
	<b>8,545,306</b>	<b>1,070,589</b>
	<b>\$30,895,006</b>	<b>\$32,250,771</b>

With the forest included we furnish the United States with a market for \$1,355,765 more than they furnish us. Leaving the products of the forest out, we find that we furnish the United States with a market for \$8,830,982 more than they furnish us; but still these people say we must seek a market in the United States. I propose to deal with the question of reciprocity from 1854 to 1866. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says the reciprocity treaty was unfair to the Americans, and that we can never expect to get another treaty like it. Now, I want, from an authority they will not question, to convince those hon. gentlemen of the contrary. I intend to quote the late Hon. George Brown, who was as strong an opponent of the right hon. the First Minister as any member in this House can ever expect to be, but though an opponent in politics of the right hon. gentleman, the hon. George Brown was loyal and patriotic to his country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is dead now.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is dead, I do not think any hon. gentleman will be found to use similar language with regard to him. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the whole Reciprocity Treaty was unfavorable to the United States and favorable to Canada, and I will just weary the House with a quotation which will show the opinion of the late Hon. George Brown on that subject. You will find it in the proposed treaty which he offered in 1874 :

“An impartial examination of the commercial relations between the British North America Provinces and the United States for the past fifty years cannot fail to establish beyond all doubt that the traffic between them has been valuable to both countries, but that the United States has from first to last reaped the largest advantage from it.”

That is from the mouth of the Hon. George Brown, and I will just give you some of the figures :

From 1821 to 1832 the United States exported to the British North America Provinces—	
Domestic products.....	\$30,997,417
Foreign.....	493,909
	<b>\$31,491,326</b>

From 1821 to 1832 the British North America Provinces exported to the United States.....	7,684,533
--	-----------

Showing a balance in favor of the United States of..... \$23,716,797

From 1833 to 1845 the United States exported to the British North America Provinces—	
Domestic products.....	\$54,082,537
Foreign do.....	4,640,332
	<b>\$58,722,869</b>
Canada exported to United States.....	28,268,275

Balance in favor of the United States.... \$36,368,594

In 1846 transport in bond commenced.

From 1845 to 1853 the United States exported to the British North America Provinces—	
Domestic products.....	\$55,072,260
Foreign do.....	22,020,254

From Canada to the United States..... \$71,092,514

Balance in favor of the United States..... \$40,358,222

Let us see what the late Hon. George Brown said still further:

"To obtain a just appreciation of the value of the traffic between the two countries during the operation of the treaty, it is necessary to keep in mind that the civil war in the States in the last four years of the treaty's existence enhanced the value of commodities, and so deranged the industrial interests of the Republic as to give the Provinces a temporary advantage in the traffic, forbidding any fair deduction from it as to the ordinary course of trade in times of peace."

This is in answer to the hon. gentlemen who say we got higher prices. I denied that and proved last Session that we did not. I took the four years when the world was at peace, when prices were not enhanced by domestic or foreign wars: I took 1858, 1859, 1860 and 1861 as a period of four years, during the existence of the treaty, and 1863, 1869, 1870 and 1871 as a period of four years during the non-existence of the treaty, and I shall show the House that the people of Canada realised larger prices for agricultural products during the latter period than during the former. The late Mr. Brown indicates here most clearly that we derived a temporary advantage because of the four years' war. Again Mr. Brown said:

"And notwithstanding the anomalous character of the circumstances arising from the existence of the civil war during so considerable a portion of the treaty's existence by which the imports from the Provinces were greatly increased in volume and value, and the exports to the Provinces as naturally reduced in quantity, the balance of trade during the existence of the treaty was largely in favor of the United States."

During the existence of the treaty, the British North America Provinces purchased from the United States \$346,180,264, and the United States purchased from us only \$325,726,520, leaving a balance in favor of the United States of \$20,454,246. The total export of the United States from 1854 to 1863, during the existence of the treaty, was \$4,000,000,000. Of this England and her possessions took \$2,769,974,538, or nearly 70 per cent. of the whole. In those days England and her colonies were the great market for the people of the United States, and today England and her colonies are equally the great market for the Americans. The prices in Liverpool and London control and are the true barometer of prices, and the United States have to seek a market in England and on the continent just as we have. Talk about our getting a market there. I would ask any hon. gentleman what is the use of going to a farmer who has 400 bushels of wheat in his granary, to sell him 5 bushels more? He would tell us: I have more wheat than I know what to do with. I must find a market for my wheat, and if I buy from you, you must take enough off the price to enable me to export it. That is the exact position of the United States market. They boast of their manufactures. That very boast ought to show these hon. gentlemen that they have not a market and never can have a market for the products of Canada. During this period, Canada took more from the United States than any country in the world except France; and leaving out France, Spain and Germany, Canada took more than all the rest of the world. I will go on to show the character of the commodities taken by us from the United States during the existence of the treaty:

Animals and their product.....	\$ 35,433,213
Breadstuffs.....	112,058,473
Other farm products.....	3,242,982
Timber.....	8,511,488
Manufactures.....	88,649,855
Miscellaneous.....	24,044,977
<hr/>	
Home productions.....	\$271,940,988
Foreign commodities.....	62,379,718
<hr/>	
Grand total taken by us.....	\$334,320,706

I want to read you again, something more that the Hon. George Brown said, in reference to this treaty:

"Did nothing more, therefore, than the volume of traffic between the two countries, and the comparative contribution of each country to it, enter into the question of relative advantages derived from the treaty  
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

by each, no doubt could exist as to the United States having reaped much greater profit from the Treaty of 1854, than the Provinces. But there is another very important branch of the account. The transportation traffic sent to and brought from foreign countries by the Provinces in bond, over the railways and canals, and in the ocean ships and steamers trading from United States ports, raise to an importance, secondary only to the traffic in domestic productions, and must have drawn very large gains into the coffers of the Republic."

The Hon. George Brown further says:

"Nor was it merely the vast interchange of commodities, and the great carrying trade in bond, that the United States reaped their golden annual harvest from the Treaty of 1854.

Mark how strongly he puts it—"Their golden annual harvest from the Treaty of 1854." He goes on:

"It must not be forgotten, that the Canadian canals and River St. Lawrence were thrown open to the ships and commerce of the United States, on the same footing as to the Canadian people who had spent large sums upon them, at tolls so low as not to defray the cost of attendance and maintenance. The sole return made for this concession was the permission to navigate Lake Michigan and the promise of the United States Government to urge upon the State Authorities of the Republic to extend to us the same free use of the American canals as we had extended to them—and this promise never bore fruit."

They never kept faith with the people of this country in regard to that promise, and they did not keep faith with them in the last treaty they made. We will see what the Hon. George Brown said in regard to the repeal of that treaty, and I think that is a complete answer to the hon. gentleman. He said:

"Immediately on the repeal of the treaty, the United States imposed a heavy Customs duty on nearly all the articles imported from Canada. The Canadian Tariff was still unchanged, and a large preponderance of the exports from the United States into the Dominion are still admitted free of duty. The use of the Canadian canals and the St. Lawrence still continued, and the shore fisheries of the St. Lawrence thrown open upon payment of a small license fee."

Still, hon. gentlemen say we have dealt too harshly with, and have tried to irritate the American people. I say that, instead of the hon. gentleman having acted simply as he has done, he should have cancelled every privilege which was given to the United States, but, in order to allow them to come to their senses, those privileges were continued until 1874. The Hon. George Brown was in Washington at that time, and so little attention did the American Government pay to his mission that they did not even bring it before the Council of their nation. Mr. Brown says:

"The abrogation of the treaty led to Confederation. Gave a new and vigorous impetus to the building of railways, enlarging the canals, and to seek trade with foreign countries. These (he says) were attended with remarkable success. Only seven fiscal years have passed since the repeal of the treaty, but already the loss inflicted by it has been more than made up, and excellent outlets in new directions opened for Canadian commerce, with an increasing annual proportion of the vast carrying trade formerly done for the Provinces by the railways, canals and steamships of the Republic transferred to Canadian hands."

This is the voice of the late Hon. George Brown in 1874, when all these things were fresh in his mind, and when he gave a candid and honest expression of opinion. I do not desire to detain the House any longer. I have already exceeded the proportions of the speech I intended to make to the House, but I may say, coming from a border county as I do, knowing the American people well, knowing their institutions well, I could not sit idly by and see that country lauded to the skies and the country of my birth derogated from in every particular. When I cross the Niagara River, people on the other side often quote to me speeches which have been made on the floor of Parliament here, saying, "You must be poor, destitute, and in want; though I do not see very many signs of that about you; that must be the case in the back country, though you keep up appearances on the frontier." I protest against such speeches being made in this House. One word as to the question of taxation. I happen to be a director of the Suspension Bridge, crossing the river at Niagara. Half of that bridge is in the State of New York, and half in Canada. I find that, in 1888, we paid state and municipal tax-

ation on that bridge in New York amounting to \$4,200, while we paid in Canada \$2,100. That is a criterion of the difference between the taxation in Canada and in the State of New York. If hon. gentlemen will examine the matter, they will find that what I said last Session is true, that, if we submitted to the same rate of taxation as the people of the United States do, we would pay off that little debt of ours in a very short time. In 1886, the State of New York raised for State purposes \$9,512,813, on a population of five million people, which would be equal to about \$1.70 a head. Hon. gentlemen will find that the taxation in that country for municipal purposes, to keep up roads, bridges and other things of that kind, is not less than our total taxation for all we need in this country. For foreign goods, our people need not pay any taxes at all, and, as a matter of fact, very few of the working people of this country buy these foreign goods, so that all the taxes they pay are practically the municipal taxes for keeping up their sidewalks, their roads, their bridges, and so on. The amount they pay in the State of New York for municipal purposes alone is about equal to the whole taxation of the people of Canada. Then, if the tariff is taken as a rate of taxation—and I deny that it is—I want to show that the tariff of the United States is proportionately much higher. Nearly everyone here knows what it is, and especially those who live near the frontier. You will find Mr. Wm. L. Scott, in the House of Representatives, stating that the rate of taxation on the average of the whole dutiable goods in the United States was 65.88 per cent. of the people. Mr. Scott and Mr. Mills endeavored to reduce the average taxation to 48.30 per cent., but they did not succeed. The people of the United States knew well enough what that meant, and did not permit it. If you were to throw in the free goods, you will find that the taxation of the people of the United States, if it be taxation at all, amounts to 54.16 per cent., which is double the taxation of the people of Canada. If the workingman of Canada wants to buy an imported article, he has to pay for it, but the workingman in the United States has to pay at least twice the amount paid by the workingman in Canada. Then he has to pay the State tax. We, in Canada, furnish to the Provinces about sufficient money every year to run the machinery of their Governments, we furnish them about 80 cents per head; while the people of the United States are taxed directly, as they are in the State of New York, for State purposes. There is no man in this House or out of it who admires or respects more than I do, everything that is good in the American people, and in their institutions, and there is a great deal that is good among them. But I am not blind to their faults, I know right well that they have many faults, and amongst them is their utter disregard and disrespect for everything that is not American. They have no respect for any nation or people under the sun that is not American. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is good in a sense, and I wish the people of Canada, as a whole, had some of that spirit in them to day, for then Canada would prosper and progress more than it does. The reason the United States have progressed in the degree represented by hon. gentlemen, is that they are a loyal and a patriotic people. Let any gentleman on the floor of Congress, in the United States, get up and speak disparagingly of his country, and he would not be there five minutes; he would be put out. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just say this much more, that we have committed to our charge a vast heritage, such a heritage as was never before given into the charge of five millions of people. We have a grand future before us. Our possibilities are great. If we would only join hands and work together to promote the best interests of this country, I would undertake to say that within the lifetime of those who are now of middle age, we would have a country unsurpassed on the face of the globe, not in population,

perhaps, but certainly in resources, certainly in grandeur, and certainly in wealth.

Mr. COLTER. In a great deal that has been said on the other side of the House we have heard the charges made that we who occupy seats on this side of the House are greatly given to disparaging our country. That seems to be their main cry, but that is not the position which we assume at all. We feel that we have a grand country, we feel that we have grand opportunities before us, and when we undertake to condemn a system of government which we believe is inimical to the best interests of the country, then we are showing true patriotism and true loyalty to our country. When we review the late political history of Canada and see what great pretensions and what great promises have been made by those who occupy the Treasury benches, and compare them with the actual results, we can charge these hon. gentleman with having been untrue to the trust which the people have reposed in them. Now, they told us in 1878 that they were going to do great things for this country: they told us that they were going to give our farmers a home market for their wool, for their wheat, and for their barley; they told us that instead of having to send these commodities, which the farmers produce, to the other side of the Atlantic, and to pay freight on them, we would have a market for them all at home; we would export nothing but the manufactured products, and we would not import any manufactures whatever. They said, Why, we are importing more than we are exporting, the balance of trade is against us, a country that imports more than it exports must necessarily be growing poorer; and they said, We will adopt a policy which will bring about a glorious reform. Well, they were put in power, and since then we have found that in 1879 the balance of trade was against us. They said, Wait till the National Policy has an opportunity to show what is really in it. We came to the year 1880, and then there was a slight balance of trade in our favor, and they said, See what the great National Policy has done for us, see what great benefit it has conferred upon us; and they claimed the credit for all these things. But afterwards when they found the balance of trade going continuously against us, when they found it last year practically the same as it was in 1878, do we hear anything from them about the balance in trade? They either undertook to do what they were unable to accomplish, and they certainly professed to be able to do impossibilities, or else the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have not been exerting themselves up to their full capacity. In either view of the case, the people have the right to charge them with being unfaithful to the trust imposed upon them, and with having deceived the people who placed them in power. We were told further that not only would we not export our raw material, but that we would export our manufactured products, and we would keep our young men at home, and we were told what great profits we would have in consequence of the export of these manufactured products. I remember hearing a very eloquent gentleman speak on that occasion when he declaimed in dulcet tones of the great benefits that were to accrue to this country. Why, he said, take a ton of ore in the raw state, and it is worth practically nothing, but convert that into watch springs, and it is worth thousands of dollars. He told us that we were going to do a great deal in this respect, we were going to manufacture at home all the products that we required for our own consumption. But we said, This is going to ruin British manufactures; they cannot export anything to us; it will injure them. What was the reply that was made? "So much the worse for British connection." But when we propose to enter into reciprocal trade with the United States, when English manufactures cannot be any worse off than they were under the policy entered into in 1878, hon. gentlemen

opposite tell us that we are very disloyal. They told us, You will have manufactures at your doors, you will not have to go abroad to buy any manufactured articles, you will buy them at home, and when you buy them at home you will not have to export those things which you produce upon your farms, and in consequence of that you will get liberal prices at home. But they have falsified those promises as well. Although manufactures have been encouraged for the last ten years, what do we find? We find that the export of manufactured articles last year—and that was much higher than the average for the last ten years—was only \$4,161,282; and we find that in 1878, when these gentlemen came into power, our exports amounted to \$4,127,755. They told us, You will not have to send your agricultural produce away, you will not have to send your animals and their product away, in order to find a market. You were to provide that market for him under the operation of the National Policy; but when the National Policy came into operation we were obliged to export more than ever. We find that the people of Canada have been submitting to most grievous taxation during the last ten years, and yet the export of manufactured articles has remained stationary or fallen during that period. There is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and it is this, that during the last few years there has been what has been termed an appreciation of money, in other words the prices of almost all commodities have fallen. Agricultural products have fallen, and we would naturally expect that the prices of other articles would fall similarly. It has been shown that the Government have been unable to prevent a decline in the price of agricultural products; or, if they have been able to prevent it, why have they not prevented it during the last ten years? But when we come to consider that the farmer has to expend a great portion of his product in purchasing other commodities, it becomes apparent that the protection system enhances the prices of the articles he has to purchase, and in that way it causes the farmer much injury. The articles which the farmer has to buy have not fallen correspondingly in price, due to the tariff which has been levied against the farmers and against the great mass of consumers, but in favor of certain of the manufacturers. I was surprised at the statement made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, who stated that the farmers need not pay any taxes whatever; that the farmers could eat with their fingers, and need not, therefore, pay taxes on knives and forks; that the farmers could raise and weave their wool, and so they need not pay taxes, but wear homespun, if they wished to avoid taxation. What I say is this, that the farmers occupy a position in this country inferior to no other class; and when the hon. gentleman attempts to presume on their supposed ignorance, he will find himself very much mistaken. The farmers know they have rights, and they will maintain those rights when the proper time and the proper occasion comes. I remember, during some of my campaigns—and I have had as many in my constituency as most people during the last three or four years—when I spoke in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, some of my opponents said: It is all right, our party is in favor of it. I am sorry for the sake of the farmers that they have been grossly deceived with respect to the National Policy; but the farmers are now determined to free themselves from some of the burdens that have been imposed upon them, for they feel they are taxed for the benefit of the favored few. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) has said they could avoid taxation, that they need not pay any duty on sugar if they did not desire to do so, that they need not use it unless they choose. The hon. gentleman is in favor of keeping sugar for the favored few, just as the Government keeps the sugar plums for the favored few. We will consider for a moment this question of sugar, and we can bring it down to something like a

Mr. COLTER,

reasonable basis. We find, according to the testimony given by Mr. Drummond before the Depression Committee in 1876, that 375 or 400 men can manufacture 100 tons of refined sugar per day, or, taking 300 working days in the year, 60,000,000 pounds per annum, or 180,000,000 pounds by 1,200 men. That quantity would perhaps equal the total consumption of sugar in Canada. That manufacture would, apparently, give employment to 1,200 men, and one would naturally consider it to be a good thing. If we come to compare this with the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that in 1881, 723 people were employed in our sugar refineries, and that the value of the product was \$962,000, capital invested \$2,150,000, total wages \$363,000, average per man \$502. That appears to be a large average, and I doubt whether that average sum has been paid to the employes in our sugar refineries. Let us now consider what the sugar refiners have obtained from the people, from the consumers of sugar in this country. During last year there were entered for consumption 201,891,000 pounds of sugar. Taking the amount of the refined at 90 per cent. of this, there would be 181,655,829 pounds. The Trade and Navigation Returns show there was a duty paid on that sugar of \$3,433,334, the duty per 100 pounds being \$1.89. That was the amount paid on sugar refined in Canada during 1888. The Trade and Navigation Returns show there were imported direct of sugar over fourteen Dutch standard last year, 1,874,283 pounds, the duty on which was \$60,898, duty per 100 pounds \$3.25. In other words, the people were paying \$3.25 of duty, while \$1.89 only was going into the Dominion Treasury. The people of Canada were taxed, not only to pay into the Dominion Treasury \$1.89 on every 100 pounds of sugar they used, but they were also taxed to put into the pockets of the sugar refiners \$1 for every hundred pounds they manufacture. So we have a double system of taxation, a system which realises a very large revenue indeed. Suppose the tax is only one cent per pound, no less than \$1,816,558 are obtained for the benefit of the sugar refiners. If we were to divide that sum by the total number of hands employed, we would find that not only did the people of this country, by reason of the taxation which was placed upon them in this way, pay the entire amount which is paid to the employes in our sugar refineries, but they paid more than double that sum every year. This seems to be an extravagant statement, but it is a statement borne out very completely and fully by the official statistics. We pay over \$1,800,000 per annum, according to the official returns. And yet hon. gentlemen, forsooth, say to the farmers, You need not pay any taxes, for you need not use sugar at all. Not only has sugar become, to a certain extent, a luxury, but it has become quite an important article of commerce. An hon. gentleman, the other day, stated that in the district from which he came you could go through a hundred miles of apple blossoms. The district I represent can show double that extent of country, even five times that extent of country well adapted to fruit growing. We have great advantages in the Niagara peninsula, and when we possess those advantages it is only natural that our people should engage in raising fruit, in canning and preserving fruits and in manufacturing jams. And we find in regard to sugar, which is a raw material, that in order to manufacture jams for export they have to pay a tribute of \$1.89 into the Dominion Treasury and pay a tribute of \$1 per hundred pounds to the sugar refiners of Canada. The sugar tax presses very heavily on the great mass of the community; it is an evil that should be remedied and should be terminated in a very short time. Take cotton; it is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the farmers need not pay any tax on cotton. We will suppose a merchant is engaged in the drygoods business for instance, and he imports cottons from the

United States or from England. He is met at the custom house and has to pay a duty of 30 per cent. The cottons cost him \$1,300, and he sells them at 20 per cent. profit, and there is not only 20 per cent. in the original cost, but 20 per cent. on the duty besides, and this would bring the cost up to \$1,560. When the retailer gets them he charges 20 per cent., and when the consumer has got those cottons, and pays for them, he pays \$1,872, but that is not all lost, for \$300 of that is in the Treasury, and part of the rest of that is taken up in the nature of profits. But, if we simmer it down, we find that the consumer pays \$434 in order to get \$300 into the Treasury. Suppose he chooses not to import these cottons, suppose he makes up his mind to patronise our cotton manufacturers in Canada, he has to go through about the same formality. The cotton manufacturer in Canada charges him just the price it will cost him to import this cotton, and when the consumer comes to pay for those cottons, although they are made in Canada, he has to pay \$400 at least. You may call that \$400 taxation, you may call it a bonus, or you may call it a fine if you please, but the consumer has to pay \$400 in order that he may put a bonus of \$300 into the pocket of the Canadian manufacturer. They tell us that our cotton manufacturers are not making so much money after all. Why are they not? They get this bonus out of us, and if they do not make that much money, then there is some mismanagement, and the consumer ought not be made atone for their mismanagement. The same might be said with reference to our woollen industries, and with reference to a large number of our industries in Canada. Whether the article is home manufactured, or imported from abroad, it is taxed, and the only difference is that if it is home manufactured the tax goes into the pockets of the favored few. We have in this way the system of the present Government in full force, and it is not increasing the wealth of the country, but simply diverting money from the pockets of one class into the pockets of another class in the community. This policy is not increasing the general wealth at all, and, as I have already stated, it is simply diverting the money from the pockets of the men who deserve it into the pockets of many men who do not deserve it. The people of Canada now feel, and they feel very generally, that the time has come when an end should be put to this condition of things. Our friends on the other side of the House well know this, and, therefore, they try to raise certain prejudices in the minds of the people. They say to us, "Do you want us to be subservient to the United States? Do you want us to back down in our proposals? Do you want us to levy a certain duty one day and to be afraid to levy it the next day?" We have had a good deal of that kind of thing from the Government lately, and indeed too much of it during the last few weeks, and they do not seem to want any more of it. It is no doubt very uncomfortable for them to have to take this humiliating position, and they think that we on this side of the House ought to feel uncomfortable in the same way, although they cannot make the charge truthfully against the party on this side of the House, yet they fall into this position, with reference to the taxation on small fruits and their proposed taxation on trees. They do not seem to be able to propose any taxation without considering from day to day how the people on the other side of the line will take it, and if the Americans protest against it our Government back down and eat humble pie in the mildest way possible. I imagine they ought to be getting well used to this kind of thing now. They say to us on this side of the House, "You want us to cringe to the United States." We never asked them to cringe to the United States. We never wanted them to make any proposals that were not just and reasonable; we wanted them to take a manly stand, and if they had persisted in doing this, and

not persisted in following their taunting and tantalising policy, there would not be so much humiliation for them. I say that the United States has pursued a tantalising policy too, and I hold that the policy of the two Governments which has existed during the last two years is unworthy the Governments of christian peoples. We, on this side of the House, propose simply to go and tell the people of the United States, "If you are willing to trade with us on fair and equal terms, we are willing to trade with you likewise, on the same terms; we do not propose to interfere with your internal legislation, and we do not propose to allow you to interfere with our internal legislation." The farmers of Canada know very well all the benefits that can be derived, and are likely to be derived, from this reciprocity treaty, and the Government and its supporters might talk till doomsday to any constituency of farmers, telling them that reciprocity would not benefit them; they might quote all the statistics in the library of the House of Commons to them, but still the farmers will not believe them. The people of the country know from past experience that reciprocity is beneficial to them, and that if it were in force now, it would be a great benefit to them also. A short time ago I was talking to a successful farmer in my constituency who is accustomed to keep accounts, and he knew very well the experience he had under the old Reciprocity Treaty. He told me, and I believe he can verify his statement from the crops he has raised during the last few years, that if we had reciprocity with the United States the net profits on his farming would be \$100 a year more than they are now. He said further, that all his neighbors would derive a like advantage if they had free access to the markets of the United States. Yet we have been told by the member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), that we do not want to send our produce there. Why, you cannot go to the station of any railway leading into Buffalo without seeing every day cars of cattle leaving Canada for Buffalo, and they are going there because there is no market for them elsewhere. Shipments are made every day of cattle and sheep and produce grown in Canada to the United States, because they have no other markets. In the Niagara peninsula we find ourselves wedged in as it were between the United States to the east and the United States to the west; we have important lines of railway running down and conveying produce from the Western States through to Buffalo, and through to New York, and through to Europe. We are on that main line of communication and every one of us feel that it would be very beneficial indeed if we had free access to the markets of the United States. But while this resolution, which I support, proposes to give us free access to these markets, it proposes something better still,—it proposes to relieve us to a large extent from the tyranny that has been imposed upon us by a few monopolists in the Dominion. Take, for instance, these sugar men about whom I spoke a short time ago. It is not reasonable to suppose that they would willingly relax the hold which they seem to have on the present Government, and the hold which they seem to have on the country, of levying over a million dollars every year, by means of their tariff arrangements, out of the great mass of the people of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. COLTER. It is not reasonable to suppose that they would relax their hold. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." It is very comfortable for him to say "hear hear;" it is very nice to be backed by such men at election times; they fill a very nice gap; and when the hon. gentleman opposite finds that to be the case, he can easily say to these men who profit by this policy, "What is your faith worth? Let us see by your works how much you are interested in this policy?"



Mr. SPROULE. What about the sugar trusts in the United States that are said to be taking \$25,000,000 a year?

Mr. COLTER. Now, we say that our people wish to be free from this tyranny. They can go to the city of Buffalo and buy better sugar at six cents a pound than they can buy in Canada at eight or nine cents a pound, and we want an opportunity of doing that. The sugar men in the United States are subsidised heavily enough, everybody knows. Further, we can go into Buffalo and buy at eight cents per wine gallon, better coal oil than we can buy at home at 25 cents per Imperial gallon. These are two of the articles of which the farmers and all the consumers of this country have to make very large purchases; and when we find that we have to pay 30 per cent. on our cottons and our woollens, and that everything else we use is taxed to an enormous extent, we wish to be free to some extent from this tyranny, and have an opportunity to buy our goods more cheaply than we can now buy them. As I said before, this resolution proposes to give us a double benefit; it will secure better prices for what we have to sell, and it will enable us to obtain the necessary commodities of life at much lower prices than we obtain them at now; and when such is one of the recommendations of that policy, we feel that we must press for it on every and any available occasion. I am not prepared to agree with gentlemen on the other side of the House when they state that we are doing everything we can to decry the country. We are not. We want to see our people, who are a noble, an industrious, thrifty and economical people, in a position to enjoy the just rewards of their industry, and that is all we ask. We have a fertile soil; we have a vigorous climate, capable of producing vigorous men; and we want free scope for the energies of those men. When our sons have gone to the other side of the line, have they, in the competition, come off the worse? They have not. They have held up their end well, and have attained some of the highest positions, both in the legislative halls and in business circles in that country; and if those who have gone have been able to do that, why cannot we do it also? We are made of the same stuff as they are, and why should we be afraid of suffering from closer contact with our neighbors? We have in Canada some of the finest water powers on the face of the globe; we have as great a stretch of fertile soil as can be found anywhere; we have immense mineral wealth and natural resources of every kind; and all we ask is that the Government will give free scope to the people, in order that they may be free to develop their resources, and not be hampered by the restrictions imposed upon them every year, or every few years, in the attempt to bolster up some concern which is about to fail through mismanagement of some kind. We now find hon. gentlemen opposite admitting the breakdown of their policy.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. COLTER. Why, what does the hon. Minister of Finance say? He says the Government are going to subsidise steamers to South America. For what purpose? In order that we may get a market for our manufactures and other surplus products. The N. P. was to give us a market at our doors, but these steamers are to be subsidised in order to obtain markets for us in South America. What is the good of paying these long freights and granting these subsidies? We have a better market at our own doors without any subsidies, and a market which we can get without demeaning ourselves in any way. Now, I believe the United States has prospered, and, notwithstanding a great deal that has been said, it has prospered, not in consequence of its protective tariff, but in spite of it. The United States affords an illustration, not of a high protective policy, but of a great free trade policy. Take, for instance, the State of New York, which has a larger population than the whole

Mr. COLTER,

of this Dominion. It has free trade with over 50,000,000 of people at its very doors, and that trade is beneficial to the State of New York, and the trade of the State of New York is beneficial to the rest of the United States as well. In the same way, if we had free trade with the United States, that trade would be beneficial to us, and our trade, at the same time, would be beneficial to them. The benefit being a mutual benefit, there is no reason why the adoption of this policy should be attended to the slightest extent with dishonor. Now, when I hear so much about the old flag by our friends on the other side of the House, I am at a loss to ascertain what their object is. They must feel that they are driven into a corner in some way, when it is necessary to resort to that cry so often. They remind me of a story I heard a short time ago. Out in the Western States, before they had any regular clergymen, they sometimes used to bury their dead without any religious ceremony, but instead there was some orator appointed for the occasion, whose duty it was to dilate upon the virtues of the deceased, and to portray the great and good things he had done for mankind and the community, and perhaps more particularly for the United States. On one of these occasions, the orator found himself somewhat puzzled, because the record of the man who had died was not just as good as it should have been. He paused for some time, and at last he said, "What though our deceased friend robbed the First National Bank, what though he made desolate the homes of widows and orphans, there is one thing at least that can be said of him, his heart always beat warm for his country." And when I find our friends on the other side of the House confronted with their professions of loyalty, and unable to make good the promises they made in connection with those professions; when I find them in 1878, in order to obtain office, saying that the expenditure of this country was extravagant when it was \$23,500,000, and that \$22,500,000 was adequate to run this country; when I find them, after getting into power, increasing that expenditure to \$37,000,000; when I find them complaining of the national debt under the Mackenzie Administration, and when they get into power increasing that debt enormously and oppressively; when they have not fulfilled any of their promises, when they have failed utterly to do all these things they agreed to do, and when they have to admit this, they think to atone for their omissions by waving the old flag gloriously, and by saying, We will always hurrah for old England.

Mr. LANDRY. I will not omit to congratulate the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat upon the eloquence he has displayed in his maiden speech. I have listened to him with a great deal of attention, but I have failed to discover, with all his eloquence and all the vehemence which he put into his utterances, any argument that had not been advanced before by hon. gentlemen on the other side to convince us why these resolutions should be adopted. The hon. gentleman has referred to one or two subjects to which, I think, had he been in this House a little longer, he would have refrained from referring. He recalled one or two subjects which, if he had consulted his friends, he would not have brought to our attention. He spoke of broken promises. He took us back to 1878, and told us that the Government at that time had made numerous promises which they had not fulfilled. He told us they had promised many things, some of which he enumerated, but more of which he gave us simply to understand by inference, and that they had not accomplished any of them. I think that the hon. gentleman, if he had been in the House and had heard the discussions which have taken place in these precincts, and the numerous prophecies of evil which hon. gentlemen opposite have made, would have hesitated before speaking of unfulfilled prophecies, because he would have known that if hon. gentlemen on

this side have made any prophecies, their prophecies were not those of despair but of encouragement, and therefore if some of their prophecies did fall somewhat short of fulfilment, yet the Government had the courage of their convictions, and having made prophecies in the best of faith for the benefit of the people and in the direction of progress, they put forth every effort to carry them to completion. But contrast our predictions with the prophecies made on the other side,—always prophecies of desolation, prophecies that this country would have, sooner or later, to succumb to the weight with which it was burdened with by the actions of the Government; prophecies always made in the one key, the key of despair. I need not go over those prophecies, but I may remind you, Sir, that there was not one undertaking entered into by the Government of the present party in power, from Confederation to the present time—there was not one undertaking entered into with a view to the future prosperity of the country, out of which hon. gentlemen opposite did not prophesy that nothing could come but blue ruin and desolation. Leaving aside the smaller undertakings and dealing with the larger ones, those which had some influence on the future of the country, I say there was not one concerning which hon. gentlemen opposite did not predict ruin and desolation. On the other hand, the hon. gentlemen on this side who proposed those undertakings had the courage of their convictions. When they believed that something was good in the interests of the country, they had the courage to undertake to carry it out, and they encountered not only the natural difficulties of those large undertakings, but also the difficulties thrown in their way by hon. gentlemen opposite who were continually making their ill-omened predictions. Had the hon. gentleman who has just spoken compared the prophecies of his friends with the prophecies on this side of the House, he would have hesitated making the remarks he did. Why, Sir, when it was proposed to acquire for this great Dominion, Manitoba and the North-West Territories, what was said by hon. gentlemen opposite? We all remember the description they then gave of the country acquired; we all remember how useless they said its acquisition would be; we all remember the evils they predicted which would result from the acquisition of those large territories. At that time they told us that these territories were nothing but the home of the bear and the wolf, that they were not worth acquiring, that they were not worth the cent and a half an acre paid for them to the Hudson Bay Company; and yet, a few years afterwards, when it was proposed to give these very lands for the construction of a railway, and when hon. gentlemen opposite felt called upon to put a value on them, they valued those same lands which they had said previously were not worth a cent and a half an acre, at \$4, \$5 and \$6 an acre. In the same manner they greeted the undertaking to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. We all remember the prophecies they made regarding that road and the obstacles they threw in the way of its completion. We all remember that when, in 1884, it was proposed to come to the aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by a loan, they prophesied that loan would never be returned, and we all know how, in point of fact, that loan was returned before the time specified in the contract. I say, therefore, that my hon. friend could not have considered these things very seriously, or he would never have turned the attention of the people to the prophecies made by both parties. The hon. gentleman has told us that our prophecies of 1873 have not been fulfilled because our people do not to-day enjoy a home market. But is it not proved to be a fact that we have a larger home market to-day than we had in 1873? Have we not had extensive manufactories established in the country since then? and have these manufactories provided us with a very large quantity of the products we consume in the

country? It is well for hon. gentlemen opposite to make assertions, but it would be better if they would bring proof and show that we have not within ourselves a very large market indeed for the products of the people. My hon. friend has told us that the farmers are not to be imposed upon. Well, he gave the answer to that almost immediately, when in the next breath he told us that they had been imposed upon because they had believed in what had been preached to them by the Liberal party throughout the country. I suppose he meant that they were no longer to be imposed upon as they had been in the past in this respect. My hon. friend referred also to the manufacture of sugar in this country in order to convince the people that our people did not benefit by that industry, and that the benefit was reaped only by a few who had money invested in it. Why, I remember, only a few years ago, during the first year or two after the National Policy had been inaugurated, if there was one argument made stronger than another by hon. gentlemen opposite, it was that the men who had been induced to put their money into these manufacturing industries by the promises made by the Liberal-Conservative Government had been deceived, and that their investments would not turn out profitable. True, what they had prophesied in the beginning was that this policy would create monopolists, and put into the pockets of the rich, who invested in these enterprises, the money of the people who could ill afford to pay it, but in a year or two they changed entirely their line of argument, and they endeavored to show that their prophecies of ill had been realised, because a great many of these manufacturers were not successful. Now, however, they tell us that the manufactories are making immense profits. I am not going to dispute that. I believe that in the last year or two, those engaged in the manufacture of sugar have made large profits, but I think I am safe in affirming, that up to a year or two ago, their investments were not profitable, although there was a very large output of sugar by which our people benefitted through its manufacture in our own Dominion, and the labor it thereby gave to our own people. As my hon. friend was speaking, my mind reverted to a manufacturing centre with which I am better acquainted than with other places in other parts of the Dominion where sugar is manufactured. I refer to Moncton, N.B. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that in Moncton, in 1873, at the inauguration of the National Policy, the amount of duties paid only reached \$19,455.00. In 1888, the amount that was collected in Custom duties in the town of Moncton was \$403,277, while, in 1878, the amount collected was only \$19,455. My hon. friends will say that this shows that the National Policy has imposed larger taxes on the people of this country, but I say that that statement cannot hold good from the point of view which I want to make clear. In 1888, and the years immediately preceding it, the price of sugar was very much lower in the Maritime Provinces than it had been before 1878. You may argue as to the amount of duty which is paid, and may try to convince the people that it is coming out of their pockets, and that they should replace this Government by another, under the belief that they would pay less taxation, but you will not convince the people of that so long as you have so positive a fact before them as that they get their sugar at lower prices than they did before the inauguration of the National Policy. Further, these people know that the \$403,000 paid for Customs in the town of Moncton meant the circulation of a large amount of money not only in that town, but in the surrounding districts, giving employment to a large number of people. Therefore, with all these advantages coming to our people, it would be hard to convince them that the result would be to their detriment. My hon. friend opposite has told us a story which

rejoiced the hearts of his friends on that side of the House, of a man for whom he was called on to preach his funeral sermon could find nothing good to say, as he had been a very bad man, except that his heart beat warm for his country. When all the good qualities which characterise hon. gentlemen opposite have left them, when they have gone elsewhere, would that we could add, after all they have done injurious to their country, after all that may be condemned by the people of this country, would that we could say that their hearts beat warm for their country. I fear very much that, if anyone is called upon to speak over their political remains, the lines, instead of being "their hearts beat warm for their country," would be "I have nothing of that kind to say, but I have come here to apologise." I will not undertake to follow the hon. gentleman through the figures he has used, because it is impossible to follow a speech of that kind of an hour's duration and pick up the figures as they are presented. I will not say that he misrepresented anything by the figures he gave, but, when he said we could get sugar for 6 cents in New York or in Buffalo for which we had to pay 8 cents or  $8\frac{1}{2}$  cents here, I think he was mistaken. I do not know where he got his figures, but I think the prices are not less than 7 or 8 cents a pound for sugar, or practically the prices we have to pay here. For a few moments, I will give some attention to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I do not desire him to think that too much attention is given to him, but in regard to his speech, for myself, I believe that in many respects it had a great deal of merit, and showed a great deal of research, and that it was placed before the House very well and deserves notice because of the high position the hon. gentleman occupies in this House. Possessing all these merits, I think it is all the more reasonable that his speech should not be forgotten, and therefore he will excuse my referring to some remarks which he made the other evening. I pass over very hurriedly some of the complaints he made against the Government of the country. When he spoke of the majority, he said majorities were not always right, but I believe in this country the majority is the test by which we find whether hon. gentlemen are right or not. That is the way in which the people are governed; that is the way by which in this House public affairs are governed; and, that being the only test we have, it is quite unnecessary to show that it is the proper test. He spoke of the Gerrymander Act and of the Franchise Act. It is not my intention to refer to either of those Acts here except to say that, in the Province of New Brunswick, at all events, the effect of what is called the Gerrymander Act, if it had any effect at all, was in favor of hon. gentlemen opposite. A great deal has been said in regard to the Province of Ontario, but, as regards New Brunswick, that sympathy was created wrongly, I believe, for the gentlemen on the Opposition side. If any advantage was derived in the Province of New Brunswick, it was derived by hon. gentlemen opposite. As to the Franchise Act, I also believe that hon. gentlemen opposite profited more largely than did hon. gentlemen on this side. I must, however, refer more at large to a complaint made by the hon. gentleman, and often made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in this House and in the country, in reference to the exodus. I am not prepared to say that the exodus for the last six, or eight, or ten years has not been considerable and deplorable, but, if there is a party in this Dominion more responsible than another for that state of affairs, it is the party on the opposite side of the House, which is very much more responsible than the Government of the day and their supporters for that exodus. While it may be a great comfort to gentlemen living in the United States who desire to represent the condition of this country as one of despair, to have the assurance of an hon. gentleman in the high position which the hon. member for North Norfolk occupies to that

Mr. LANDRY.

effect, yet it must result to our detriment. I say that his speech alone is sufficient to show that he and his friends are largely responsible for that exodus, and I will refer to some of his remarks in order to prove that, if the hon. gentleman is to be believed by the people of this country—and we must take it for granted that his statements are read by the people, when they are so elaborately got up and so well delivered—the inevitable result will be to drive the people from this country and send them to the United States of America. My only hope is that with the speech of the hon. gentleman that may go to the country, may also go the eloquent refutation that has been given by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have preceded me. Let them both go together, and I am not afraid of the result; but if his speech goes alone I am compelled to believe that if there has been an exodus, it will be greater still after what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The public money pays for the Budget Speech.

Mr. LANDRY. We will not discuss the means by which these speeches go to the country; but I have no doubt that by some means the speech of the hon. gentleman will reach the people of this country, numerous and extensively. I have no doubt that it has been already sent as campaign literature, and will be sent more extensively for the purpose of educating the people of this country in their views. Let me try to show to the people of this country, or to those who may do me the honor of reading my observations, how pernicious are the sentiments which are contained in the speech of the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk. He says:

"In the case of war with the United States, England would be utterly unable to place an armed force upon the frontier between these two countries adequate to the defence of Canada."

Sir, what sort of a declaration is that to go to our people? Who would take the hon. gentleman as a guide, who would take him as one to whom they would look for information, whose opinion they would take upon the question as to whether this country was worth living in, or as to whether we should leave this country and go to another more prosperous, where the people find more sunshine and more happiness and contentment? The hon. gentleman tells us that we are only 4,000,000 of people, and we cannot defend ourselves against 60,000,000 in case of war; and if we cannot do it, neither is England able to do it, our mother country, upon whom we have depended, the mother country upon whom we do depend, in case anything of this kind should ever occur. The hon. gentleman says, seeing that we are in this position, what should we do? We must throw ourselves immediately into the arms of this great nation alongside of us. But that is not all, for he goes on to say:

"The United States, with no greater exertion than was put forth in the rebellion of 1861 to 1864, could place in the field an army of 3,000,000 men, and it is folly to talk of England being able to cope with such a force, in British North America, so far from her base of operations. It is true that, so far as land operations are concerned, England would be unable to afford to us adequate assistance and protection."

Now, Sir, I am not disposed to believe that myself, and I hope that the people will not believe it; yet there are hon. gentlemen who are making use of that argument. Why do they preach that to the people of this country? Although I do not believe that the hon. gentleman desires to produce that effect, yet I say his speech can have no other effect than to make the people of this country dissatisfied with the country they live in, and make them hurry to leave our shores for the purpose of emigrating to that great and better land which he has so much lauded. Now let us go a little further. He says in another place:

"Why, what is the condition of the farmer in this country to-day?"

Here I want you to bear in mind that this speech will be sent to the farmers of this country; and we all remember

the story that was told of the prisoner who had heard the eloquent harangue made on his behalf by his counsel, who wanted to prove that he was not guilty. The prisoner knew that he was guilty, and he told his counsel, after hearing his eloquent plea, "You have convinced me that I am not guilty." And when the farmers of this country will read the eloquent speech of the hon. gentleman, endeavoring to convince them that they are living in a forsaken country, that it is not good enough for them, they may be led to believe, and to say: "After all we are not so fortunate; we are not so happy as we thought we were; we will emigrate to some other land." He then goes on to say:

"What is the condition of the farmer of this country to-day? Living, Sir, in a country which is the dearest in the world to purchase in, which is the cheapest in the world to sell in."

Well, Sir, if this country is the dearest in the world to purchase in, where can you find a stronger argument to make a man believe that this is not a good country, and that he had better try and seek another, which will not be the "dearest country in the world to purchase in, and the cheapest to sell in."

"So far as the products of his labor are concerned, selling the products of the soil for very much less than they were sold for during the régime of my hon. friend at my right, struggling with difficulties created by this very party who taxes everything that he produces, and reduces the purchasing power of the natural customer to whom he sells his productions, and not only increases the cost of what he purchases, but diminishes the price of what he sells."

Here is something else that is going to be sent to the people of this country for them to think over:

"The circumstances of the case were entirely different, and they took different ways, and the result of those experiments we may see to-day in the one case in the creation of a great nation—"

He was speaking of the colonies that separated from the mother country more than a hundred years ago, and he was comparing their condition with the condition of the people of this Dominion:

"—with its own history, with its own national life and with the world looking to it as one of the great powers of the earth, while in the other case we see as the result of the experiment the creation of a great colony without a history of its own, challenging the attention of the world, and shining, not in its own light, but in the borrowed light of another luminary."

Then a little further:

"The American States have prospered and grown rapidly, and a condition of things more favorable to their growth could not have been desired."

Well, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with us because we call that disloyalty. I cannot find any other term for it, although I do not wish to use that term in an offensive way, but how else can we qualify it? We see that hon. gentlemen opposite, and all their friends, in the speeches they make in this House and in the country, and in their press, direct all their efforts to running down the Dominion of Canada, leading the people to believe that this is a country unfit to live in, that we are burdened with taxation, while they picture in glowing colors the condition of the people of the United States. Sir, can we come to any other conclusion but that there is disloyalty in language and efforts such as these, even if the language was true, which, however, fortunately for ourselves, in my opinion, is not correct. Now we go a little further in this speech, and we find some other assertions that are even stronger than those I have cited:

"Take these four geographical groups of the Dominion—the Maritime Provinces, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the Province of Manitoba and the Territories of the North-West, and British Columbia—nature has decreed that each one of the four shall trade more naturally and on more advantageous terms with the country to the south of the line than with any other geographical group in the Dominion."

There again he is grouping the Provinces separately, telling the people of each one of them, Your best market is not with your own neighbors, your best market is not with your

own fellow-citizens, with those living under the same flag and the same constitution; the proper thing to do is for these groups to abandon each other, for the Maritime Provinces to abandon the Province of Quebec, and for the Province of Quebec to abandon the Province of Ontario, and Ontario to abandon the rest of the Dominion, and your best way is to throw yourselves into the arms of another nationality. In this way hon. gentlemen hope to convince some of us that our natural markets are with another country and with another people. A little further he says:

"We have perhaps a million of immigrants who have gone there instead of coming to this country, and that is a mighty force which is drawing these two countries more and more together, and is impressing on the mind of both countries the desirability of free commercial intercourse and the absurdity of maintaining the condition of things which now exist."

And again:

"I turn to the United States and find the increase in that country in the decade commencing one year earlier and ending one year earlier was 30·8, as against 18 in Canada. That is not satisfactory. Here we have a difference in the increase of population of the two countries of more than 11 per cent. against ourselves, and there is no reason for it."

Sir, the same observations that I have been making elsewhere, apply also to this quotation. I will not make any more quotations from the hon. gentleman's speech, although I had marked here some eight or ten of the same nature, everyone of which go to disparage the condition of the people of Canada, and speaking in very eulogistic terms of the people of the United States. I repeat again what I believe to be true, that the figures which the hon. gentleman used were not always accurate; but even if they were accurate, if he had been a true Canadian at heart, he would not have been the first to have brought them before the Parliament of Canada. Why, the hon. gentleman found fault with us because we tried to expose not only the fallacy but the injurious effect of those speeches on our own people, and he declared that he might as well charge upon a physician responsibility for the disease because he had given an accurate diagnosis of the case and when the treatment he had recommended had not been adopted. In my opinion the cases are not at all similar. I believe no wise and true physician would preach despair and brood over death to his patient; and if he were a prudent physician he would be careful to avoid making his patient dissatisfied with his condition. A physician would be blameworthy who although he might have a suspicion as to the true condition of his patient, constantly pointed out to him that under different circumstances he would have been in a better condition, when those circumstances would have driven him from his own home. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to other matters, which I shall take the liberty of discussing for a few moments. He stated that no attempt had been made to secure reciprocity, and that the conduct of the Government had been exasperating to the United States. I need not cite any authorities to show that the assertion that the Government had made no attempt to secure reciprocity with the United States is devoid of truth, or rather is not stating the case quite accurately. I affirm that the authorities go to show that the Government by speech and by advances have gone as far as it was possible for them to go in an honorable way to meet the people of the United States with a view to obtaining a reciprocity treaty on a fair and equitable basis. I would ask the hon. gentleman whose fault was it if the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated? Was it the fault of Canada? No; it was the United States which abrogated that treaty. If they were of the opinion that Canada was receiving greater advantages from the operation of the treaty, there was no reason why the treaty should have been abrogated, and the people of the United States, if they had wished to continue reciprocity, might have asked that amendments be made to the treaty as it then existed and have pointed out the manner in which it bore heavily

on their people. But instead of doing so they abrogated the treaty. After the abrogation of that treaty, what do we find? The people of Canada, in order to show their good feeling towards the United States—and I commend this to hon. gentlemen opposite who say the conduct of the Government has been exasperating to the United States—gave a direct contradiction to the assertion that they no longer wished reciprocity. They allowed the United States to continue to enjoy many of the advantages they possessed under the Reciprocity Treaty, whereas the United States, when they put an end to reciprocity, did not allow the people of the Canadian Provinces to enjoy any, or at all events very few, of the privileges they possessed under the Reciprocity Treaty. With the permission of the House, I will cite an authority which cannot be disputed—a report made by a gentleman two years after the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty. This report must be held to be authentic because the United States have made the views expressed therein part of their record. What does the writer say? He said, in speaking of the privileges the United States had been enjoying of the use of the St. Lawrence under the treaty :

“No arrangements or understanding have been entered into since the abrogation of the treaty, between the United States and the Government of Great Britain or of Canada, with reference to these subjects. But the Canadian Government have seen fit to permit the arrangement practically to continue in force, so far as our citizens are concerned, in the hope, as they avow, that some understanding will shortly be entered into for liberalising trade between the two countries, and they desire in the meantime, to do nothing which might bear an unfriendly interpretation.”

Could we have anything stronger? This is a report prepared at the request of Congress, for the purpose of ascertaining the exact state of affairs; and the writer, in so many words, tells us the nature of the privilege extended to the United States, after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. Is that evidence, that even at that time, the Government of the country were doing anything to exasperate the American people? It gives a direct contradiction to that assertion, at all events at that period. The writer goes on to say further :

“There is really no regulation or Order in Council upon the subject of the St. Lawrence. Since the termination of the treaty, American vessels desiring to pass either to or from the ocean through the St. Lawrence have asked permission in each case of the Canadian Government and it has in no instance as yet been refused. But the informal manner in which this permission has been given and the absence of any general regulation upon the subject, evidently shows that the Government does not desire to have the special permits regarded as precedents or as in any manner committing the Government in its treatment of the question hereafter should no general arrangement be entered into with the United States.”

A little further on the writer proceeds to show the great importance of this privilege to the United States. He says :

“It is not exaggerating its consequence to assume that even a war for the possession of the right to the natural outlet to our great lakes and the fertile teeming territory they drain would be less costly to us in its consequences than the loss which the closing of that outlet to our products would entail.”

I am inclined to think he exaggerated the value of it, but he estimated the privileges so highly that he said that it would be even less costly to go to war for the retention of that right than to surrender it.

“And yet notwithstanding the gravity of this question and the extent of the interests involved, our citizens enjoy the privilege at this moment solely through the liberality of the Canadian Government, without any understanding whatever of an official or even unofficial character, and without the right to enter a complaint if the permission to use that river was refused.”

We would have the right to refuse an extension of that privilege, but Great Britain representing the different Canadian Governments, extended that privilege to the Americans. On this point I desire to read one more extract to illustrate the point still further, and in order to show that the conduct of our people before Confederation

Mr. LANDRY.

has not been to exasperate the United States, but has been liberal to a great degree. In order to make this more intelligent I would premise by saying that the reason given for the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty was because, immediately after the civil war, it became necessary for the United States Government to levy higher taxation than otherwise would have been required, and under the changed condition of affairs they could not do that with the Reciprocity Treaty in force. The writer said :

“So reasonable was this argument felt to be that the representatives of the several Provinces, placed on record their acquiescence in its justice. A delegation, comprising members of the Government of the then Provinces of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, visited Washington, and on the 2nd February, 1866, submitted the following memorandum, acknowledging the changed condition of the country, the propriety of establishing duties on articles heretofore embraced in the free list of the Reciprocity Treaty, equivalent to the internal taxation existing in the United States, and general propositions for the rearrangement of trade relations between this country and the Provinces they represented.”

The memorandum was a strong evidence, in my opinion, of a desire on the part of those people representing New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that some arrangement should be arrived at with the United States. If there was anybody at fault at that time, it was the United States, who did not make any effort to meet our people half way. This memorandum goes on to say, then :

The trade between the United States and the British Provinces should, it is believed, under ordinary circumstances, be free in reference to their natural productions, but as internal taxes exceptionally exist in the United States, it is now proposed that the articles embraced in the free list of the Reciprocity Treaty should continue to be exchanged, subject only to such duties as may be equivalent to that internal taxation. It is suggested that both parties may add certain articles to those now in the said list.”

I will not read the memorandum in full because it is too long; but I have read this much in order to emphasise the fact that step by step the people of this country, whether they represent Nova Scotia or whether they represent New Brunswick, or the two Canadas before Confederation, showed to the United States their strong desire to live on friendly relations with them, and their ardent wish to meet them half way in the direction of arranging the tariff that might exist between the people of the two countries. Every step taken by the people of Canada in this direction, since the abrogation of the Treaty in 1866, was always thrown aside by the people of the United States, and very often it was rejected, if not in an offensive way, in a way calculated to make more difficult the conciliation between the two peoples.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, before returning to the subject with which I was endeavoring to deal before the House separated I wish for one moment to refer to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Colter.) He told us before dinner that in Buffalo (I do not know that he gave us the date, but very recently indeed) sugar was selling at 6 cents per pound, while we had to pay 8 or 9 cents per pound for it in Canada. I ventured to assert without having looked up the quotations myself that the hon. gentleman must have been mistaken in the figures he then used, or that he had a defective memory if he depended on his memory for the figures. The quotations have been handed to me since and I find that on the 8th of the present month, according to the quotations, sugar sold at 7 cents per pound in the United States, and in Montreal yesterday, only a few days afterwards, sugar was sold at exactly the same price. If hon. gentlemen will come before this House and solemnly affirm in a way that their speeches may go to the country, and in a matter like this, not important in itself, but with the intention of having the effect of showing that we live in a country which is dearer to living in

than the United States—if they make such mistakes as this what can we expect of their other statements where they cannot be immediately contradicted. I have no doubt that in the article of oil referred to by the hon. gentleman, if I had time to look up the prices of that commodity, I would find that his figures are quite as inaccurate as those he gave us in regard to sugar. Returning to the subject that I was dealing with before six o'clock, I was trying to contradict the statement often reiterated in this House that the conduct of the Canadian people was exasperating to the people of the United States and that the conduct of the Canadian people as represented by their Government since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty had not been inviting to the United States to either renew that treaty, or to enter into a new treaty with a view of our having wider commercial relations with them. I was endeavoring to show that the conduct of our people as represented by our Governments before Confederation, and by the Dominion Government since Confederation, has always been in the direction of conciliation instead of exasperating the people of the United States, and that it has been rather inviting to the United States to enter into commercial relations with us so far as that be beneficial to Canada. I will not say that we wished those relations to the same extent that some hon. gentlemen desire on the other side of the House, because I do not think that would be beneficial to us, but we desired them to the extent the people of this country believed it was beneficial to them. No opportunity has been lost to try and further that end with the people of the United States, and almost invariably we have been met with a denial or a refusal to treat. A great deal was said by an hon. gentleman the other evening in order to try and show that under the Reciprocity Treaty the Dominion of Canada had made very rapid and very extensive progress; very much greater progress than we have since made and for that purpose the hon. gentleman cited a great many figures and made a great many assertions. I am not going to go through the figures he gave to this House, but from the study I have given the subject I will venture to assert, and it is at any rate the conclusion at which I have arrived, that the prosperity the people of Canada enjoyed during the period of the Reciprocity Treaty was not due entirely to the fact of our having that Reciprocity Treaty with the States. There were many other causes that tended to enlarge our trade with the United States at that time. We must remember that during that period came the civil war in the United States, and we must remember that the Crimean War had something to do with giving larger markets and higher prices for the produce of the people of this country. But even making the admission to some extent, that our commerce with the United States sprang up very rapidly from the time this treaty was entered into, yet I say that in my opinion the hon. gentleman who quoted figures here the other night did not represent the case exactly as it was. I think that in his eagerness to try to show or to exaggerate the position that Canada had assumed in from 1854 to 1866; that with the idea of exaggerating that in the eyes of the people of this country and in order to give them a desire to return to the same thing again, that he did not quote a sufficient quantity of figures—although he cited a very large quantity—to show the exact state of affairs. I hope you will permit me to deal with figures for a very few moments for the purpose only of illustrating what I mean. The hon. gentleman told us that in 1854 our exports to the United States were \$10,473,000. I do not find from the figures that I have been able to hunt up that his figures are exactly correct, but still I will not dispute them, and I will take it for granted that in 1854 our exports to the United States were \$10,473,000. He tells us that in one year, 1855, our exports amounted to \$19,316,000. Now, Sir, the best infor-

mation I can obtain is that instead of being that amount in 1885, they had risen to only \$15,136,734.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman quoting from Johnson's Statistics?

Mr. LANDRY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think he will find that the figures were not made up for the fiscal year, but for the calendar year ending with December, and that is how the discrepancy occurs.

Mr. LANDRY. If that is the case, even then the hon. gentleman failed, I think, to show that the exports to the United States between 1854 and 1866 went on steadily and largely increasing. He simply showed that from 1854 to 1855 they made a rapid stride, and then again from 1855 to 1866 there had been a very large increase, but he omitted to show how uncertain and fluctuating were the exports during the twelve years. Though up to \$15,136,734 in 1885, yet, four years afterwards the amount had not gone up to more than \$16,000,000. In 1859 it had only reached a little above \$19,000,000 and in 1861 it was \$19,800,000. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that we did not at that time make such rapid strides as the hon. gentleman indicated. It is true that in the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty there was a very large increase indeed. There were many reasons contributing to that circumstance. One great fact, which, I think to a large extent influenced trade in that year was the notice which had been given to bring the treaty to an end, which, no doubt, induced our people to send to the United States all they could in the last year of the treaty and thus swell the amount to unusual dimensions. Therefore, it is unfair to cite that year for the purposes of comparison, to show the progress the country made. It is true, the difference in the amount of our trade has not been, perhaps, so great between a single year and the next, but it will be found that since then we have made considerable strides in the direction of increasing our trade with the United States every year. I do not think there is any exception in any year, if I can trust the tables from which I have quoted, and I do not think their accuracy has been denied by anyone. But more than that, we find, by a very good authority, the authority from which I quoted a little while ago, that the prices obtained by the people of Canada during the time the Reciprocity Treaty was in force were not equal to the prices obtained by them after that treaty was abrogated. If that be the case, what deductions do we derive? If there be any argument in what the hon. gentlemen say, that to have the market of the United States opened to us would be beneficial to our farmers, they must mean that our farmers would get greater prices for their productions. If it can be proved that they got as large prices after the abrogation of the treaty, it seems to me that argument falls to the ground. Quoting again from the report of George W. Brega, made at the request of Congress, I believe, we find that he gives tables containing many figures which I will not cite; and then he says:

"An examination of these tables shows the remarkable fact that large as were the sales of produce by Canada to the United States, under the free admission to our market; yet the prices obtained in Canada, after the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, for such articles was, in almost every instance, higher than when it was in operation. It cannot be denied—granting the correctness of the figures given above, which are from official sources—that whatever amount of this produce was purchased for consumption in the United States since March, 1866, was purchased at as high prices in the Canadian markets as before the abrogation of the treaty; and that the American consumer was compelled to pay the American duty in addition."

If it be the case, that the prices paid for these goods which were purchased by the Americans within our own territory were higher than the prices obtained before the abrogation of the treaty, then I say that no great damage was done to our people by its abrogation. But there is another consid-

eration which it seems to me must weigh heavily in the minds of our people in considering this matter, namely, that transportation facilities are very much greater to-day than they were at that period. It must also be borne in mind that a great deal that was purchased by the United States from us at that time was re-exported by them across the Atlantic. If that be the case, who made the profits on those goods? It was no doubt the middleman in the United States who purchased from us. It may have been that it was inevitable to our people to export their products in that way; it may have been more profitable for them to do so than to export them direct; no doubt it was, or they would not have done it. But since then the means of communication have become more easy, and our people have taken advantage of them, and instead of selling their products to the United States for the purpose of being transhipped to European markets, they can to-day export directly from Canada to Europe. On reading the beautiful lecture delivered by Mr. Murray in the city of Boston, which was spoken of in this House a day or two ago, I was struck with the similarity between the argument used by that gentleman and that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It appeared to me that the hon. gentleman had taken up that document, and followed almost exactly the lines taken by Mr. Murray. Of course, the two gentlemen did not appear to have the same object in view, and did not profess to have the same object in view. Mr. Murray said to his audience and to the world, because he published his lecture and sent it broadcast throughout the world, and particularly throughout Canada, that he prepared his statements not for the purpose of advocating unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, but for the purpose of inducing the people of Canada to become united with the United States. From this point of view it was a patriotic lecture; but can we say the same thing of hon. gentlemen who take up that discourse as a model, and preach the same lines to the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people, though professing at the same time that the object is not to get them to join the Union, but to secure reciprocity with the people of the United States. Well, Sir, when Mr. Murray commenced his speech to an American audience, the first thing he did was to ask for a map; and my hon. friend here was so strongly impressed with his ideas that he did not want to begin his speech without first having a map also; because if he had only a map hung on the walls of this Parliament, to illustrate to the minds of the members the argument he wished to make, that our geographical situation was such that whether we would or not we had to throw ourselves into the arms of the American people, his argument would have been made stronger. Well, listen to Mr. Murray for a few moments, and see what his ideas are. He says:

"Now look at the map. Wipe out that fool's line drawn by two foreign nations, who had no right to make a line of division here save that of conquest."

That is the argument used by my hon. friend. We had that fool's line, which is an imaginary line, and should be obliterated. We ought not to have that line to separate us commercially, or in any way, from the American people. If we have too strong attachment to our land to wipe it out completely, we should obliterate it so far as it refers to our commercial relations with the American people. This gentleman goes on to say:

"Being alien to the soil which is to us fatherland, and drawn, too, when on them and us had not yet dawned the vision of an empire, besides which the Persian and the Roman world, when it stood at its widest, is but a unit by which to multiply our measurement. Look at the rivers. See how they run. Note how they tie north and south together like threads into whose golden strands new strength is spun continually."

We must all admire that language; but yet while it may be becoming in an American citizen to point out to his people that this line must be an imaginary line, that these large

Mr. LANDRY.

rivers—and he referred particularly to the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi—were rivers that should connect us with them as one people; I say that while we may admire such language in him, we cannot admire it in a gentleman representing a Canadian constituency, and representing, as I have no doubt the hon. gentleman does, a very loyal people. The hon. gentleman told us that our natural markets are not among ourselves, but among the people of the United States. Well, I would ask, who at present is closing the door? Who is putting restrictions upon this natural market? It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to find fault because the door is closed, and there are restrictions between us and the United States, commercially speaking, but who is it that imposes these restrictions and closes the door? Why, if we were to judge by the hon. gentleman's speech, we would be disposed to believe that the Canadians are the ones who put up the barriers that are so injurious to our trade and commerce. Well, I need not remind you, Sir, that if there be restrictions, they have been imposed in the first instance by the Americans, and that they have never shown, from the time they first imposed their barrier of a high tariff, any disposition to remove that barrier, but, on the contrary, have shown every disposition to strengthen it. Even the last presidential election was run upon this line, and the voice of the people of the United States pronounced largely in favor at any rate of not lowering in any degree the barriers but of leaving them as they are. Yet the people of this Dominion are found fault with by hon. gentlemen opposite because of these barriers. I say we have had nothing to do with them. True, we were forced in 1878-79, in self-defence, to establish the National Policy, but when that policy was established, the tariff imposed was very much lower indeed than that of the United States, so that if we put up any barriers they were much less difficult to get over than those put up by the United States. Therefore, when it is proclaimed that these restrictions should be swept away, the electors of the Dominion, as sensible people, will ask the question, if it is necessary to put these things aside, and if that would benefit us, let us find out who is to blame for their being there, and whether of our own motion we can sweep them away, or whether it requires two to make a bargain. If they come to the conclusion that we cannot do this alone, that it is not becoming to go down on our knees and ask for it, and by proclaiming in Canada that the removal of these restrictions is our only salvation, the only thing that can save us from ruin—if they come, as sensible people to this conclusion, they are not likely to throw the blame on the Canadian Government for the existing barriers. They will conclude that the United States must themselves remove the barriers existing between us and them. The hon. gentleman may say that the United States Government have shown a disposition to do so. I will come to that in a few moments. But before dealing with this disposition, as shown by the famous Hitt resolution, I want to cite another extract or two from Mr. Murray to show that, while he followed the same line of argument used by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), his meaning was unmistakable. He said:

"For Canada there are but three possible futures, —"

According to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), there is only one, and even that is not very certain, unrestricted reciprocity, and he has not pointed out in which way we are going to get this unrestricted policy at all. His great remedy is to try to get reciprocity, to try to open up negotiations with the United States in order to get it.

—"one is to remain as she is, an outlying English colony, —"

appears to me that is—according to the line of the speech of the hon. member for North-Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

—a colony left to itself, not to be helped by England in case of trouble—

—“hampered in growth, hectoring in spirit,”

Again the very words of the hon. gentleman—

—“pinned continually to the edge of peril from Imperial entanglements, drained of her population by the great attraction to the south of her—”

And no man spoke more warmly of the great attraction to the south, than did the hon. gentleman—

—“drained of her population by the great attraction to the south of her, with which, while she remains a colony, she can never successfully compete;—”

Well, Mr. Murray has gone to the extent of saying, and I admire his candor because he is speaking for another people, that we can never compete with the United States while we remain a colony. I do not know whether our hon. friends opposite will admit that or not, but they profess to say we may compete if we can only obtain unrestricted reciprocity.

—“oppressed with the burden of a debt, which, from the peculiar construction of the federative agreement, and the equally peculiar habits of her politicians, she can neither easily carry or put a stop to its further increase;—”

This language is exactly on a parallel with the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite—

—“remain subject to unfortunate conditions and ever opposed to the pressures of an uncertain, if not a perilous future; or she can, impelled by the necessity of bettering her condition, seek and obtain release, as she probably could from Imperial connection, and out of the chrysalis of colonialism burst into the winged embodiment of independency. This possibility has its attractions to all generous minds. The birth of a new nationality, if it be a happy one, coming in the fulness of time, and having adequate heroic causes for its parentage, is a result upon which the good wishes of mankind are sure to be showered; and such a birth, so caused in the case of Canada, would be hailed as an event of prime magnitude by all members of the English speaking race.

I will show you in a few moments how it will be held by all members of the English speaking race. I will show you this by the language of the hon. member himself:

“If Canada should become a republic, the natural instincts of all Americans would prompt them to give her a noble and generous recognition. Regarded only from a sentimental point of view, we should all contemplate her nationalisation with pride and satisfaction. She would surely receive from us all both official and sympathetic recognition, but I fail to see how beyond the point of personal good will, she could receive from us of the republic either the practical assistance she needs or the commercial connection on which, and on which alone, she can safely base her future industrial expansion.”

They would not give us very much assistance and help because it is not that they desire—

“For we of the republic believe in the Monroe doctrine, not only as applied to our sea line, and the parts of the Continent to the south of us, but we believe in it with equal sincerity, and earnestness as applied to the great division of the Continent to the north of us as well.

I will give you that part which shows exactly the encouragement which will be given, taking Mr. Murray as an authority, in all the positions which he says are open to us. After having gone over and shown the three different positions we may assume as a people, he says:

“But one thing Canadians must understand, and it would be unwise and unfair for us to conceal it from them, and that one thing is this, that this Republic will never see a great power built up on this continent either on the north or on the south of us, under either French or English flags, and take no action to prevent it.”

See where all the goodwill has gone to. They are willing to see us grow, but they will not permit us to grow under an independent flag—

“Least of all shall we ever assist them to become numerous, rich and powerful with that end on their part in view.”

And yet, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will point out to us that this resolution presented by Mr. Hitt and adopted by the House of Representatives is an indication that they are going to assist us to become rich, and powerful, and numerous, and to extend our commerce

and to become a rival to them; but these words do not seem to verify that view:

“Least of all shall we ever assist them to become numerous, rich and powerful.”

And, therefore, if the people of the United States have invited us to take a certain course of action, it is not to make us numerous, rich or powerful, but rather because they do not believe it will result in making us numerous, rich or powerful, but will rather have the opposite effect—

“We invite them cordially to share with us the destiny of the continent,—”

Not unrestricted reciprocity, observe—

—“to share with us its greatness and its glory, as, historically, they have a right to do, and should be proud of doing; but, if they foolishly decline our invitation, and undertake to rival us and imperil us by an alien development, then must they look for no help from us, for we shall certainly not help them at all, and we shall as certainly oppose their progress to the fullest extent of our power. And this we shall do in the interest of liberty and of mankind, for he must be a fool who thinks that two great rival powers can exist side by side in peace upon this continent.”

I hope that this is not a feeling shared in by the majority of the people of the United States. I hope that they, in common with the majority of people of Canada, believe that it is possible for two great rival powers—if by rival powers you understand simply those who are living under different flags—can live side by side peacefully, progressively, becoming richer and more prosperous. I cited those extracts to show and to insist upon the idea that, if that voices the sentiment of the people of the United States, they are not disposed—not because of any hatred to us, but from a feeling of patriotism to their own country, and because they believe it would be of advantage to them to have us united with them—to see us become rich or prosperous unless we do so under those relations with them to which reference is made. Let us see for a moment, speaking for the people of the Maritime Provinces more particularly, whether the people of those Provinces can be deluded by the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite that the change which they advocate will so very much benefit their trade and commerce. Let us take for example the States in the American Union which would more properly correspond in their geographical position with the Maritime Provinces. Let us take the New England States, and I will use a few figures to show that the people of the Maritime Provinces have made greater progress than the people of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont, the New England States which are contiguous to us. Surely those hon. gentlemen who have used these arguments to-day, and before, will not say that these four States have not had the full advantage of this free trade of which they spoke this afternoon, that they have not had the trade with these sixty millions of people, that they have not had the full benefit of having wiped away what they choose to call the imaginary line of customs boundaries. In 1870 Maine had a population of 626,915, and ten years after, in 1880, it had a population of 648,936. I invite particular attention of hon. gentlemen who have been impressed with the great importance of the United States enjoying all the privileges of a market of sixty millions of people and of the constitution which they possess, to the fact that during those ten years the State of Maine, which is the nearest to the Province of New Brunswick, only increased by 3.5 per cent., while New Brunswick during the same period—that is from 1871 to 1881—increased 12.4 per cent. Yet we were hampered during that time with all the great evils which have been dilated upon by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Then, Massachusetts, including the large city of Boston, it is true made more progress than we did, but, taking the large city of Boston out, they made less progress than we did. In New Hampshire during those ten years there was an increase of only 9 per cent., and in Vermont an increase of not 1 per cent.; while



Prince Edward Island increased by a little over 15 per cent., Nova Scotia by more than 13 per cent., New Brunswick by more than 12 per cent., and Quebec by 14 per cent.—those being the four Provinces bordering on the New England States. How do we account for that? If those hon. gentlemen wish to convince the people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of the Province of Quebec by their arguments, they must first show us how it is that these people, being nearer to these States of the Union than the other Provinces, have prospered more rapidly than they have. This also shows that, while great complaints are being made that the exodus has assumed alarming proportions in the Maritime Provinces, reason must be given for the small increase of population in the four States of which I have spoken, or rather for the decrease in their population. It must be a decrease, because I know that a large proportion of the exodus from the Province of New Brunswick settled in those very States which have not increased altogether more than I have stated, which shows conclusively that the exodus from those States must have been immensely larger than that from the Maritime Provinces. It may be true that the exodus from those States was to some portion of their own domain, but the fact remains that those States did not make more progress than I have pointed out. I have spoken of them separately, but, grouping the four States together, and grouping the four Provinces together, we find that in twenty years, from 1860 to 1880, the percentage of increase in the population of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island was 25·6 per cent., while the increase of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts was only 24·4 per cent.; and that notwithstanding that they had all the advantages which could be derived from this spirit of activity and enterprise, this judicious and wise expenditure of money, and this great market of 60,000,000 people in the United States to which hon. gentlemen have referred. With all these great advantages I say, Sir, if you give us no more advantages than they had we cannot expect our progress to be greater than the progress of those States; on the other hand they must limit those advantages to a greater extent than they would to their own people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What period was that in?

Mr. LANDRY. The last was between 1860 and 1880.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was the period of free trade in this country.

Mr. LANDRY. I have cited the figures also from 1870 to 1880 after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where did the hon. gentleman get the statistics to 1880 concerning the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. LANDRY. To 1881. I have taken them from the latest figures given. I have told the hon. gentleman that the figures I took for the Maritime Provinces were from 1871 to 1881, and those that I took from those States were from 1870 to 1880.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We only had protection two years during that period.

Mr. LANDRY. But the American Union had protection for a longer time, and they had the same home market. My hon. friend can try and demonstrate that, if he wishes, by and by, but I do not think he will be able to do it to the satisfaction of people who look into both sides of the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will cite one or two sentiments as samples of what has been going the rounds of the press of the American Union during the last few years, in regard to Canada. Not very long ago the *New York Tribune* had the following:—

"If commercial union is so urgent a necessity for Canada that annexation will inevitably ensue if the tariff barriers are not thrown down  
Mr. LANDRY.

why should the favor be granted for which the Provinces are clamoring? Why should a future annexation movement be obstructed by premature concession of commercial privileges."

Now, Sir, there would be the same thing again, in my opinion, if we were to approach the United States unduly. If they made a bargain with us at all, it appears to me they could not lose sight of that grand policy that they have always in view, namely: Will this tend to advance the idea we have in view, of getting the Canadian people to sue for union with us. Another citation is from the *New York Sun*:

"Canada must come into the Union or starve out in the cold."

The *Philadelphia American* says:

"The days of the Dominion are numbered."

I think that will be sufficient for the present to show the tone of some of the important newspapers in the United States who represent public opinion. When we find papers of so much influence asserting these things, where do they get them? I venture to say they have not sent emissaries to Canada for the purpose of finding out the feelings of our people as to whether we "must go into the Union or starve out in the cold"; I venture to say they have not sent men of independent minds for the purpose of studying the history of Canada, its resources, its capabilities, its finances, its debt, and the progress this country has made since Confederation, for the purpose of forming an unbiased opinion on the question. Sir, these newspapers have taken their inspiration from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have cited the statements made upon the platform and in the press of this country, all crying down the Dominion of Canada as a country to live in, statements made, not with a view, perhaps, of hurting the country, but with a view of hurting the Government. Well Sir, I am not the only one who condemn such language of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I will read to you the opinion of a good Liberal journal, printed in New Brunswick, the *St. John Telegraph*:

"These absurd impressions are gathered from the little annexationist clique in Canada, whose feeble attempt to belittle and disparage this country fall upon willing ears on the other side of the line."

That is what I have said, and the *St. John Telegraph*, that has been for years fighting the battles of the Reform party, has come to the same conclusion. It goes on to say:

"But why should Canada starve? We have the great wheat fields of Ontario and Manitoba, the vast herd-producing plains of the North-West, and the fertile valleys, uplands and marshes of the Maritime Provinces, which are capable of furnishing bread to a population equal to that of the Republic. Or why should we be cold with our illimitable forests to furnish fuel, and with the great coal fields of Nova Scotia, the North-West and British Columbia?"

It appears to me that if hon. gentlemen opposite will not take those sentiments from us because we are too ready to cry up the old flag, and to raise the cry of loyalty, I think they will accept the opinions of one of the ablest of their own organs, as to the impression which their speeches are making upon the American people. Then it says further:

"Nor are we hungering for the Republican system of Government. We could have had it long ago had we so chosen. But a hundred and ten years ago we rejected it. Ninety years ago we again, in the most solemn manner affirmed our choice of a monarchical constitution. And to-day we are neither hungering nor striving for Washington rule. The Dominion will not fall to pieces yet a while, and the stability of the Republic has no guarantee of perpetuity. It has stood a hundred years, so have our St. John charter and our provincial institutions. In all that time our coast has not been blockaded, and we have been quite able to repel such feeble attempts at invasion as have fallen to our lot. Our history is so far clean of slavery records, Mason and Slidell surrenders, and the assassination of presidents. We are not striving for the honor of adding such incidents to our national annals. In fact Canada is in no sense a starving country, and the sooner our neighbors realise the fact the earlier we shall be able to congratulate them on their returning common sense."

Now, Sir, I myself, perhaps, would not be prepared to use such strong language as has been used by this journal, although there may be a great deal of truth in it. I will

merely remark, not that the sooner our neighbors realise these facts that are related here, the better, but the sooner the whole people of this Dominion realise these facts, and to such an extent that they will reach their representatives also to realise these facts, and to express them, both in the House of Commons and on the hustings, the better it will be for the people of this wide Dominion. Sir, when we speak of the people of Canada being on the brink of starvation, it seems to me that we do not take into account the immense progress that has been made by this Dominion since Confederation, or even the immense progress that was made before Confederation, but particularly since. We need not speak of it in this House; there is not an hon. gentleman who if he will sit down and look into the matter carefully will not admit that the progress of the Dominion since Confederation has been far beyond the expectation of even the fathers of Confederation when they pictured out in glowing terms what our future would be. I have no doubt that our progress is marked by almost every event that has taken place as it has been marked by public works. But our people alone do not recognise the great progress we have been making; it has been appreciated, I will not say to its full extent, but it has been appreciated and is being appreciated by the mother land much more so than formerly, and by foreign nations besides. Take the United States themselves: Within the last three or four years the American people have appreciated, even more than one half of Opposition friends, the greatness of this country and the vast progress we have made. It is highly flattering to us, notwithstanding the disparaging terms used in some of their journals, and sometimes on the public platform, that so powerful a country as the United States should utilise our politics to the extent they do, even in running their presidential election. It is gratifying to us that they use this country so largely in the discussion of their public affairs, and they do this because we have forced them to the conclusion, not that we are menacing them as a rival power on their borders, but we are menacing them in a friendly manner in the way of commercial extension and general prosperity. I was surprised to hear the other day an expression used by an hon. gentleman opposite when he was trying to make a point—I do not know against whom he was trying to make a point—who said we loved Canada better than England, and the expression was cheered to the echo by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It struck me at the time to ask why should that expression be so cheered. There has been no reason to force us to make a choice between our love for Canada and our love for the old country. Nothing has as yet been done by the mother country or by ourselves to force the choice as to which we like best. I have no doubt that should the time ever come that England would force upon us the choice, it would be time enough for us to make the choice. But the time was not so very long ago when the thirteen American colonies severed their allegiance from England, and when hundreds and thousands of people left that country for the purpose of coming under the flag of England. They did not proclaim, we love the thirteen colonies better than England, but they proclaimed they loved England better than their homes, heritage, everything, and therefore, loving England, better, they left their lands and emigrated to a country where they could still be under the old flag. I believe the descendants of these people were proud of their ancestors who left the United States and came to the Maritime Provinces, and at a recent anniversary of that occasion they were proud to have the most eloquent orators to dilate on the subject and to excite enthusiasm and patriotism in the hearts of the people assembled to hear them, and to take great credit for having shown so much loyalty and patriotism. I do not think we are called upon to declare that we like Canada better than we like England. If to-day we were driven to the choice; if the

same thing was to happen, that unfortunately Canada was to sever her allegiance with England, we would find a large number of people of this Dominion who would do the same as the loyalists did and refuse to declare that they loved Canada better than England and would leave Canada, and if they could find a country that afforded as much promise as this country did at the time the loyalists came over and joined it, they would go there to be again under the old flag. Believing that, I do not hesitate to say that I do not think we are called upon to make expression of our choice in Parliament. Why, I see among those who joined in the applause representatives of the very constituencies where speakers dilated on the glories of the loyalist anniversary of the landing of the Loyalists in this country, and it appeared to me to be a direct contradiction of the sentiment that has been expressed by the most eloquent men that could be obtained for that anniversary. One hon. gentleman, during this discussion, said that what they were asking was in the interests of the farmers. In this House the farmer occupies a very large place indeed in the hearts of the representatives, and he has occupied a very large place in everything that influences the welfare of the Dominion and he occupies a very prominent place when a member has to go back to his constituents to seek re-election, and of course we are all desirous to have them at our backs. But when we hear hon. gentlemen proposing unlimited reciprocity as in the interests of the farmers and of this country, I ask the farmers, before they decide in regard to the subject, to look calmly into the question and not be led away with the idea that because they are in a bad position and suffering under the heavy burdens of taxation, and the allegation is made that money is being taken out of their pocket for the purpose of putting it into the pockets of rich monopolists, but look deeply into this question and see how their condition would be improved by having the American market open to them and our market open to the Americans. We remember how it was established at the time the National Policy was inaugurated, and how the farmers took hold of the point, that our market had become a slaughter market for the Americans; and if it was established then, we need only repeat that the same condition of things would recur and that our markets would again become a slaughter market for the Americans, and in return our farmers would not obtain the extended market to which hon. gentlemen opposite have alluded. I do not like to weary the House with figures, and I do not trouble the House often, but before concluding I desire to adduce a few statistics with respect to the construction of railways in the Dominion. The time of the House and the Committees is more largely taken up with considering the subject of railway construction and with granting charters to railway companies than almost anything else. In 1868 we had only 2,523 miles of railway in the country. In 1887 it had risen to 12,292. Surely that afforded proof of the great progress that had been made. The population per mile of railway in different countries is as follows:—Great Britain 1,930, Germany 2,065, France 2,110, Italy 5,000, Belgium 2,102, Holland 3,400, Russia 5,965, Canada 495. It is true that the United States is equally advantageously situated, for the number there is 417. The number of passengers carried in Canada for 1875 was 5,190,416; in 1887, 10,685,508. Tons carried, 1876, 6,331,759; 1887, 16,367,987 tons. The earnings in 1876 were nineteen millions and some hundred thousand dollars, while in 1887 the earnings were thirty-eight millions or nearly thirty-nine millions of dollars. These figures alone show the great progress that has been made in railway development. I need not quote any more figures to prove the great progress made by railways in this country, for all I have to do is to ask the people of the Maritime Provinces—I have not the same knowledge of the progress made in the other Provinces, so far as railways are concerned—and the people of New

Brunswick and Nova Scotia can tell us of the progress that has been made in railways among them. Outside of the fact that we have the Intercolonial Railway from one end to the other of the Province of New Brunswick, and nearly from one end to the other of the Province of Nova Scotia, although not to such an extent as in New Brunswick, there is not a county through which the Intercolonial Railway passes, but has one or more branches of railways through that county to the seaboard. Take Restigouche and you find a branch from the Intercolonial Railway to the seaboard; in Northumberland you find as many as three railways; in Gloucester you find some 60 miles of railway to the seaboard; in Kent you find two branch railways, and in Westmorland you find another branch. All through the Province of New Brunswick you find these branches and this railway development. And these things have happened since when? Since relatively a very recent period; and all these things have happened how? By the aid of this Dominion to a very large extent, and by the aid of local subsidies. By the enterprise of the people of this Dominion, headed by the Government of the people of this country. What do we want with these railways if it is not to provide for the rapid growth of our industries and for the purpose of transferring either our manufactured goods or the products of our soil. Having dwelt upon that I will ask this House to consider for a moment—but possibly I am asking them too much as they have probably considered it before, and they may think me presumptuous for asking them now—but at any rate I will ask the people of this country to consider for a moment what is the resolution that has been presented to us by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Let me ask the indulgence of the House to read this resolution over once more:

"That in the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be affected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith."

Now, Sir, the conclusion of this is that it is expedient for us to take steps to negotiate for the purpose of ascertaining on what conditions we can secure full and unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. What are the reasons given for this resolution by the hon. gentleman who has no doubt made a study of the subject and whose large intelligence and wide knowledge of public affairs would have given him full authority to draw out a resolution of this kind even without any effort further than to draw from his own resources and his own experience. He says "in the present condition of affairs," but has he pointed out why, "in the present condition of affairs," this is necessary, unless it is the condition I have been trying to combat and which has been advanced by the gentlemen on the other side of the House, namely, the present bad condition of affairs as they say. There could be no other reason for it. But we are not in a bad condition of affairs, we are not in a position that it is incumbent upon us to look for any particular remedy to get out of the position in which we are. I say that our position to-day is sufficiently good, I say that our position to-day is sufficiently promising, I say that our position is sufficiently secure and that it is not necessary for us to look about everywhere for the purpose of getting some remedy from the evils under which we are said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be suffering. We are not suffering under any evils that we are not competent within ourselves to remedy, and we are not suffering from any grievance that this Parliament cannot remedy. Why, Sir, where are the grievances and where are the complaints made to the House of Commons? Where are the petitions; the usual mode of transferring to this House of Commons the grievances and the evils under which the people suffer. There are none. It is true we have the voice of some of the re-

Mr. LANDRY.

presentatives in this House, but they represent a minority of the people, and in my opinion in the utterances which they give vent to into this House, they represent but a small minority of the people who voted for them. What strikes me very forcibly in this resolution is that the hon. gentleman gives as a reason why we should have recourse to this "the recent action of the House of Representatives." Have hon. gentlemen noted what that recent action of the House of Representatives is when they tell us that it is incumbent upon us immediately to ask the American people to give us unrestricted reciprocity? Is it because within the last few days, the United States have emphatically and in a way which is the most solemn and binding upon the people, by the voice of their representatives in Congress, said that they do not want to give unrestricted reciprocity to us? They have said they want to give us something else which hon. gentlemen opposite had nursed for a while but which they rejected as something they did not want. Hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground because the people of the United States have offered us something we do not want, that it is the proper time to go to them and ask them for that which they refuse to give us. It appears to me that if there was an inopportune time for this, it is the present time. If it is desirable that we should get this Reciprocity Treaty, the proper time for us to go is when these gentlemen instead of having offered us unrestricted reciprocity have their minds bent on giving us commercial union which the people of this country have repudiated and which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House after having nursed threw to one side like a soiled glove. If we did want unrestricted reciprocity it would be for us to wait until the anxiety of the American people had passed away to give us this commercial union. I will read, not for the benefit of this House who know it already, but because I desire it to go with the observations I have made, the joint resolution introduced by Mr. Hitt in the House of Representatives. It is:

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts, in a commercial union; and said Commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

Now, Sir, it appears to me from this that the most inopportune time we could select even if we desired to have unrestricted reciprocity, is the present time. When the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was presented in this House I had not read the resolution introduced by Mr. Hitt in the House of Representatives, but I fancied that there must have been something in it on the line of the resolution we are now discussing. My surprise was great when I found that Mr. Hitt's resolution was exactly the opposite to this and that it offered us, what, as I have already stated, has been rejected by hon. gentlemen opposite. My greatest surprise however was when I discovered by whom this resolution was introduced to this House. I thought I remembered when the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution was with his party in power in this country. I remember that in speaking of the desirability of obtaining with the United States a more extended trade relation, that hon. gentleman had enunciated the sentiment that in order to get that, we should not say we were anxious to get it. I had heard of a speech he delivered in Prince Edward Island in which he said the way we would be least likely to achieve what we desired was to show ourselves too anxious for it; and believing that he was

sincere when he uttered those sentiments, and that his obj<sup>ct</sup> to-day was what it was then, I was surprised that the hon. gentleman should have been first to show his anxiety by moving the resolution which he has done in the House and which he is making exertions to get his friends to support. Now, sir, I am done. I would simply repeat what I have said, that looking at our condition to-day as a representative of one of the most important constituencies in this Dominion, I cannot myself come to the conclusion that our position is such that we require to look for any great remedy to relieve us from the evils under which we are suffering. I do not believe we are suffering under such great evils. I think they are greatly magnified by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of creating in the minds of the people of this country some discontent in order that they may benefit from it when the time comes for making a choice between the two parties. But we have this great satisfaction, that though these are the same arguments which they have used in the last six or seven years, and that this is the same tune that has been harped upon before the people of this country, we know that every instance in which the people have been appealed to when their verdict would have determined the position of parties in this House, they have always been in favor of the wise policy that has been pursued by the present Parliament, and not the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

**Mr. PERRY.** At this advanced stage of the debate on this very important question, I do not intend to trouble the House with very lengthy remarks. There is one thing certain, I do not intend to travel over England, France and Australia, nor over Germany, Russia or Austria; I will try to hold myself within this great Dominion of ours. I must say that the debate on both sides of the House has been very moderate, very instructive, and much to the point. However, I was surprised to hear the remarks made by the last hon. gentleman who has spoken (Mr. Landry). I thought that hon. gentleman represented a large number of farmers, fishermen and laborers, but he has certainly not to my mind made such a speech as would warrant me in coming to the conclusion that he is representing either the farmers or the fishermen of New Brunswick, and much less those of Prince Edward I-land, where I come from. The hon. gentleman is a very fluent speaker, and no doubt he has spoken very nicely and with satisfaction to himself and his friends; but, Sir, in all his ingenuity and narrowness, he has endeavored to run down the great nation across the line, to show that the Dominion ought to have no trade with the United States, but that we are able to rely upon our own resources without bidding the time of day to the people of the United States. Sir, he would lead the people of Canada to believe that we have no right to cross the line or to associate with the American people. I am sorry he did not give this salutary advice before the Government spent a million of the money of the taxpayers of Canada to build railways in the United States. The hon. gentleman told us of the great progress the Dominion has made under the maladministration of the present Government. Well, all I have to say is that the greatest progress the Dominion of Canada has made in the last ten years has been in rolling up a large national debt; she has progressed well in that respect, but not otherwise. One would think from the speech delivered by my hon. friend that his own constituents had no market at all to find in the United States. We might suppose that they could sell all their potatoes, all their eggs, all their oats, if they have any, all their hay, and all their fresh salmon, their smelts, their trout, their oysters, their lobsters, and every article they have to sell, to Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia; and when millions are paid out to encourage a line of steamers to run from Vancouver and China and elsewhere,

I suppose he expects that those articles will find their way to those countries. Well, Sir, it will be amusing to the House and a piece of information to the hon. gentleman's constituents, to be told that the people he represents have no other market in the world outside of what they find in the United States. I will read from a paper whose statements I believe the hon. gentleman dare not question. It is published at Shediac, and is called the *Moniteur Acadien*. I believe my hon. friend is the father of that paper, and is ready to swear to almost every word it contains. Now, what does it say? We find that last year, from the port of Shediac, not very far from where my hon. friend lives, they have shipped to England not one cent's worth of farm produce, not one cent's worth of hay, not one cent's worth of potatoes, not one cent's worth of lobsters, mackerel, or fish of any kind, or fish oil. I find that they shipped to Bermuda \$5,979 worth, and to French St. Peters \$600 worth; and a little further on I find that the hard-working, honest people of that county, those poor people who are over-burdened with taxes, who my hon. friend says pay no taxes, have had to ship and sell to that nasty country last year, to that country with whom we ought to have no dealing, to that country which is composed of very ugly people, who should be kept altogether outside of our trade, 12,682 bushels of potatoes, 111,142 dozens of eggs, 201,575 lbs. of smelt, 16,320 lbs. of fresh salmon, 18,864 lbs. of lobsters and 13,994 lbs. of mackerel, besides sundries, in all \$37,688 worth. Now these are all the exports from the port of Shediac for the last year, as accounted for in this document; and in this document England and all the other parts of the world. France, Italy, Germany, Spain and all the rest, did not buy one cent's worth from the hon. gentleman's constituents, but the whole of their exports went to the United States. Still the hon. gentleman is prepared to shut that market out altogether. He says we have no right to go on our knees and ask the American people to negotiate unrestricted reciprocity with us. Well, who are going on their knees? Why, the present Government in 1879 went on their knees; and worse than that, if they prayed on their knees they prayed like a parcel of hypocrites, because they did not mean to carry out what they had made the law of the land. The leader of the Government had caused a law to be passed which provided that as soon as the United States would allow certain articles, the natural products of Canada, into the United States free of duty, we would allow corresponding articles from the United States into Canada free of duty. Well, last year, I remember quite well when this House was in Session, the Government got a little rap over the knuckles by the American Government, and under pressure allowed certain articles of natural products of the United States free of duty into Canada in response to a similar action on the part of the United States with regard to our products. But, no sooner did our Government take that course than a horde of these fruitgrowers from Ontario—no doubt, all Tories—came down, and asked the Government to re-impose the duty on American fruit. The Government replied: No, we cannot do that, but we will impose a duty on the baskets; and from that day out they were known in Prince Edward Island as the Government of the Peach Basket Policy. As I said a moment ago, I do not believe that my hon. friend has made his speech for the farmers of New Brunswick. He has not made his speech for the farmers of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, but he has made a speech no doubt to suit himself and the Government, and in all probability, if all were known, that hon. gentleman expects very soon to get clear of politics. At all events, he is not farming, I believe. The question of reciprocity is no new question in Prince Edward Island. In 1854 Prince Edward Island was a separate colony, and in that year we obtained the great boon of free trade with the United States. That treaty was abrogated by the Americans in 1866. It may

be asked, why did they abrogate it? If you take up the statistics you will find that during the existence of that treaty, our exports to the United States were five hundred per cent. greater than our imports from them, and the Americans, who are an astute people, having access to our Trade and Navigation Returns, and finding out that the balance of trade was so much against them, no doubt decided to abrogate the treaty, and they may have been also impelled to some extent to do this by the feeling of hostility which grew out of the conduct and sympathy of the Canadian people during the American war. The year after the Reciprocity Treaty between Prince Edward Island and the United States was abrogated, I find that Sir Robert Hodgson, who was then administering the Government of Prince Edward Island, said in a speech at the opening of Parliament:

"Since the close of your last Session a visit was paid to the colony by a committee of the Congress of the United States. The object of their mission was to obtain information in connection with the subject of reciprocal trade between this island and the United States. A report of members of the Executive Council in relation to this matter, addressed to His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, will be laid before you, together with communications on the same subject which have passed between the Local Government and Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies."

This shows plainly that the people of Prince Edward Island were then quite alive to the great boon which they had enjoyed commercially under the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. Well, a committee of three gentlemen was sent to Prince Edward Island by Congress to offer free trade. The offer was made, based upon the same principle as that on which the Treaty of 1854 was based, and that offer was approved of by all the members of the Executive Council of Prince Edward Island. It was approved of by Joseph Hensley, who was then Premier, Robert P. Haythorne, now one of the Senators here, W. W. Lord, George W. Howland, another Senator—and I hope he is still of the same mind—H. J. Calbeck, Alexander Laird and A. A. McDonald. These offers were endorsed and accepted by the people of Prince Edward Island, through the members of their Executive Council. I want to show the House that during the year 1887, the most of our exports of certain articles, such as horses, sheep, cattle, poultry, eggs, hides, coal, gypsum, wool, barley, went to the United States; and if the United States market had been closed against the farmers of the Dominion, as far as these articles are concerned, I would like to know where else they would have sold them. I find here that during the year 1887 we sent altogether from Canada 18,777 horses, and to the United States of that number we exported 18,225 horses, or very nearly the whole amount. Of sheep we exported altogether 443,000 head, of which the Americans took 363,000. Of cattle we exported 116,000 head, and of that quantity 45,000 head went to the States. Of poultry we exported \$107,000 worth, of which \$99,000 worth went to the United States. Of eggs we exported \$1,825,000 worth, the whole of which went to the United States. Of hides we exported altogether \$693,000 worth, and \$413,000 worth went to the United States. Of coal we exported 527,000 tons, of which 494,000 tons went to the United States. Of gypsum we exported 140,000 tons, the whole of which the United States took. Of wool we exported 1,416,000 lbs., and of that quantity 1,300,000 lbs. went to the United States. Of barley we exported 456,000 bushels, the whole of which went to the United States. Now, if the advice of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) had been adopted by the people of Canada, they would have closed the market for all these articles I have mentioned, the most of which were exported to the United States. There are a great many other articles which are not mentioned in this; for instance, the article of mackerel. We know very well that the Atlantic Provinces export large quantities of mackerel, and to what market should they go? I would ask my hon.

Mr. PERRY.

friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) that question. They must sell them in the United States market. I know a dealer in Tignish where I live, who sent several barrels to Ottawa, to see how they would go, in order to get rid of this obnoxious specific duty of \$2 a barrel. He kept them here in this city for two months, and in that time, how many mackerel do you think he had sold? He had sold the large quantity of ten mackerel, and he had to cooper his barrels again and send them to Chicago, and pay the \$2 a barrel duty, and sell them there in the American market. My hon. friend wants to close up this market. He says we have no need of the American market, because we can have an inter-provincial trade. I will show you what is the benefit of the inter-provincial trade which the Government created of late years. They have endeavored to force a trade from Nova Scotia up here to these Provinces in coal. What is the result? They are carrying coal from Spring Hill in Nova Scotia to Quebec at the rate of \$22 per carload on the Intercolonial Railway, and they are charging \$20 for a carload of lumber from Bathurst to St. John. The distance from Spring Hill to Quebec is about 600 miles, and the distance from Bathurst to St. John is 214 miles. My hon. friend the member for Kent (Mr. Landry) allows his constituents to be robbed by the Intercolonial Railway charging two-thirds more for freight than the people of Nova Scotia are charged for coal from Spring Hill to Quebec. The members for Gloucester and for Restigouche have not raised their voice against this wrong any more than the member for Kent, and they have chosen to bolster up a set of petty industries in the lower part of Nova Scotia, while their own Province was being unfairly dealt with. If the same policy was carried but all through, instead of the charge on lumber being \$20 per carload from Bathurst to St. John, it should be only \$6.20. That part of Nova Scotia has to be well looked after. The Counties of Cumberland, Pictou and Colchester cannot be neglected. They must be looked after very closely. In 1890, we will have to pay our share of the \$5,000,000 required for that great scheme, the Chignecto Railway, which is shortly to be built, and the Government did not blush to vote that money, though, when they were bound to carry out the terms of Union with Prince Edward Island, they did not think fit to do so, because Prince Edward Island did not choose to send members to support the present Government. In Sir John Macdonald's letter, which was written just previous to the election, he said that the plans and specifications were very easy to get for the subway, and that, when those plans were got, he hoped the work would be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was before the general election?

Mr. PERRY. Yes; just before the general election. Then, Sir Charles Tupper said he spoke very plainly on the platform on the day of the election—this was in a letter addressed to Mr. Ferguson, the candidate of the Government, in order to strengthen his influence. We find, also, that a report of the engineers has been published, stating that the subway is practicable, and that it can be built, but still the money is not voted. I have looked over the Estimates carefully, and I do not see one cent voted to show that the Government are going to carry out their pledge in building the subway or any other way. That is the manner in which Prince Edward Island is to be treated. We will go a little further and see the articles which are shipped to the United States from Canada and the duty which is paid on them. I want this House to understand that, although we have been told several times that the exporters of produce to the United States do not pay the duty, they really do, and this will prove it. In 1887 9,137,717 bushels of barley were sent to the United States, which paid a duty of 10 cents a bushel, or \$913,771. In that year the American

people produced in their own country 60,000,000 bushels of barley. Therefore, the 9,000,000 bushels against the 60,000,000 could not command the price, and consequently the exporter or grower of that barley in Canada had to pay the duty. Again, in beans, we shipped that year 197,764 bushels at 10 cents duty, and paid \$20,660. Of peas, we shipped 405,353 bushels at 20 cents, upon which we paid \$66,268. Of wheat, we exported 341,503 bushels at 20 cents a bushel, and the duty paid was \$60,300; but the United States produced that year 459,000,000 bushels of wheat, and, therefore, our few bushels of wheat could not command the price. Of potatoes, we shipped 1,276,809 bushels at 15 cents duty, and paid \$191,521. The American people grew in that year 169,453,539 bushels of potatoes. Therefore, our potatoes did not regulate the market in the United States. Of hay, we exported 69,450 tons at \$2 a ton duty, and \$138,900 was paid that year. Of horses, we exported 18,255, at 20 per cent., the duty paid being \$112,867; but the price of those horses could not be regulated by our export, because the United States that year had of their own horses 10,357,488. Yet my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) says the American people are a poor people, that they are not a progressive people, that they are not a go-ahead people, that their population is diminishing. If that is so, how is it that, while we are trying to make a country of Canada, we have a population of less than five millions, while they have a population of sixty-five millions, and, when you compare their products with ours, you must conclude that they are a great and a growing people. Of cattle in the same year we exported to the United States 45,765 head at 20 per cent., and we paid duty on them to the amount of \$177,551. The United States turned out in that year 35,192,074. Of sheep we sent to the States 363,046 at 20 per cent., upon which we paid \$194,896 duty. But the American people raised that year 35,192,074 head of sheep. Now of wool. We were told the other day by some hon. gentlemen that we would find a home consumption for our wool. The contrary is true, because in that year we sent there 1,297,867 pounds at 10 cents per pound, on which we paid in duty \$129,796. During the year we paid in the vicinity of two million dollars into the American treasury on these few articles I have named. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) is quite willing to allow the United States to bleed our farmers in this way, he does not care so long as they vote right. But I cannot see it in that light, and I think his constituents cannot see it in the same light either. I do not mean to say that the people of Canada cannot live without the United States. I am one who believes that the Dominion of Canada can live without the United States; but I say that if you remove the barriers, if you tear down the Chinese wall which the present Government has built between the two countries and give us unrestricted reciprocity with the American people, we would be 30 per cent., yes, 40 per cent. better off than we are now. People may say that the day will not come. Hon. gentlemen opposite may try to frighten the people and try to make them believe that Imperial Federation is better. But they might as well try to stop the tide from rising with a pitchfork as to try to stop the day coming when we are going to have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I think I can safely make these statements. I think that day will soon arrive, although not while the present Government are in power, because their policy is one of "to-morrow," and that is the way all the time. It is a policy of protection, in fact it is almost a policy of prohibition. Fancy the idea of having this Chinese wall between the great city of Boston and the great city of Montreal. What would American people think if there were a barrier between the great city of New York and the great city of Chicago? Fancy a Chinese wall between Massachusetts and Illinois—how would the people live?

Yet it would be much handier for the people of Montreal to reach Boston than for the people of New York to reach Chicago; and I say it is just as unreasonable to raise a Chinese wall between these two countries and expect them to prosper, as to expect these two states of the Union to prosper with a Chinese wall between them. The hon. member for Kent also stated—and I thought it a very queer assertion—that we would have better prices without reciprocity with the Americans than we would have with it. I do not see how he expected gentlemen on this side of the House to swallow that statement. He says that under unrestricted reciprocity the farmers of Canada could not expect to get as good prices as they have without it. Sir, I think I have shown by the figures I have quoted that such is not the case. When you consider the amount of duty being paid, when you take 15 cents a bushel on potatoes, 10 cents on barley, 10 cents on beans, 10 cents on peas, 20 per cent. on horses, 20 per cent. on sheep, \$2 per barrel on mackerel, will that hon. gentleman stand up and tell me that he believes the statement that he has made? Sir, that statement was made, like a great many other statements which my hon. friend made, without thinking of what he was saying. It is impossible. When these barriers are taken down a man will export his horses to the United States at a price 20 per cent. better than he can do now, he will export his mackerel at \$2 a barrel better than now, he will export his cattle 20 per cent. better than now. The Minister of Finance stated the other night that the farmers paid duty. He gave us a great piece of information, indeed, he told us that we paid no taxes. He told us that he himself did not use tobacco, that he did not drink whiskey and the poor farmers, he thought, might do the same, and, therefore, they would not pay taxes. Does he mean that the farmer, in order to pay no tax, shall build their houses with logs, as they did fifty or sixty years ago, with an old chimney place in the corner and a bar of iron across the chimney upon which to hang a kettle to boil the potatoes in, and I suppose they would not have a goose to cook very often if my hon. friend could have his way. Sir, my hon. friend is altogether wrong. Why, he contradicted every word which the hon. member for Kent has uttered to-night. He said that the country was prosperous, that the country was going ahead. Sir, if we are to go back to the years 1784 or 1834 to get an idea of our prosperity, then we have not progressed, we have retrograded. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the farmers are not supposed to build a comfortable house? Does he mean to say that the farmer would use no nails in building that house? Does he mean to say that the farmer will not have to pay a heavy duty on the two-pronged fork, on the three-pronged fork, on the four-pronged fork, on the shovel, on the spade, on the hoe, on the axe, on the horse shoe, on the horse nails, on the iron that mounts the truck waggon or the buggy, that mounts the plough, the mowing machine, the reaping machine, the horse rake, the harrow and everything else? Why, Sir, I would not be done until to-morrow morning if I were to repeat all the articles upon which the poor farmer has to pay this tax, which has been imposed upon him by the present Government. I find that last year we have imported \$227,618 worth of flannel, upon which we paid \$61,137 duty. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the farmers of Canada have used none of that flannel? We have imported \$483,320 worth of shirts, upon which we have paid \$126,632 in duty. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the poor farmers have not used any of these shirts? We imported in clothing \$1,095,374 worth, upon which we paid \$273,846 duty. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the poor farmer, the poor fisherman, the poor laborer, the artisan, the miner, have used none of these clothes? With what did he clothe himself, I would like to know? Has he gone naked? Of hats and caps there were imported last year \$1,291,627

worth, upon which a duty was paid of \$322,907. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the farmers, artisans and fishermen should go without hats and caps? I suppose they should wear straw caubeens. We imported 4,862,042 pounds of sugar on which a duty was paid of no less than \$3,167,528. Is that not paying a duty with a vengeance? It is about 75 per cent. duty paid by the poor farmers, artisans, miners and fishermen. There is a large quantity of molasses used in the lower Provinces. The hon. gentleman forgot to state the high duty paid on the article; but I suppose the fishermen in his county do not use any molasses or the fishermen in Nova Scotia; but hon. gentleman opposite will be able to give them plenty of molasses on the eve of an election in order to soothe them, and I have no doubt the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is an expert in offering molasses. We find that fish hooks, the materials to make the "jiggers" used to catch mackerel, fishermen's waterproof boots, the knife used to cut the bait, the twine entering into the nets and seines, the nails entering into the boats, the canvas that goes to make the sails, the rope that rigs the boat, and the iron that enters into the anchor and cable, all these articles are very heavily taxed. And yet the Minister of Finance tells us that these poor people are paying no taxes. I am afraid the hon. gentleman himself is paying no taxes; I believe he is not; in fact I believe he is more of a drag on the people than the amount of money involved. When I allude to that, I refer to the amount of his cab hire, which I say it is disgraceful for any country to allow. I find we imported last year \$164,000 worth of Bibles, upon which we paid \$3,211 duty. I suppose the Minister of Finance thinks the farmers do not read, but they will read his speech, and I hope when the next election comes they will read him out of the House. Of carpets there were imported \$1,181,387 value, on which a duty was paid of \$330,000. Are not poor people to be allowed the privilege of having a carpet on their floors or are they to have bare floors all the time? It appears to be the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite that poor people should not improve, but it is not my idea. I should like to see these poor people go ahead, I should like to see the farmers prosperous and independent; and while I am proud that there are a great many independent farmers in this country, I hold that there would be 50 per cent. more if they were not brought down by this miserable, narrow-hearted policy of the present Government, by which they keep up this Chinese wall between this country and the United States. The Government appear to think that the country can be made prosperous by opening communication with China and Japan, South America and other distant points when we have a market at our own doors, and all we have to do to obtain it is to take down the barriers. I endorse every line in the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and it will be endorsed by the people I have the honor to represent and by the great majority of the people of the lower Provinces; and I state in my place in Parliament that any representative who speaks otherwise stultifies himself and misrepresents the interests of these people. What was the reason that Prince Edward Island in 1837 returned a solid phalanx of six members against the Government, not to support the Government as was asked by the late Minister of Finance? It was the miserable narrow-hearted policy of the present Government, and it was because unrestricted reciprocity was brought before the people and because they had had an experience from 1854 to 1866 of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I believe at this time that if Prince Edward Island were a separate colony from the Dominion, less than three months would suffice to negotiate a commercial treaty between the United States and the island. I do not intend to detain the House longer, but let me repeat that the day is not far distant, in fact in my opinion it is at hand, when we are going to have a

Mr. PERRY.

change of Government, and the people know that the sooner we have it the better. I have already stated that the members representing Restigouche, Gloucester and Kent have no right to sit here and allow the Government which they support to charge their constituents for carrying their lumber from Bathurst to St. John 200 per cent. more than is charged for carrying coal from Spring Hill to Quebec. They have a right to raise their voices against that injustice, and if they fail to do so I raise my voice on their behalf. I say the Government are doing wrong in this matter, and they should cease for their own sake, and I would warn them now to cease, because I believe no Conservative candidate will be returned at the next election unless these great wrongs are redressed. I hope if I have not convinced and converted hon. gentlemen opposite, I have pleased my constituents; I have spoken in their interests and also in the interests of the people of the County of Kent. I should not wonder if I were invited to run for election in that county.

Mr. LANDRY. I would sooner you would not come.

Mr. PERRY. The change might be a very good one. The rumor has gone abroad that the elections may take place next summer, but I do not think we will have any election so soon, for the Government are afraid to face the country, but if they are prepared I am prepared. I believe that the Government will die a natural death, and then if they die a natural death they can blame no one for murder.

Mr. DALY. I will not attempt, in the few remarks I am about to make, to offer any reply to the gentleman who has just taken his seat, as I will leave that to some hon. gentleman coming from the lower Provinces who is more conversant with the state of affairs in that part of the Dominion than I am. I simply rise for the purpose of endeavoring to set before this House, and before the people of this country some facts which I think will show that we have made some progress in this Canada of ours, and particularly in the North-West. We have had this discussion going on here for several days and several nights and no person from the great North-West or from Manitoba has had an opportunity of saying anything on the subject. I thought it would not be well to allow the opportunity to go by without endeavoring in some manner to refute the statements made on the floor of this House, that Canada has made no progress during the last ten years, or since the introduction of the National Policy. It has been a favorite theme with the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to endeavor to show that the policy of this Government in connection with the administration of lands in the North-West Territories and Manitoba, as well as their policy generally, has not been beneficial to that part of the country. I will endeavor to show from some statistics that that country is in a prosperous condition, and that it has prospered immensely since 1881 when the Canadian Pacific Railway was commenced. There is nothing which will tell the progress of Manitoba so well as the census returns of 1881 and 1886, and they record marvellous advances during the period intervening between these years. In 1881 there were only 2,384,337 acres occupied and of this 250,416 acres were cultivated and 230,264 acres under crop. In five years the acres occupied had increased to 4,171,000, the number of acres cultivated was 751,571 and there were 591,995 acres under crop showing an increase of over 79 per cent., 300 per cent. and 257 per cent. respectively. In 1881 we had a crop amounting to 1,033,623 bushels. In 1886 there were 6,711,186 bushels, and in 1887 there were 14,000,000 bushels; an average of 30 bushels to the acre, a yield unprecedented in the history of the world, a yield sufficiently large to supply all the wants of the Province, and to leave a surplus of 12,000,000 bushels for export. The comparison of the yield of grain in

Dakota, that land of promise which hon. gentlemen opposite are so liable to hold up to the people of this country as being the place where our dissatisfied farmers should go—the comparison of the yield of wheat between Manitoba and Dakota, which is looked upon as the banner wheat producing territory of the States, is as follows:—Dakota, when it had a population of 135,000, produced a total wheat crop of 2,830,259 bushels; while Manitoba with a population of 110,000—25,000 less than Dakota—produced more than five times that quantity. The contrast is still more striking when it is learned that 90 per cent. of the population in Dakota are said to be rural, and only 72 per cent. in Manitoba. In this same year the population of Dakota produced only 2,217,000 bushels of oats, 2,270,000 bushels of barley, and 664,000 bushels of potatoes, while Manitoba with a smaller population and a smaller percentage of farmers raised 2,500,000 bushels of potatoes, 2,000,000 bushels of barley and 7,000,000 bushels of oats. I think that those figures go to show that we have made some progress in the Province of Manitoba. I will go further now and compare the yield per acre in Manitoba with the United States and from which comparison the superiority of the soil of the former Province is manifest. In 1880, the average yield per acre in the States was 13.1; in 1881, 10.1; 1882, 13.6; 1883, 11.6; 1884, 13; 1885, 10.4. In the latter year the average yield per acre in the following States was:—Oregon, 15.9; Dakota, 12.8; Wisconsin, 11.5; Iowa and Nebraska, 11.3; Minnesota, 11.1; Indiana and Kansas, 10.6; Ohio, 10.2; California, 9.4; Illinois, 8.5; Missouri, 7.4; while in Manitoba the average was 18.4, much larger than the average of any of the other States. In 1887 when Dakota average had increased to 16 bushels per acre Manitoba had increased to 32 bushels per acre. In 1887 Manitoba raised more wheat than all the following States in the Union in the previous year, combined:—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Wyoming, Nevada, New Hampshire, Mississippi, Arizona, Vermont, Maine, New Mexico, South Carolina, Idaho, Delaware, Montana, Alabama, Utah, Georgia, Arkansas. In 1887 Manitoba raised more wheat than any of the thirty following States:—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Wyoming, Nevada, New Hampshire, Mississippi, Arizona, Vermont, Maine, New Mexico, South Carolina, Idaho, Delaware, Montana, Alabama, Utah, Georgia, Arkansas, New Jersey, Colorado, West Virginia, North Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Maryland, Washington Territory, Tennessee, New York, Oregon and Kentucky. I may say that in 1887 the total yield of Manitoba was 14,000,000 bushels, and in that same year the city of Brandon from which I come, marketed 1,500,000 bushels, that is the little city of Brandon eight years old marketed as much in 1887 as was raised in the whole of the territory of Montana. During that year the greatest yield of any of the States outside of Dakota was in Kentucky which raised 12,405,000 bushels and in the same year Manitoba raised 14,000,000 bushels. In the report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade respecting the disposal of the crop of 1887 it was shown that there were 432,000 acres under crop as per the report received from the Department of Agriculture. In September the board, assuming that the average yield would be 28 bushels to the acre, estimated the total crop at 12,000,000, but within a month after they decided that the crop actually reached 14,000,000 bushels. This was accounted for as follows:—Exported to Eastern Canada and Europe 8,500,000 bushels; converted into flour in Manitoba 2,600,000 bushels; used as seed for 520,000 acres, 1,100,000 bushels; in the hands of millers and shippers and of farmers for close marketing, 1,200,000, making a total of 13,400,000; and to this may be added wheat used as feed on farms sufficient to make up the 14,000,000 bushels. Now, Sir, leaving that phase of the question we come to this fact that the census of Manitoba, taken in 1886, shows that 16,000 farmers were in Manitoba that

year, and it may be accepted as a fact that these farmers raised the crop of 14,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1887, having an average each of 875 bushels. With a wheat crop of 14,000,000 bushels grown on 432,000 acres, the average yield per acre was 32.4 bushels. In the year 1887, the value of our exports from Manitoba was as follows:—

Wheat.....	\$4,675,000
Flour and bran.....	1,250,000
Flax, and its products.....	120,000
Barley.....	140,000
Oats and oatmeal.....	280,000
Dairy products, eggs, potatoes, vegetables, wool, hides, fish, &c.....	600,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$7,065,000</b>

I may state that the value of furs is not included, is not in this statement. Now, Mr. Bell, the indefatigable secretary of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, in reference to that great crop of wheat which Manitoba produced in 1887, prepared some statistics to illustrate the extent of that crop, which I will give to the House. He says:

“The estimate is made on the basis of last year's (1887) wheat crop, which was 14,000 bushels. A few years ago, when Red River carts were the only mode of conveyance, an average load was estimated at between 800 and 900 pounds. If we were dependent on this conveyance to-day, it would take 1,000,000 carts to carry out the crop of wheat. They would extend in a straight line 5,000,000 yards, or 2,841 miles, which is practically the distance of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Vancouver to Montreal. The wheat crop would make 550,000,000 pounds of flour, and would weigh about 840,000,000 pounds. Transporting it in carloads of 650 bushels, weighing 39,000 pounds each, it would require 21,533 cars, making up a train 798,906 feet, 265,635 yards, or 151 miles in length, or it would load 466 vessels with 30,000 bushels each. Supposing a farmer's sleigh or waggon load to be one and a-half tons, it would require 233,333 waggons to carry the wheat. Supposing the average distance of the farmers from market to be eight miles, in going and coming, to deliver the wheat of the Province, our farmers would travel 3,733,328 miles. This wheat would feed, according to the adopted amount laid down per head of population, 2,800,000 people for one year, and would feed the present population of Manitoba for 21½ years. It would seed 7,000,000 acres at two bushels to the acre, or 10,907 square miles. It would seed a mile in depth along the Grand Trunk Railway from Toronto to Montreal 33 times over, or a strip two-thirds of a mile wide around the world, in this latitude. The acreage under wheat last year (1887) in Manitoba, equals a strip of land two miles wide, extending from Toronto to Montreal.”

Now, Sir, I think if the hon. gentleman who spoke on this question can digest these figures and the illustrations given by Mr. Bell, they will come to the conclusion that we have made some progress in the Province of Manitoba. They referred to the wheat crop of only one year, to-day we have a larger acreage by 25 per cent. under crop than we had then, and I am perfectly satisfied that it is only a matter of time when we shall double the output of wheat made in 1887. Now, Sir, we have in Winnipeg, as the United States consul the Hon. G. W. Taylor. He has been there a number of years, and he makes annual reports to Washington. In his report of 1887, we find some very interesting figures. The declared exports from the Winnipeg Consulate for 1887 were \$448,353 to the United States, against \$232,109 in 1885; to Great Britain, \$632,058 against \$395,232—the falling off being in furs, to Eastern Canada (estimated) \$6,000,000, against \$1,500,000 two years previous. The trade with British Columbia rose from almost nothing to an aggregate of \$250,000, chiefly shipments of flour, oats, barley and dairy products, with an importation of lumber and fish valued at \$50,000. There is an evidence of the increase of our inter-provincial trade. Consular records at Winnipeg exhibit an exportation of fish—the catch of Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba—amounting to 1,488,330 lbs., in 1887, with invoice value of \$61,359. These shipments were made to Buffalo, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha, Kansas City and Chicago. The supplies of wheat of 1887 are placed at 10,000,000 bushels, valued at \$5,200,000, against 4,530,000, valued at \$2,778,000 in 1885; 2,200,000 in 1884; 1,000,000 in 1883; and 500,000 in 1882. Speaking of the yield in 1887, the Consul says:



"Such a harvest, particularly of wheat, is without precedent in the annals of American agriculture."

Now, we find a general statement in the consular report of the trade of Manitoba with Eastern Canada, the United States, Great Britain and British Columbia, as follows:—

Countries.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
Eastern Canada.....	\$5,450,280	\$8,000,000	\$13,450,280
United States.....	2,735,140	540,793	3,275,933
Great Britain.....	841,751	650,043	1,491,794
British Columbia.....	50,000	250,000	300,000

Our total imports in 1887 were \$9,152,843, our total exports \$7,492,371, making our total trade \$16,650,214. This shows a vast increase over the trade of 1886, which totalled \$12,118,492—the imports being \$7,820,959 and the exports \$4,297,523; and over that of 1885 when the imports were \$10,983,713 and the exports only \$2,627,341 and the increase is still more emphasised when compared with the trade of 1872, amounting to a pastry \$1,208,361, of which all but \$85,541 were imports, or with that of 1873 when the imports only amounted to \$918,336 and the exports to \$246,783—a total of \$1,165,319. The development of the inter provincial trade is most marked, increasing from \$7,824,566 in 1886 to \$11,750,280 last year, an increase of almost \$4,000,000. Now, to show the very large progress that has been made in Manitoba, I might point out that the best evidence of the progress of our country is to be found in its educational facilities. We find that we had in Manitoba in 1871, 16 Protestant schools and 17 Roman Catholic schools; in 1881 we had 128 Protestant schools and 17 Roman Catholic schools; in 1887 we had 522 Protestant schools and 78 Roman Catholic schools; and out of 529 teachers employed in the Protestant schools of Manitoba 310 received instruction at the Provincial Normal School. We have high schools at Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie. We have the Manitoba University, which is denominational; St. Boniface College, representing the Roman Catholic population; St. John's College representing the Church of England, the Wesleyan College representing the Wesleyan Methodists; and Manitoba College representing the Presbyterians. With regard to the progress made in our railways, in 1877 there was not a mile of railway completed in the Province of Manitoba, and to-day we have 1,135 miles of railway in the Province, of which the Canadian Pacific Railway has on its main line 315 miles, the balance being made up of branches. The Manitoba and North-Western 217 miles; the Red River Valley 67 miles, and the Hudson Bay 40 miles. Now, I could not give better evidence of the fact that we have a large and increasing trade in the Lower Provinces than to show the trade in the city of Brandon. I heard the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) say the other night that our farmers had not any market for their horses. Well, I would tell that hon. gentleman that in 1888, we received in the city of Brandon alone 85 carloads of horses from the East, and taking an average of 18 to the car, that would give 1,530 horses; and we received during that year 24 carloads from the West. Now this is but one point in the Province of Manitoba. If we received 85 carloads of horses at Brandon, no doubt Winnipeg received as much, and Portage la Prairie and other places received their due proportion. Since the 1st of January, 1889, up to to-day, we have received from Ontario 22 carloads of horses. To give you an idea of the progress our farmers are making, we find that wheat is selling at Brandon, at \$1.05 cents a bushel; oats, 24 cents a bushel; barley, 28 cents a bushel; eggs, 20 to 25 cents a dozen; butter, 20 cents a lb.; pork, \$7 a 100 lbs; beef, \$1.25 per 100 lbs.; hay, \$6 a ton; mutton, \$5 per cwt.; and other articles in proportion. As a further evidence of the progress we are making in the way of immigration, I may read for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who are decrying our

Mr. DALY.

country the report of the Emigration Agent, at Brandon, Mr. Bennett. He says:

"The increase of immigrants to this district has been 27 per cent. over that of 1887.

"The arrivals from Great Britain increased every year since this agency opened. The class of immigrants, with very few exceptions, were excellent. There were a large proportion of the farming class, and better provided with letters of credit, and Bank of England notes, than came under my observation any previous year. Several have taken homesteads, some have purchased improved farms, others have bought railway land, while one has invested £5,000 in real estate, and has in reserve an equal amount for investment when favorable opportunity offers.

"The immigration from the Eastern Provinces was also very great, nearly all of whom were in good circumstances, bringing their stock and effects with them, and through the medium of their friends had farms purchased, to which they moved at once.

If you will read that report and the other reports of immigration agents in Manitoba and the North-West Territories you must come to the conclusion that our population is largely increasing, that we are building up the country, and that our resources are daily becoming greater. Things with us are in a much better condition than they are in Dakota, which hon. gentlemen opposite are so eager to quote as being a paradise of prosperity. To show you how much better off we are than the people in Dakota, I will read you a letter from Mr. L. A. Hamilton, a gentleman well known in Winnipeg. He says:

"One dollar and three cents a bushel was the ruling price for wheat at Gretna, Manitoba, on the 2nd inst. Only 96 cents a bushel was offered at Neche, Dakota, on the same day. These stations are only two miles apart. It is, therefore, seen that the Manitoba farmer received 7 cents a bushel more for his wheat than his Dakota neighbor. Ontario farmers intending to move to the North-West should carefully consider these facts before selecting Dakota in preference to Manitoba. I think to politicians another lesson is also suggested by this comparison.

"Yours, &c.,

"L. A. HAMILTON."

I would impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite this comparison, which shows that wheat is selling at \$1.03 cents in Gretna while it is selling at 7 cents less two miles distant on the American side. The best evidence we can give of the condition of the unfortunate people in Dakota, for I say they are unfortunate, despite the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other night, when he said that from Brussels, sixty families had gone to the United States. I hope they have not gone to the Territory of Dakota, because any gentleman who has read the papers during the last three or four months must have noticed the terrible distress that is reported to exist among the people there. Every day men from Dakota are coming into our section, and they say the reason more people do not leave is that they have not money enough to move. I hold in my hand a letter published in the *Winnipeg Call* from Mr. Martin, and without having seen this man that wrote this letter, I am perfectly satisfied he is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. He says:

"I have been a resident of Dakota for six years, and as that is the place to which so many Canadians are alleged to have gone to better their condition, I feel anxious to give my experience in that land of hot winds, drought and hail. In the spring of 1883 a party of us settled in Brown and McPherson counties. It must be remembered that Brown is rated as one of the best counties in the Territory. The wheat of that year did not yield more than five bushels per acre, oats not more than twenty. In '84 we were more fortunate than any of the neighboring counties. We had sixteen bushels of wheat and twenty-five bushels of oats per acre. In '85 a few got as high as twenty-one bushels of wheat and thirty of oats, but hundreds did not get more than half that amount. In '86 we got from three to seven bushels of wheat and ten to fifteen of oats. In '87 from fifteen to twenty-five of oats. In the past harvest ('88), wheat ran from three to ten bushels, oats from eleven to twenty-four, while hundreds of thousands of acres, south and west of us, were never cut at all. In regard to barley, it did not yield any better than wheat or oats. I sowed barley four seasons, and three seasons out of the four I did not get ten bushels per acre. I have been over a large portion of Manitoba during the past summer and this fall, and found farmers in every district ready to testify to the growing of one hundred bushels of oats, forty and some fifty of wheat, and fifty to seventy of barley. Now, I wish to say right here that there is no use of any paper of Toronto or any other place denying the above figures, for we can bring the proof

from any part of this Province that they are correct. Of course some parts are badly frozen this year, but, in this, the worst year that Manitoba has seen, there is a better crop of oats and barley than I ever saw in Dakota, and, as a rule, the farmers are not at all discouraged, mostly all having something left from last year's bountiful harvest. Nearly all that I have talked with are out of debt, or nearly so, and not as the Oak Lake writer says, waiting for a chance to sell, but say they are here to stay. My nearest neighbor says that he spent his last 25 cents for bread on his way from Portage here. Now he has 800 acres of land, 5 horses, 15 head of cattle, a comfortable house, in which is a good organ, rides out in a covered buggy, and owes no man a dollar. Many others that I have met get here with scarcely a dollar and to-day are in good circumstances, while in Dakota nine out of every ten settlers cannot show value for half the amount they took there. Here we get good lumber—"

And this is something I want to impress on hon. gentlemen opposite.

"—for \$15 per 1,000 feet, there the price is from \$25 to \$30. Here the settler has but to go to the timber lands and cut his fuel; there he must buy coal, or follow up the cattle for cow drips, which nearly all have to do. Should a settler here want to borrow money it can be had at eight per cent. per annum; there he must pay three per cent. per month, and give the best of security for it at that. That may appear a big story but thousands of settlers are paying that rate of interest, and have everything in the line of stock and implements mortgaged for all they can get upon them. For example, should a settler want to get credit at a store for six months' goods he must give a mortgage upon his crops or stock as security, and hundreds of settlers, not being able to meet those payments on account of failure of their crops, are destitute, and have nothing left to face winter with, and they cannot go to the bush, as the settler in Manitoba can, to get fuel, but must buy coal or suffer as only those that have had to live upon those bleak prairies without good fuel can describe. I have helped some of my neighbors to do their threshing here, and was surprised to see oats turn out fifty bushels per acre in this the worst year they have ever seen in this part. Taxes do not amount to more than one-third the amount here that they do in Dakota. Some townships there pay as high as thirty mills on the dollar school tax, and with that amount only get three to four months' school. Now, I would advise every Canadian in search of a home to come and see Manitoba for himself, and see if he cannot do better than this Oak Lake writer, who must have put in five years of hard labor to get sixty acres under cultivation, which is about two months' work.

"G. W. MARTIN."

That letter is signed by G. W. Martin, a man who wasted six years of his life in Dakota, and who told a friend of mine that he thanked God he had enough money left to bring him back to Canadian soil again; and yet Dakota is the country which the hon. gentleman the other night held up as the country to which every Canadian should go. We cannot deduce any other conclusion from the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) because he made out that the United States, of which Dakota is a part, is a better country than Canada. I showed the other night that the land laws in that country are not as liberal as ours, though the hon. gentleman has made the contrary statement for four or five years past. I ask any hon. gentleman to go to the Library and take the land laws of the United States and examine them, and I guarantee that he will find that those laws are not as liberal as ours. I have shown by the letter I have read that their taxation is larger than ours, and that they cannot raise produce as well as we can in Manitoba; but, notwithstanding these facts, which must be as much within the knowledge of the hon. gentleman as they are within mine, they have the hardihood to stand up here year after year and make these statements. I will give you some further evidence on this subject. I see the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), smiling. I will give him a dose by and by, but I will give the House a few facts now in regard to this matter. David Caffery, Brandon Post Office, Township 12, Range 18, has 2,000 bushels of No. 1 hard on hand, after paying everything; Geo. Halse, Brandon Post Office, south-east  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Township 30, Range 9, Section 18, west, had about 1,700 bushels of wheat, and has about 1,000 bushels after paying all; Geo. Roddick, W. H. Danbar and G. Roddick, jun., Brandon Hills Post Office, Township 18, Range 3, Section 18, and other lands, have not sold yet; they have nearly 16,000 bushels on hand amongst them, half of which will pay all liabilities; D. W. Shaw, Brandon Post Office, west  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Section 10, Township 10, Range 19, had about 1,800 bushels which will net \$1,000, last year; Allan Young, Griswold Post

Office, Township 10, Range 22, Section 23, netted \$2,700, after paying everything, last year; Jas. McFarlane, Chater Post Office, Township 11, Range 18, will net \$1,000; Percy Selwyn, Rounthwaite Post Office, Section 1, Township 8, Range 18, will net \$1,500; Samuel Hannah, Griswold Post Office, Township 10, Range 22, Section 23, sold \$5,500 worth of wheat, and has 1,500 bushels on hand and 2,000 bushels of oats, and will net over \$3,000; Jas. Young, Griswold Post Office, Township 10, Range 22, Section 23, sold \$3,400 worth of wheat, has 2,000 bushels of oats in hand, and will net \$2,000; R. bt. Hall, Griswold Post Office, Section 18, Township 10, Range 22, will net \$2,000; W. J. Good, Griswold Post Office, Township 10, Range 22, Section 18, will net \$2,000; Geo. Stewart, Stratherne Post Office, Township 8, Range 17, Section 16, had 1,000 bushels of wheat, and will net over \$1,000; Wm. Dorsey, Stratherne Post Office, Township 8, Range 8, Section 17, will net \$1,200; Jas. McFadden, Stratherne Post Office, Township 8, Range 17, Section 4, had over 7,000 bushels of wheat, and about 3,000 bushels of barley, and will clear over \$2,000. I could give you many other incidents of the prosperity of the men in the neighborhood of Brandon, and, from my own personal knowledge of the men whose names I have given, I know that most of them went to Manitoba without a dollar. They came from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick, from Ontario and from Quebec, and, when hon. gentlemen opposite state that the farmers of Ontario cannot make a livelihood to-day, let them send them up to the Province of Manitoba. Take the case of the Rev. George Roddick, who came from Pictou, Nova Scotia, and crossed the Assiniboine in 1880, scarcely nine years ago, and yet to-day he has 10,000 bushels of wheat, worth ten thousand good Canadian dollars. In face of these facts which I have given to the House, in order to show that, if in other Provinces the farmers are not prosperous, they can come to our great land of promise, hon. gentlemen will continue to make the same statements. It is true that we have had drawbacks, but notwithstanding those drawbacks, notwithstanding the bad seasons we have had, here is the record of one year in regard to these men whose names I have mentioned, and I do not think there can be any better argument than this to prove that we have a great and glorious country, and that all we have to do is to be true to ourselves and then we need no nearer or closer relations with the United States of America. I do not suppose that there is any hon. gentleman on this side who does not desire trade relations with them, but it ill-becomes anyone to stand up in this House and, because an irresponsible representative in the House at Washington proposes a resolution in favor of commercial union—not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity—to ask us to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because, if you read that resolution you will see that the desire is expressed to establish commercial union with us if we desire to establish it with the United States, and the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford says that we will act in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives at Washington. That resolution was passed in the dying days of the Cleveland Administration, it did not reach the Senate of the United States or the President, and yet, in view of those facts, we are asked to vote that we are in favor of such a scheme. When the proper time comes, when the people of the United States, through their representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, approach our Government in a proper way, that, in my opinion, will be the proper time to consider this question; but no evidence has been produced to show that we are not open to negotiation. Evidence has been given to show that time after time we have shown our friendship to our American cousins, and have been ready to meet them half-way. We have no necessity to go down on our marrow-bones to them. The fact is, that it

was not until the Canadian Pacific Railway had bound this great country of ours together and developed our magnificent resources that the people on the other side thought we were worth any consideration, and now it appears to be possible that there is a conspiracy on the part of men like Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Hitt, and their friends on this side of the line, to get hold of the vast country which we have developed by our own resources. Does anyone suppose that we cannot develop our own country ourselves? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), said in his speech that for twenty-five years the people of the United States had this great Chinese wall that the last speaker spoke of, about them. We have not had it ten years yet, and I venture to say that when we have had it for twenty-five years we will be able to present just as good a case as the hon. member for North Norfolk, the advocate of the United States, has presented in favor of that country. I was amused at the remarks of the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Perry), who is evidently not a free trader. He was not for unrestricted reciprocity, he was not for commercial union, because he wants to have unrestricted reciprocity with a country that has a much larger tariff than we have now. Sir, if hon. gentlemen opposite think that they are going to hoodwink the electors of this country, they are very much mistaken. They went to the electors in 1882 and 1887 upon a similar cry, and that cry was met in the same way that it will be met in 1891, and that is that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House will come back here with the same majority that he has to-day. Now, in regard to inter-provincial trade: I stated a short time ago that I would give the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry) some facts. I was rather enlightened this afternoon to hear that the people in that portion of the Dominion were able to ride out in buggies. I thought, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that they were so poverty stricken that they could not even ride in a waggon; but I am informed by hon. gentlemen in this House that Mr. McLeod, of Summerside, whom, no doubt, the hon. gentleman knows, has recently ordered \$25,000 worth of top buggies for Summerside, and he ordered them from a Gananoque manufacturer. Now, if these people are in the condition described by the hon. gentlemen opposite, how is it that they have money put by with which they can pay for these buggies? To give you a further idea of this inter-provincial trade, I find that carloads of waggons, containing 600 in each, were ordered from Fredericton, New Brunswick, the other day. The waggons were all put up in sections. They are worth \$75 each, which amounts to \$45,000, and these for that one city alone. We find also that Mr. Fairchild, of Winnipeg, one of the smallest dealers in Manitoba in agricultural implements, ordered recently 250 buckboards, worth \$30 a piece, and 1,000 buggies worth \$75 apiece. These are little instances of the inter-provincial trade that is springing up between the different Provinces. These facts that I have given show that that trade is increasing in Manitoba at a great ratio. I have spoken of the resources of Manitoba. We have a Province to the west of us that is not very often heard of in this House, that is the great Province of British Columbia, and I think, under the circumstances, that it would not be out of place for me to refer to the progress that Province has made during the past few years. Let me read from the eloquent words of Lord Dufferin, who said, speaking of British Columbia:

"Canada would indeed be dead to the most self-evident considerations of self-interest, and to the first instincts of national pride, if she did not regard with satisfaction her connection with a Province so richly endowed by nature, inhabited by a community so replete with British loyalty and pluck, while it afforded her the means of extending her confines and the outlets of her commerce to the wide Pacific and the countries beyond."

Now I find that according to statistics for the years 1858 to 1886 the gold mines of that Province yielded \$50,289,417,  
Mr. DALY.

that the salmon industry, having thirty canneries, employing 5,000 hands, annually packed an average of 200,000 cases, at \$5 a case. The Skidegate Oil Company extract oil from the livers of dog-fish to the extent of about \$400,000 annually, yielding 40,000 gallons. From 1860 to 1870 only 320,000 tons of coal were shipped from Nanaimo to San Francisco. Rich magnetic iron ore is found on Texada Island, only twenty miles distant from Nanaimo and Wellington collieries. In 1887 the coal output from the Province of British Columbia was 410,573 tons, and we find that San Francisco alone took 335,864 tons. The output of the Dunsmuir mine was 242,723 tons, valued at \$4 a ton at the pit's mouth, equal to \$966,892 and employing 915 men. The Vancouver output was 187,850 tons, valued at \$537,300, employing 615 men. The East Wellington Company had an output of 30,000 tons. Taking these figures altogether it shows an output in that year of \$1,624,192 worth of coal. On Vancouver Island are to be found splendid locations for hundreds of families, and the opening of the railway reserve will supply hundreds more. It is estimated that there are 389,000 acres of arable land on the island, of which 300,000 are well suited for agriculture, the greater portion, however, being densely timbered. The New Westminster District is not exceeded in fertility by any tract of land on the coast. The productiveness of the delta lands is marvellous. Statistics carefully prepared give the return per acre, at 75 bushels of oats: hay, 3½ tons; barley, 40 bushels; turnips, 40 to 50 tons; potatoes, 30 tons. Roots and vegetables attain an enormous size, and the yield to the acre is very prolific. In this district there is a quarter of a million of acres of prairie. Dr. Dawson, an authority unquestioned, estimates the whole area of agricultural lands east of Fraser River, in the southern portion of the Province, at 1,000 square miles, which may be easily utilised:

"In the Spallumcheen, Salmon, Okanagan, Kootenay and Columbia regions there are thousands upon thousands of acres of arable land yet to be claimed."

Again Dr. Dawson says:

"There is a large agricultural section, an extensive area of low land, lying west of Fraser River, and chiefly north of the fifty-first parallel, which I estimate at 1,230 square miles."

Of it he says:

"The soil is almost uniformly good; but, being to a great extent covered with trees, it cannot be utilised so readily for agricultural purposes, and it lies, besides, off the route of the railways, and is not likely to be opened up for some time. Still, it is a country which I have every reason to believe will be occupied eventually by an agricultural population."

Now, we find from these facts that I have given you that the trade of British Columbia has largely increased. Both British Columbia and Manitoba enjoy a very large trade. I regret that I have not the figures here to show the trade of the North-West Territories, but taking the returns of Manitoba and British Columbia together they are evidence, to every fair minded man in this House, that our great Western Provinces are in a very prosperous condition. I am satisfied that when this question is fully discussed before the people of Manitoba and the western portions of this Dominion in general, you will find from their attitude upon the subject, that they are just as loyal to the Crown of Great Britain as are the people of the Eastern Provinces, and they will give no uncertain sound in relation to this question. I cannot understand for one moment how anyone who was born in Canada, as I have been, can have any misgivings as to the future of this country. We have Prince Edward Island on the east with its large agricultural resources, with its large fishing industries, then we have New Brunswick with its great timber resources, Nova Scotia with its fisheries and mines, Quebec with its minerals underlying almost the whole surface of that great Province, Ontario of equally large wealth to any one of the United States. We

have between here and Port Arthur timber and mineral wealth equal to any to be found on the continent. From Port Arthur to Manitoba there is one long stretch which the traveller expects to be a barren waste, yet underlying the surface of rock we find vast deposits of silver and gold, and at the Lake of the Woods, through the instrumentality of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there has been opened one of the largest water powers in the world, and there is running at that point one of the largest mills in Canada. On the great prairies of Manitoba and the North-West we raised, in 1887, 14,000,000 bushels of wheat. If we raised that quantity in 1887, how many bushels will we raise in 1897? These are facts which require careful consideration. If our population does not increase in the same ratio as that of Dakota, our resources have developed in a greater ratio. Those hon. members of this House who have not been through the Province of Manitoba I invite to come. If you do not believe the facts I have given, come to our Province in August and see thousands upon thousands of acres of golden grain ready for the sickle; and more than that, nearly every acre of grain is cut with Canadian machines. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to the fact that the farmers of Manitoba were down-trodden and were oppressed, and because of the National Policy they were paying so much for their machinery. As the effect of the National Policy, what do we find? In 1882 binders were sold at \$3.5 each and today binders of the latest pattern and best make can be purchased for \$180 cash. That is the effect of having protection. If we had not that protection, American machines would have ruled in the North-West, and where would have been the factories in the east? As I was saying, in Manitoba and the North-West we have fields of golden grain; and as you go west to Alberta you find there the greatest ranching country in the world and the finest grasses found in any of the western territories. Travelling through the grand and magnificent stretch of scenery in the Rocky Mountains and the Cascades you reach British Columbia, the riches of which I have already pointed out; and taking the chain of Provinces together, I say it is a Dominion of which we must be proud. I feel proud of it, as we must all feel proud of it, and I not only feel proud of it, but I feel proud of our British connection, and we must all hope and trust that not only ourselves but our descendants may enjoy the freedom and the prosperity which we now enjoy under the grand old flag that has braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have listened with much pleasure to the address which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Daly). With the great portion of his address I entirely agree. He has spoken with regard to the fertility of the soil of the North-West, of its immense resources, the rich mines, the great fertility of the soil, and the increase that has taken place in that country during the last three years. I am very glad to know that, after Canada has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in developing the resources of the North-West, the time has now arrived when we may look for a slight return for the large expense incurred. I noticed, however, that the tone of hon. gentleman opposite has changed very materially during the last few years. It was not always as hopeful as it is at present. The hon. gentleman opposite did not speak of the great development that was taking place in this country; this has only taken place lately, only since they have obtained a Local Reform Government that had the backbone to stand up for the rights of the Province, and demand that fair play should be meted out to it. And what was the result of the Province assuming that attitude? The long continued series of disallowance of charters passed by the Local Government for years and years intended to develop and open up that great country ceased, and the very moment the Local

Reform Government took the matter in hand and determined that they would not allow those proceedings to continue, the Province obtained relief. That was one of the main causes of the prosperity in the North-West, and I do not think there is a single hon. gentleman in this House who will not be glad to hear that our great and fertile possessions in the North-West, of which we all feel proud, are increasing in wealth and prosperity. While this is the case, the whole of the hon. gentleman's argument is foreign to the point under discussion. What has that to do with the question of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? The hon. gentleman has read extracts from statements by farmers all over the North-West Territories, stating how many bushels of wheat they raised and how many bushels of turnips they raised, and all such stuff as you could get in any ten cent almanac. If you take any of the thousand immigration pamphlets distributed gratis in every part of the country you can obtain nine-tenths of the hon. gentleman's speech, and I do not see that it has anything to do with this all-important question we are discussing. Although the North-West may have increased to a wonderful extent and although it may continue to increase, no man would say that if the people of that country had access to markets which extend for 3,000 miles along their border and if trade could ebb and flow between the United States and the North-West, the prosperity of that portion of our country would not be increased. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House (Mr. Daly) mentioned the large exports of coal from British Columbia, and he stated that 410,000 tons were shipped from the mines of British Columbia, and that the greatest portion went to San Francisco. Does the hon. gentleman know that on every single ton of coal that enters San Francisco there is a duty paid of 75 cents per ton; and will the hon. gentleman say that if that duty were removed and the coal admitted free the miners of British Columbia would not receive so much more for their coal. The production of coal in the United States in 1880 was 7,480,000 tons, and that quantity has largely increased since that time. Accordingly, the 410,000 tons we exported to the United States from British Columbia formed only a drop in the bucket and had no effect whatever in establishing prices. It is as plain as a ray of light that, if the duty on this coal were removed, the miners of British Columbia, and those of all sections of the Dominion from which coal is exported, would receive so much more pay. This is a great and important question, it is one of the most important questions that has ever come before this Parliament, and I therefore think that in discussing it we should consider it not as Reformers or Conservatives, but as Canadians. We should ask ourselves this question: Will it be for the prosperity of Canada that we should adopt unrestricted reciprocity? If it will build up this country, if it will make the people of this country more prosperous or more contented, then by all means we should adopt it; but if on the other hand it does not fulfil these requirements then we should reject it. I have listened quite attentively to the arguments brought forward against our adopting this resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and I have not heard one single argument that I consider was worth anything in rebutting the arguments advanced on this side in favor of adopting this policy. If we look at the enormous quantity of goods that we sell to the United States annually, and the kind and quality of those goods, it can be readily seen that if the duties were removed the producers in this country would realise a very much larger amount than they now secure. If we take the products of the mines, fisheries, forests, animals, agricultural products, manufactures, and miscellaneous articles, we find that we exported to the States last year no less than \$37,333,161 worth, while to Great Britain our whole exports of those articles last year was only \$33,648,200 worth. Thus, while

we have to pay a very large duty to get our goods into the United States and while in England they go in free and without having to pay any duty, these figures prove that in spite of all these barriers we export to the United States of those products nearly four million dollars worth more than we do to Great Britain. This proves that the markets of the United States are our natural and best markets for these products, and I think it could be easily shown that if it were not for the duty we have to pay, and if it were not for the obstruction thrown in the way of the trade between this country and the United States that our exports to that country would be largely increased. I will treat the matter first from an agricultural standpoint, because I think that the agriculturists of this country on account of their greater number as compared with any other class, the great excess of capital they have invested in their farms and farming lands, and the greater number of men they employ, are entitled to the first consideration of this Parliament. I believe that any line of policy which will benefit the farmers will be for the interest of the people to adopt. If we consider the product of the farm we find that nearly everything exported is sent to the markets of the United States. Of barley alone there were nearly 10,000,000 bushels exported to the States last year, and only 1,687 bushels to England, showing clearly that the United States market is the only market for that great produce which the farmers raise so extensively. Upon that barley we had to pay a duty of \$936,000 to get it into the States. I say that we had to pay the duty, because if it had not been for that ten cents a bushel our farmers would have got for their barley that \$936,000 above the price which they did receive. The United States last year consumed about 65,000,000 bushels of barley, so that you can readily see that the quantity that we exported to the United States bears such a small proportion to the quantity consumed, that it could have had no effect in determining the value there at all. We also exported horses largely to the United States, and the hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke about the great trade in horses between Ontario and the North-West. There is no doubt there is a large trade between the Provinces, but we must look for a foreign trade, because we have a large number of horses which must be sent somewhere else. Last year 19,925 horses, valued at \$2,400,000, were exported to the United States, and upon those horses we had to pay a duty of no less than \$480,000. The same argument will apply to our paying the duty in this case as applied to barley. In the United States it was estimated last year that the Americans had 13,000,000 horses and if you take the average life of a horse at 13 years you will find that it requires an annual supply of 1,000,000 horses a year to keep up the supply in the United States. What signifies the little less than 20,000 horses that we exported there; it is as if we only sent one single horse to the United States, and it has no marked effect on the supply, and would not alter the price. Hay is a product in which the farmers in the western part of Canada are much interested in, and last year we exported 84,000 tons of hay upon which there was a duty of \$170,000. There again the duty came out of the pockets of the farmers of this Dominion, because in the United States they consume 196,000,000 tons of hay every year, and the quantity we exported could make no appreciable difference in the price. We sent 10,000,000 lbs. of wool to the States last year, on which we paid a duty of nearly \$96,000; of horned cattle we sent 40,000 to the United States and we paid a duty of \$139,000; we sent a little over 1,000,000 sheep to the United States, upon which we paid \$71,000, and I maintain that all this money paid in duty came out of the pockets of our farmers. So much for this question from the farmers' standpoint. I think that it can be readily seen from the statistics I have given and which have to some extent been given by the gentleman who preceded me, that

Mr. CAMPBELL.

there can be no doubt that if the farmers of the country had free access to the markets of the United States for all those articles which they export there so largely, they would have just so much more for them as the duty paid for getting them in there amount to. We might take up many other lines of our exports and the same rule would apply for all. I find that we exported \$3,000,000 worth of fish to the United States last year and we paid on that fish no less than \$524,000 duty. Will any man say that if that duty of 20 per cent. was taken off the fish going into the United States, our fishermen all over the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland would not benefit largely by a policy which will admit their fish into the United States free of duty. The annual production of fish in the United States is so much larger than what we export there, that the same argument would apply, and the quantity we might send would not reduce the price one *iota*, but every dollar of it would go into the pockets of the fishermen of this country. Then, this policy would largely increase the prosperity of the miners of this country, and develop to a wonderful extent the mineral resources of this Dominion. When Sir Charles Tupper made his Budget speech two years ago, when he introduced the tariff on iron, he spoke in eloquent terms of the great mineral wealth of this Dominion—of the illimitable mines of phosphates, and of coal, and iron ore from which the very best quality of iron could be produced. He stated that we had in Nova Scotia what was not possessed by any other country in the world—almost illimitable mines of coal and iron and all the necessary materials for producing the very finest grades of iron, lying right alongside of one another; and they were on the line of railways which connect with every portion of this vast Dominion, and near the sea coast where they could have access to all parts of the world. Yet, strange to say, although we have all these resources and facilities, what has been the result of the imposition of those iron duties? They have not developed the iron mines of this country. The Londonderry Iron and Steel Works, although they were started a few years ago under the most favorable auspices, and although their coal and iron were carried over the Intercolonial Railway at a dead loss to the people of this Dominion, yet with all those advantages they have failed over and over again. Thousands and millions of dollars of capital have been sunk in those works, until the introduction of the heavy iron duties imposed two years ago, and the infusion of more capital into the concern, I believe, have enabled it to carry on its work; but for many long years it has been a dismal failure. The reason is simply this, and it must be apparent to any hon. gentleman in this House, that the company have not got a market for their goods. They have all the facilities and all the advantages that any company ought to have, and they ought to do an immense trade and send their goods all over the world; and if this measure of unrestricted reciprocity were brought about, it would be one of the greatest blessings to the miners of Nova Scotia which possibly could be brought about. Why, Sir, the exports of our mines last year amounted to \$3,341,000, consisting largely of coal, iron and copper. Of coal, we exported 427,000 tons to the United States, paying a duty of \$318,000. It is strange that while we export to the United States no less than 427,000 tons of coal, principally from British Columbia, we are at the same time importing a much greater amount from the United States. Now, if unrestricted reciprocity were introduced, a great development in the mines of this country would immediately take place. Notwithstanding our vast deposits of iron and copper ore all through the Lake Superior region, we find that while there is great activity in the development of the mines on the south side of the lake, on the north side I am sorry to say there is idleness and desolation. The reason of this is plain, because it will not pay to invest millions of

dollars to develop those mines, to construct lines of railway and smelting works, so long as there is not a market to which the product can be sent. But once you break down the wall, and open the markets of Boston, New York, and all the great centres in the Eastern States, a great development would immediately take place. Then, so far as our lumbermen are concerned, I think it would be of great advantage to them if the duty on lumber were removed. Now, Sir, I find that of the products of the forest we sold last year to the United States \$10,622,000 worth, and only \$8,932,000 worth to England. This shows again that the best market for the lumber of this country is in the United States. Our lumber export consists principally of planks, boards, joists, hardwood lumber, deals, and various other kinds. Our exports of planks, boards and joists were 508,304,100 feet, on which we paid a duty of \$1,016,608. Will any man say that if this duty were removed, if the walls were thrown down, the lumbermen of this country would not get that much more for their lumber? And you must remember this fact, that of the products of the forests there is only a small proportion that can be exported to the United States. It does not pay to pay a duty of \$2 a thousand on second-class lumber; consequently it has to be sacrificed, and it is only the best cuts which it will pay to send to the United States at all. Now, if this duty were removed and the market made free, the whole product would go, and the value of our vast resources of timber would be greatly enhanced. Now, I think it must be apparent to any one that the farmers, the miners, the fishermen and the lumbermen would be largely benefited by the adoption of this policy. But there is another class that we have to consider, that is the manufacturers of this Dominion. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that the adoption of this policy would simply wipe out our manufacturing industries—that our manufacturers would have to go to the wall. Well, I would be very sorry indeed to support a measure that would wipe out the manufacturing industries of this country. I am glad to know that we have manufacturing industries which are a great advantage to the country; they are developing its resources, and they are building up and making this the great nation which we all desire to see. But instead of this policy being injurious to the manufacturers of this country, I claim it would be greatly to their advantage. Why, the milling industry of this Dominion, which is by far perhaps the largest and most important in the Dominion to-day, an industry that employs a capital of about \$20,000,000 and gives employment in various ways to millers and packers, bakers and coopers all over the land to the amount of nearly 8,000 or 9,000 men, would receive such an impetus by the adoption of this policy, that before very long their prosperity and number would be greatly increased, and we would actually supply the Eastern and New England States with all the flour they want. Let me say one word as to the policy of the Government with regard to the milling industry. This Government has acted in a most shameful way towards the millers. Anybody can start any kind of manufactory in this Dominion; he may start making mosquito nets or fly traps, or any little thing of that sort, and down comes the Government and gives him from 35 to 40 per cent. protection. But here is a great industry, the very backbone of the Dominion, and how does the Government treat it? The Government do not even put the millers on a plane with the American miller. They do not treat them as they do the cotton and woollen and other manufacturers. The moment the cotton manufacturer engages in business he is allowed his raw material in free, and has a protection of 35 to 50 per cent. on his manufactured goods. The woollen manufacturer and other manufacturers are protected in a similar way, but the milling industry is actually discriminated against in favor of the millers of the United States. There is 22 cents a

barrel more duty on the raw material than on the manufactured goods, and although this anomaly has been pointed out over and over again, although hon. gentlemen on both sides say it is wrong and should be remedied, and although I have heard members of the Government admit it was wrong, yet no steps are taken to remedy it, and the wrong consequently remains unredressed. Let us take up another branch of manufacturing industry. Take our cotton manufacturers. Is there any possible reason why the cotton manufacturers of this country should not be able to compete with those of the United States or elsewhere? They have all the skilled labor they want, they have the best machinery they require, they have all the facilities for carrying on their business economically and successfully, and why should they not be able to compete with the Americans? Take the cotton mills of Cornwall or Dundas? They have the best of water power, every facility in the way of shipping, all the skilled labor they require, and the very best machinery. They can get their raw cotton from the south at about the same figure, or even cheaper than the cotton manufacturers of the United States can, and why should they not be able to compete with the latter? They can, but here is the trouble: On account of our limited market, on account of our being only 5,000,000 people all told in this Dominion, these manufacturers must take up several different lines, while in the United States the manufacturers can confine their efforts to one article. The Americans take up one, or at the most two specialties, and devote all their energies, and time, and attention to those, and consequently they can reduce the cost down to the lowest possible figure. They have 60,000,000 of people to sell to; but what would become of the manufacturer in this country if he took up one specialty only, when he has but 5,000,000 people to sell to? He is forced to take up a good many different lines. A gentleman who is largely engaged in manufacturing paper told me that his firm had to take up 16 or 20 different lines, but that if unrestricted reciprocity were introduced, they would at once devote all their time and attention to one or two specialties, and by that means be able to reduce the cost down to the lowest possible figure, and compete successfully with the manufacturers in the United States. The moment this measure would be brought about, our manufacturers, having this wide and extended market to cater for, would be at once able to devote their attention to one or two specialties and compete with the manufacturers in the United States. All we want is fair field and no favor. I might apply the same remarks to our woollen manufacturers. I see no possible reason why they should not be able to compete with those of the United States, and I believe they would be able if they were only allowed free access to the American market. Take another trade which would be largely developed by the introduction of unrestricted reciprocity—the trade of sashes and doors, and woodwork of every kind. That trade would be considerably benefited. Mention has been made in reference to waggons and buggies going to the North-West. I happen to know something about this trade. I know that in the town of Chatham, Kent County, we have one of the largest, perhaps the largest, manufactories in Canada. They are making there one of the very best waggons made in this Dominion and one of the cheapest. They have all the facilities for carrying on an extensive trade. They have the very best machinery, the very best and cheapest skilled labor, and, I believe, are able to turn out waggons as cheaply as they can possibly be turned out. But the factory, with all these advantages, is only running not over six months probably in the year. The rest of the year the mechanics are discharged, and have to find work wherever they can. I claim that as soon as these walls are thrown down and unrestricted reciprocity introduced, not only this waggon factory but every waggon factory in Canada would be running full time, and instead

of turning out, as they do in Chatham, 3,000 waggons, they would turn out probably 10,000 waggons before two years have passed. There is in the State of New York, within a stone's throw of the factory, more people than we have in the whole Dominion, and almost within stone's throw of the factory is the line of railway which permeates all parts of the country. Our Chatham manufacturers could lay down their waggons in New York, and sell them below the price they are sold for there. I believe they have sent one or two carloads of waggons to the State of Maine and paid the duty on them. A gentleman who has the contract to build the Short Line—I do not know but what it was the Short Line we have heard so much about—had a contract there, and found he could buy the waggons or the carts in the town of Chatham, and take them there more cheaply than they could be got there. I believe that, the moment the wall was thrown down, our waggons and our buggies will have an increased sale, and the factories would employ many more men than they are employing to-day. There is an objection which has been taken to this resolution, and I think it is the only tenable objection which has been taken to it, but I do not think, when you examine it, that it amounts to very much. It has been represented that, if this resolution were adopted, we would lose a large amount of revenue—I think some \$7,000,000—on imports from the United States, and therefore we would have to resort to direct taxation. Any person who considers this question for a moment need have no fear on that account. If you put an Act upon the Statute-book which will increase the prosperity of the people of the Dominion, which will put more money into their pockets by millions of dollars, you need not be alarmed about a few million dollars of revenue. I believe, you will get more revenue than will be required, and anyone who looks at the enormous increases that have taken place in the expenditure of the Government of this country in the last few years, must be struck with alarm at the rapidly increasing expenditures which are thrown on the people of this Dominion. I will give a few items. The interest on our public debt in 1877-78 only amounted to \$7,048,883, but it increased in ten years by \$2,774,000. Then, the Administration of Justice, which in 1877-78 cost only \$564,000, last year cost no less than \$678,000, or an increase of \$113,000 in ten years. In this connection, let me say that I am sorry to see the resolution which the Minister of Justice has placed upon the Order Paper. I see that, by that resolution, he proposes to add \$2,000,000 to the debt of this country. He proposes to add \$71,000 a year for all time to come to the expenses of the Administration of Justice. A more iniquitous, a more diabolical measure, I believe, was never introduced into this House. Not a single argument can be advanced in its favor. The hon. gentleman proposes to increase the salaries of the judges, to add \$1,000 a year to the salaries of men who are getting \$5,000 and \$6,000 a year, besides an allowance of \$1,000 and \$1,500 a year for travelling and other expenses. It is a perfect shame for the Government to bring down a measure to saddle \$71,000 a year more on the people of this country; and that amount is to go into the pockets of men who are now getting large salaries. A salary of \$5,000 or \$6,000 is a large amount. I have heard men in this House abuse the Government because the civil servants are getting, some of them, salaries of \$2,500 and 3,000 a year, and yet they propose to give the judges \$1,000 more than they are getting; whereas the civil servants give value for their money, they work all the day during every day of the year, they are doing their duty, and they do it honestly and fairly; but I do not believe that one of the judges in this country is overworked, not one of them does as much in a month as an ordinary man does in a week. Take the salaries of our bankers and our business men throughout the country, and you will find that there is no comparison between their salaries and the salaries

Mr. CAMPBELL.

of the judges. I say it is a perfect shame that the Government should come down and propose to saddle upon the country the additional charge of \$71,000 for the increase in the salaries of judges. What will be the effect of this? Next year you will have an application from the County Court Judges asking why they should not have another \$1,000 as well as the Superior Court Judges. The Government of the day, having established the precedent and laid down the principle, cannot go back upon it, and probably the expenses of the country will be increased enormously next year by increasing the salaries of the County Court Judges. I hope the Government will carefully consider this matter, and that before the Bill is carried an earnest protest will be entered—at all events from this side of the House—against the proposition. There are a few other items to which I desire to refer in which the expenses of this country have increased enormously during the past few years. In 1877-78, immigration cost \$154,351; last year that ran up to \$244,789, an increase of over \$90,000 in ten years. What was the result? I need not go over the figures, because they have been stated here so often; but if you look at the result in the North-West and all that we have spent, the millions of dollars that have been spent for immigration to the North-West, the census returns show that a large proportion of the immigrants who were said to be settled in the North-West must have gone to another country. I think the policy of the Government in spending \$240,000 or more in promoting immigration should be put a stop to. I do not believe in taking the money of the people of this Dominion, the mechanics and the artisans of this Dominion, and using it to bring out competitors with them in the labor market of this country; and, if anything in the expenditure of the Government should be cut down altogether, it is this abominable system of immigration. I do not think the money is spent as it ought to be at all or in the public service. Then, there is another item which has largely increased, and that is the item of Militia and Defence. In 1877-78, that cost us \$618,000; last year it ran up to \$1,273,000; that is an increase in ten years of more than 100 per cent., or of \$655,000. I do not believe that all this money is necessary in order to carry on that department. I believe, without bringing any charges, and it is not my duty to bring any abusive charges against any particular department, that the policy is wrong, and that there is no need to spend so much. Then, take the Mounted Police in the North-West, which in 1877-78 cost \$334,000, and last year cost \$862,000, an increase of \$528,000 in ten years. Civil Government: 1877-78 cost \$823,369; 1887-88, \$1,258,618; increase in ten years, \$435,249. Fisheries: 1877-78 cost \$93,262; 1887-88, \$416,182; increase, \$322,920. Indians: 1877-78, cost \$421,503; 1887-88, \$1,000,802; increase, \$579,299. Legislation: 1877-78 cost \$618,035; 1887-88, \$807,424; increase, \$189,389. Miscellaneous: 1877-78 cost \$81,167; 1887-88, \$464,448; increase, \$383,281. Total expenditure, for all purposes: 1877-78, \$23,503,158; 1887-88, \$36,718,494; increase, \$13,215,336. Let me say a word about superannuation. Superannuation cost us in 1877-78, \$106,000, last year it cost us \$212,000, doubling in the last ten years. Now, I think this is a system that ought to be put a stop to. I think the time has come when this Parliament should put its foot down upon this system of superannuating officials. If our officials are not getting salaries enough to enable them to keep themselves, support their families, and lay by something for old age, then, I say give them an increase of salary. But this system of taking money out of the pockets of the people to provide for retired officers is entirely wrong. When this system was first brought into force it was supposed and also proposed that the receipts from the Civil Service would be able to meet the requirements of this fund, but from year to year the expenses have increased and the receipts have not increased in proportion. Then

again, if this system as it was at first inaugurated, and if it was carried out as it was intended, to provide for men who had grown old in the public service who become disabled in serving their country and allowing them to make some provision for their old age, it would not be so bad; but when we know that men in the prime of life, active, stirring, enterprising men, are quietly superannuated, and needy supporters of the Government are placed in their situations, I say that the system is one that cannot be defended on any ground. Let me give you one instance that occurs to me just now. Mr. Alexander McNab, who was Superintendent of Government Railways in Prince Edward Island, a man receiving a salary of \$3,400 a year, only forty-five years of age, a young man in the prime of life, a man who for many long years was able to perform all the duties devolving upon him, his position was required by a needy supporter of the Government he was superannuated, he went to Chicago and obtained a lucrative position there, and he is drawing, and will continue to draw for the rest of his days, no less than \$1,700 out of the pockets of the people of this Dominion. Now, this system is wrong, and, as I said before, if these men do not get enough, let us increase their salaries. Now, Sir, let me say, in conclusion, that I believe that this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, if it can be obtained, will confer the greatest possible benefits upon the people of this Dominion, that it will build up the various industries of the farmers, the fishermen and the lumbermen in this country, and believing all this, I shall give it my hearty support. I believe that if the Government of the day were prompt and would take this matter up in earnest, as they ought to take it up, in the interests of the people of this Dominion, I think there never was a time in the history of this country more opportune for doing so than the present. We were told last year that we could not get it any way, and what was the use in trying? Well, Sir, you never will get it unless you try; and the fact that the American Congress have passed that resolution that has been mentioned, shows clearly to my mind, at all events, that they are ready to negotiate in this matter. They have taken the first step towards a conference, they have held out the olive branch to us, and in the interests of Canada we ought to meet them in the same spirit. There surely can be no objection to that, there can be no possible objection to passing the resolution that is proposed, and conferring with the people of the United States; we are not bound to accept what they propose, we need not accept anything unless it suits the interests of the people of this Dominion, unless it will make our people more prosperous, content and happy. What possible objection can there be in meeting them half way, to conferring with them and asking them upon what terms they propose to meet us? Believing, as I do, that this measure is one that ought to be adopted, that it is the bounden duty of the Government, now above all other times, to meet the American people upon even terms, and confer with them, I shall support this measure. Sir, with unrestricted reciprocity nailed to the mast, I look forward in the near future and see this Canada of ours making vast strides forward, to see the vast prairies of the North-West, the hills and valleys of the East filled with an intelligent and progressive people, one in sympathy and action, the inheritors and possessors of the same institutions, the noblest, the freest and the brightest development of mankind.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

### HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Act relating to the House of Commons. He said: The object of the Bill is to provide for the manner in which cheques shall be drawn for the amounts which are placed to the credit of the Internal Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to amend the law respecting the Exchequer Court. He said: The object of the Bill is to make further provision in reference to enquiries made by the court, and to regulate the rule-making power of the Exchequer Court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### DEPARTMENTAL REORGANISATION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) to repeal the following Acts:—

An Act respecting the Department of Trade and Commerce, 50-51 Victoria, chapter 10;

An Act respecting the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue, 50-51 Victoria, chapter 11; and

An Act to make provision for the appointment of a Solicitor General, 50-51 Victoria, chapter 14; and for other purposes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Explain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice asks me to explain. I think he was a member of the House when these Acts were placed upon the Statute-book. Some of us on this side objected to them at that time, and they have now been on the Statute-book for nearly two years, and no action has been taken by the Government in relation to them. The Government said it was important that these departments of the public service should be reorganised, that some of them should be made less important than they are now, and they stated that it was necessary that another law officer should be appointed. We were assured that the Minister of Justice and Attorney General was not equal to the discharge of the duties that pertained to the law department of the Administration. Now, the hon. gentleman has been two years since that period in charge of that department, and the Government, who are responsible for introducing these measures into the House and carrying them through Parliament, has taken no action upon them. Nothing has been done to put these measures into operation. It was said also at the time that it was very desirable to introduce the system of Under Secretaries that existed in England. But there was not the remotest resemblance between these measures and the organisation of the departments in England. We all know that in the Executive Government in England each department has a subordinate as well as a chief, who has a seat in one or the other Houses of Parliament, and every department of Government is represented in both Houses. But there was nothing approaching to that system in the



policy of these measures; the Government, so far as the two Houses are concerned, would stand exactly in the same position in which they are to-day. It is true that, either for the purpose of getting rid of a colleague, or for some other purpose, the hon. gentleman proposed to abolish the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue as they now exist, and to make these two Ministers subordinate officers in a Department of Trade and Commerce. Well, Sir, I have no objection to the appointment of a Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think it is very well that such an officer should exist, and it seems to me that the natural and appropriate thing to do is to make the Minister of Customs a Minister of Trade and Commerce. There will be no additional charge upon the public if such a policy is adopted, and it is consistent with the line of duties that that Minister has now to discharge. It is perfectly clear that it was for party convenience that these measures were put upon the Statute-book. The hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government has never found the party exigencies, up to this moment, to compel him to advise His Excellency to bring these measures into operation, and so they have remained a dead letter upon the Statute-book. I have heard the hon. gentleman, several times since I have been in Parliament, say that it was better that a measure should not exist at all than that it should remain inoperative upon the Statute-book. These measures have been upon the Statute-book for two years, they are still inoperative, and certainly it looks very much like an attempt on the part of the Minister of the Interior for the time being, to make Parliament a mere register of the wishes of the Administration. Here we have three departments that the Government have proposed to alter or to amend, and to have new officers appointed, and they take that power on the ground that it was urgent in the public interest that changes should be made. It will be two years on the 23rd June next since these measures became law, and no action has yet been taken. Those of us who thought that the proposed changes were not in the public interest, have had our views vindicated by the conduct of the Administration since. Surely if the hon. gentleman believed it necessary, as his supporters, at all events, believed, that the Department of Justice should be strengthened in the way he proposed, it was as proper to appoint that officer the moment that the power was obtained creating the office of Solicitor General as it would be at this moment. The fact that the hon. gentleman has got on without this subordinate officer, for two years since the measure was passed, is an evidence that that officer was not required, and that the hon. gentleman who is now the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, is adequate to the discharge of the duties of legal adviser of the Administration. The hon. gentleman also said at that time that it was very important that offices of a subordinate degree should be created for the purpose of introducing new and inexperienced men of talent into the Administration, and to give them a sort of training as apprentices before they attempted to perform the duties of the more important offices which other of his colleagues are called upon to fill. Well, I pointed out at the time, and I have seen no reason to change my opinion, that while a system like that might work very well in England where society is segregated into orders, and where the sons of noble men are introduced at an early period of life into Parliament, and put in possession of office with a view to giving them the experience and training that is supposed necessary to qualify them for public life, such a policy and such a course are altogether unsuited to the democratic character of this country. The hon. gentleman has sitting around him able men who have never been in office at all, and who certainly could not, without a serious loss, abandon their private business to accept any such office as that which he proposed to create; and it does seem to me that the fact that these three measures to which I have referred have

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

been upon the Statute-book for nearly two years, and that no action has taken place, shows that there was no necessity for them, and that they ought to be repealed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I do not think I can be induced to enter into a discussion of this nature on the first reading of the Bill, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman. I have not seen it yet, but when the Bill is printed and stands for its second reading, we will be ready to discuss the matter with my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

Mr. SKINNER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to amend chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: "An Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons." He said: The effect of the Bill, if passed into law, would be to allow members to be absent from the House for not more than 30 days during the Session, without any deduction being made for the sessional allowance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY.

Mr. LISTER, in the absence of Mr. BARRON, asked, Has the Government sold Fitzwilliam or Horse Island in Georgian Bay? If so, when, and to whom? What was the extent of the island in area and pine timber at time of sale? What was the price paid for the island? Under what authority or right did the Government of Canada claim the right to sell the island?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Fitzwilliam or Horse Island was sold to Joseph Cozins on the 1st June, 1882, for \$2,000, on the approval of Mr. Phipps, the Government agent, made in February, 1882. The area of the island is about 12,000 acres; the quantity of pine, large and small, estimated at 500,000 ft. board measure. The lumber sold at \$500. The Government had the right to sell the island under the Manitoulin Treaty of 1862.

#### ST. BEATRIX, JOLIETTE, POST OFFICE.

Mr. NEVEU asked, Whether the Government intend to grant the request of Mr. H. Ladouceur, and others, asking that the post office of St. Beatrix, in the county of Joliette, be transferred from its present location to the house of Hormidas Ladouceur, the latter being more central?

Mr. HAGGART. The application made on 1st March inst. was sent to the Post Office Inspector for enquiry and report.

#### SEED WHEAT, MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE asked, Whether the Government are willing to accept from those settlers in Manitoba who are still owing for seed wheat, &c., advanced to them in 1876, the payment of the amount due by them, without interest, and upon such payment, to discharge the mortgages held against their respective real estate?

Mr. CARLING. This question is now receiving the attention of the Government.

#### LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE.

Mr. KIRK asked, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a post office at Little Dover, in the county of Guysboro', and connect it by a weekly mail service with Canso, as petitioned for?

Mr. HAGGART. The application has been referred to the Post Office Inspector at Halifax for inquiry and report.

## OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. KIRK asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. Mark Hadley to the vacant postmastership of Oyster Ponds, in the county of Guysboro', as petitioned for?

Mr. HAGGART. The question of making an appointment to the postmastership of Oyster Ponds is under the consideration of the Government.

## LUNENBURG POST OFFICE.

Mr. EISENHAEUER asked, Whether any repairs were done to the post office at Lunenburg during the year 1888; if so, what did they consist of, what was the cost, who did the work, what was the amount paid, and to whom paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no post office building at Lunenburg, as the hon. gentleman knows. The Government purchased a site in May, 1887, and on 31st September, 1887, \$53.27, for legal expenses in connection with the purchase of the site, was paid to Mr. Wallace Graham.

## SAWDUST IN CANADIAN RIVERS.

Mr. EISENHAEUER asked, Were any fines imposed during the years 1887 and 1888 for violation of the law prohibiting the throwing of sawdust into the rivers of the Dominion; if so, what are the names and residences of the parties so fined, the amount of each fine, and whether all or any of such fines have been paid, and dates of payment?

Mr. TUPPER. There were fines imposed by the Government in 1887-88 for violation of the law in regard to throwing sawdust in the rivers of the Dominion. In regard to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, as an answer would involve considerable research, I would ask the hon. gentleman to give notice of motion in the regular way, and then the information will be brought down in a return.

## OVERFLOW OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (translation) asked: Whether it is the intention of the Government to submit to Parliament, during this Session, such measures as will prevent the destruction caused by the periodical overflow of the St. Lawrence at Montreal, and in the surrounding counties?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I may state that it is not the intention of the Government.

## ST. BARTHELEMY STATION POST OFFICE.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to accede to the request of the inhabitants of the parish of St. Barthelemy, county of Berthier, and to establish a post office at or near to St. Barthelemy Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway; and if so, when?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not at present the intention of the Government to establish a post office at St. Barthelemy Station.

## ST. CLAIR RAPIDS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has the work of dredging on the St. Clair Rapids, at Point Edward, been completed? If not, is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work during the coming season.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work of deepening the St. Clair Rapids at Point Edward has not been completed. To complete it would cost \$10,000 additional. The Gov-

ernment have not yet decided what they will do in regard to the work during the coming season.

## CARRIAGE OF CANADIAN FREIGHT.

On the Order, for Select Committee to enquire into and report upon the amount of tonnage and kind of freight, during the year 1887, going to or from Canada, and passing through the United States in bond, its destination and place of shipment, both as to exports and imports, and what changes or improvements are necessary to be made to make it *advantageous to shippers* and importers to have such freight carried by lines of transit wholly through Canadian territory and received at or shipped from Canadian ports.—(Mr. Ives.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this motion should either be dropped or proceeded with. It has been on the paper six weeks, and that is a long time for it to remain without being proceeded with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Ives has been away a good deal, for reasons which no doubt the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he will continue to be away when the motion is likely to be reached.

Mr. CASEY. The understanding is that motions are not allowed to stand, unless at the request of the Government and for reasons of state. Unless the Government ask particularly to have this motion stand, and give some reasons for their request, we must insist upon the motion being dropped. Mr. Ives has been here to-day, and he should not have left the Chamber. This is a very important matter, and it is not fair to other hon. members that the motion should remain on the paper and have precedence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will do no harm to any member, and the Government asks that it be allowed to stand.

## MANUFACTURERS' INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. LISTER moved for:

Correspondence between the Manufacturers' Insurance Company and the Superintendent of Insurance respecting the list of stockholders of said company furnished by the said company in accordance with the statute in that behalf.

He said: It requires no excuse for any member of this House to bring a matter before the attention of the House so deeply affecting the interests of the general public of this Dominion, as a question affecting the life insurance companies of Canada. I am induced to bring this matter before the House on account of what, to my mind, seems to be great irregularities on the part of the officers of that company in making returns to the Government, as the law requires. I know nothing of the financial position of the company, nor do I care particularly anything about that, but what concerns this House and the country is, that a law passed by Parliament as a protection to policy-holders in the life insurance companies of this country should be observed by the officers of the companies, in order that the policy-holders should have the fullest possible protection. When I state that, at the end of 1887, as shown by the last return I have been able to obtain, the total amount of life insurance in the Dominion amounted to \$191,694,000, and to-day is probably over \$200,000,000, hon. gentlemen will understand how important the question is. The Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company is a company incorporated by this Parliament. It is a Canadian company, and under the statute in force in Canada relating to this and other companies, the law requires that a return should be made by the president, vice-president,

manager or secretary-treasurer, giving a list of the stockholders, the amount of stock subscribed, and the amount paid upon that stock. Section 19, chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes of Canada says :

"The president, vice-president, or managing-director, and the secretary or manager of every Canadian company licensed under this Act, shall prepare annually, under their own oath, and cause to be deposited in the Department of Finance, a statement of the condition of affairs of such company at the usual balancing day of the company, in the preceding year, which statement shall exhibit the assets and liability of the company, and its income and expenditure during the previous year, and such other information as is deemed necessary by the Minister."

And schedule "A" of that Act requires that a return shall be made, and that—

"That return shall contain the names of the shareholders and the amount paid by the shareholders on account of their stock, and shall be under the oath of the officers of the company."

Now, Sir, as I said, the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, incorporated by the laws of this country, has made returns to the Superintendent of Insurance, setting forth that certain gentlemen were, at the date of that return, stockholders in this insurance company, and that certain other gentlemen were holding other offices. We find that in the prospectus of this company, issued when they started business, that the actuary of the company is Professor Loudon, professor of mathematics at the Toronto University. I understand that Professor Loudon has no information that he was ever appointed to that important office by the company. I find, Sir, further, that the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company issued a small pamphlet giving the names of the officers and the heads of this company, and I find that Sir Alexander Campbell, K.C.M.G., Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, is named as vice-president of this company, and that the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald is the president of the company. I find that in an application for a policy in that company it is endorsed with the name of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B., as president, and Sir Alexander Campbell, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, is put down as vice-president. I find furthermore that in the *Canadian Sportsman* of date February 1st, 1889, the advertisement of the company sets forth that Sir Alexander Campbell is vice-president of the company, and looking over the returns up to date, which I have mentioned, I find that Sir Alexander Campbell's name appears upon the last sworn return made by the officers as a stockholder, and as having paid \$2,000 on account of the \$10,000 stock which he owns; that is, 20 per cent. on his total stock. Now, Sir, I find that on the 24th day of September last past, a letter appeared in the *Toronto World* of that date, to this effect:

"Editor *World*.

"With reference to the paragraph in your paper of this day's date, about the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, I am requested by Sir Alexander Campbell to say that he is not, and never was, connected with this company, either as vice-president or otherwise, and that the use made by his name in this respect was altogether a mistake. May I ask the favor of your publishing this correction?"

"JAMES MACLENNAN.

"TORONTO, September 22nd, 1888."

I stated, when I brought this matter to the attention of the House, that I knew nothing about the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, so far as its business is concerned, but it has been brought to my attention that the returns made by the company are not true returns, if we are to believe the letter of Mr. James Maclellan, the solicitor of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. If it is true that the manager, or secretary, or president, or other officer of this company has made a return to this Government falsely stating that a gentleman occupying a prominent official position in this country is a stockholder in this company, when in fact he is not a stockholder, then to a certain extent a fraud has been committed on the country and it becomes the duty of the Government to investigate the matter. It is not for me to complain or to say anything about the First Minister of the Government occupying a position as president of a commercial institution, further than this, that when we remember that the official whose duty it is to investigate and watch, in the interests of the public, the working of those insurance companies is a servant of the Government of the day, controlled by the First Minister, and we can readily understand how it might be possible that something more than errors might creep into the matter of the administration so far as he is concerned, of the insurance companies of the country. It is to my mind a dangerous precedent that the First Minister of the Government of this country should allow his name to be used by any commercial corporation. Having brought the matter before the attention of Parliament, I have discharged what I conceive to be a duty. If it is true that such is the case, if it is true that false returns have been made to the Government, then, I apprehend it is the duty of the Government to investigate these returns, and to see how far the matter has gone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure the House must be obliged to the hon. gentleman, as I am, for bringing up this matter. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that supervision should be taken with respect to all companies of this kind who come forward to claim the confidence of the people of the country. I will not enter into a discussion as to whether I, as a member of the Government, have committed any impropriety in becoming a director, or even president, of a commercial company. I have done so, and am quite willing to bear the responsibility of that fact. All I can say is that the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company has got a proprietary and a board of direction for wealth, respectability and standing not second to those of any company in Canada; and in saying that I do not include myself. My standing is political, not financial; but I speak with respect to the board as a whole, and any hon. gentleman from Toronto who takes the trouble to look over the list of directors will see what a respectable and wealthy body they are. The particulars of the alleged irregularities I cannot speak to. I was not aware, indeed, what the object of the hon. gentleman was in moving for these papers. The papers will be brought down at once, and it will then be seen whether there are any irregularities which will at all affect the standing of the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company. At present the company holds a very high position, and is doing a very large and very profitable business; and unless hon. gentlemen see some flagrant irregularities in their system, I hope, when my hon. friend opposite takes my place, I may find another sphere of usefulness as president of the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman has, no doubt, the right to take advantage of my hon. friend's motion for the purpose of saying a good word for his company, and testifying to the wealth and respectability of the officials and the directorate generally. But my hon. friend's complaint is just this: that the published statements as to who were officials and stockholders in this company, are contradicted in one very important instance, that of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, by that hon. gentleman's solicitor, who says he is not connected with the company. I think my hon. friend is justified in making this enquiry, and pointing out that the Government should look sharply after this company, to see that it makes no false representations as to who are officials and stockholders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. First Minister must consider the statement made by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) as a very serious one, that in sending in a return a deliberate false return was made, and that my hon. friend's statement was, *prima facie*, confirmed by a published letter from Mr. Maclellan, acting as solicitor for Sir Alexander Campbell. That, it seems to me, would come within the region of the grossest fraud, and I

Mr. LISTER.

would have expected the hon. First Minister to say that, whether these papers were brought down or not, he would cause the Superintendent of Insurance, who is appointed specially for that purpose, to investigate the correctness of such a statement. If I understand aright the letter read by the hon. member for Lambton, it stated most explicitly that Sir Alexander Campbell never was connected with this company as vice-president or otherwise. That, I presume, must be interpreted to mean that he had never subscribed stock and had never paid the \$2,000 which appears credited to him. Now, for a company to send in a deliberate statement of that kind, if it is not true, is a fraud, and a very serious fraud. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that his directorate is a good one, and that the names of the men who appear in the list of stockholders may be very good; I dare say that is the case; but does he not see that the country at large depends very considerably upon the published list of stockholders as an index of the respectability of a company? And if it be true, in so prominent a case as this, that men's names have been put down without their consent, and large sums reported to have been paid by them, that amounts to a very gross offence indeed on the part of the officers of the company. I do not for one moment suppose that the hon. gentleman was in any way privy to such a thing as that; I would not imagine that; it would have been the act of a born idiot, which the hon. gentleman most assuredly is not; but if the statement is at all correct, somebody has committed what I think the hon. Minister himself would designate, as I do, a gross fraud, which should be investigated by the proper officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if any improprieties—fraud is a very strong word—have been committed by the officers of this company, the Superintendent of Insurance should investigate it. Some of the facts the hon. gentleman has mentioned have reached my ears for the first time. With respect to Sir Alexander Campbell, I had heard—though I never knew of that letter before—that there was a misapprehension in his case. What extent it was, or how it happened, I cannot now say. Therefore, I will reserve anything I have to say until the papers are brought down. I have not seen the papers myself; they will be brought down at once, and I, on behalf of the company, will have an immediate investigation.

Mr. CASEY. Is Sir Alexander Campbell vice-president now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. LISTER. The last return, in the sessional papers of 1888, page 385, states:

"Sir Alexander Campbell, Toronto, \$10,000; amount paid up, \$2,000."

Motion agreed to.

#### TENDERS FOR CANAL WORKS.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Return showing—

1. Statement of cases in which all or any of the tenders called for and received for any work in connection with canals, within five years, were rejected on the report of the Chief Engineer of Canals, giving names of tenderers and gross amount of each tender; with copies of all such reports of the Chief Engineer, giving reasons for such rejection, and noting the cases in which new tenders were called for.

2. In cases where new tenders were called for, a statement of names of tenderers and gross amount of each tender, noting which tender was accepted, and giving copies of any reports or other reasons for the rejection of lower tenders, if any.

3. Statement of cases in which claims for extras have arisen under any contract entered into in pursuance of any such accepted tender, and have been referred to the sole arbitration of the Chief Engineer of Canals, showing amounts paid to claimants under his award, and a detailed statement of costs paid by the Government, or other parties to the suit, in connection with the arbitration in each case, and to whom paid.

He said: My reasons for moving this resolution are very simple. I understand, and I think it is pretty well known,

that in more than one case in which tenders have been called for for public works, the engineer has reported that these tenders were below the figure at which the work could reasonably be expected to be executed, and for that reason all the tenders have been thrown out, and in some cases new tenders have been called for, and the work has been gone on with under one of those new tenders. In every case the new tenders, so far as I know, have been considerably in excess of the former ones. When the first tenders were stated to be too low, the contractors would naturally tender at higher prices, and in cases arising under contracts of all sorts in the department to which my motion has reference, any claims for extras have been referred to the sole arbitration of the chief engineer of the department, and he has received, I am informed, very large sums as arbitrator in these cases; having been sometimes paid by the Government and sometimes by other parties to the suit, according to the way in which it turned out. As a rule, I suppose, if the Government lost the case, they would have to pay the costs, and if the contractors lost it, they would have to pay the costs. I do not know what the rule has been, or who has paid these costs, but, at all events, it is quite certain that the chief engineer of this department has received very large sums, over and above his salary, for arbitrating in these matters—sums amounting to thousands of dollars a year. I cannot give the exact amounts, because I do not find them in the Public Accounts, and I do not know of any way of finding out how much he has been paid by the contractors, who may have had to pay the costs of the suits, and consequently have had to pay the arbitrator. I think the whole system is a very rotten one. The principle of throwing out tenders because they are all too low, is a bad one. If a man puts in a tender, and puts in sufficient security to satisfy the Government, he is responsible and liable for any damages that may accrue from his not carrying out the work; and the Government ought to accept his tender, even though the engineer says it is too low. Instead of that, it has been the custom to throw out at times whole batches of tenders, on the ground that they were not sufficiently high, and to call for new tenders, and then let the work at increased figures. Then, despite that, there are claims for extras, which are referred to the sole arbitration of the engineer in chief, Mr. Page, who, after sitting some days or weeks in determining the matter, has been paid either by the Government or the contractors. The system offers a premium to the engineer. I do not say that the gentleman in charge of that position is liable to corrupt influences, but this system offers a premium to whoever may be engineer of the department to see that extras are claimed, and an arbitration had, so that he may have a nice little job that will give him \$2,000 or \$3,000 in addition to his salary. It has been for some time the theory of the Administration here that a civil servant who is paid a yearly salary is paid for his whole time and has no right to any extra pay for anything he may do for the Government during that time. In spite of this theory, however, we find civil servants constantly down in the Public Accounts for large amounts in addition to their salaries, and the case I have in hand is one of them. Mr. Page has been paid large sums for extra work as arbitrator and in other capacities, and my object in moving this resolution is to find out how much he has been receiving, from whom and for what purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How far back do you wish to go?

Mr. CASEY. Say ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will not get it this session.

Mr. CASEY. I want to get the information this Session, and if the hon. gentleman will say what period of years will be covered this Session I will ask for that period.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I am obliged to furnish information to my hon. friend to prepare his motion. He has to make his own motion.

Mr. CASEY. I am asking the hon. gentleman how many years would probably be covered by a return which could be brought down this Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot tell. I do not know the number of tenders, or the number of objections or acceptances.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I will say five years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman asks for the tenders, rejected on report of the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals. It does not at all follow that the report of the chief engineer has been accepted. The tenders may have been rejected contrary to his report.

Mr. CASEY. I do not ask for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman then proceeds to ask for the reasons for such rejection. I do not think we can bring that down, and my hon. friend will see the reason. The publishing of the reasons which are contained in a confidential report from the engineer, may grievously affect the character and standing of men who would not like to have these things published, and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), when a member of the Government, must have seen a good many of these reports. The chief engineer might, in a report, feel bound to say that the tenderer was an unsatisfactory contractor, that he had failed in previous work, that he was unfit to prosecute the work successfully, or that he was financially weak, or he might bring charges more grave against him. These reports set forth candidly to the Government the reason why a party should not be employed. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is a matter of no consequence, so long as we get a good man for the work, who is appointed, and we must trust our officer to a very considerable extent as to what report he shall make. You will never get a full report on those matters, if it is to be understood that the reports are to be published. If the hon. gentleman knows of any case in which undue favoritism has been exercised, in which a respectable and capable contractor has been thrown over for favoritism, or any other cause, that would be a good ground to pass a motion, but a general motion to bring down reports on all the contracts within five years which the officers of the Government, in the conscientious performance of their duties, have made unfavorable to individuals, is asking a great deal. And it may be deeply injurious to the party whose tender has been rejected. However, we will bring down all the cases in which tenders have been rejected for the five years, and we must judge, in the interest of individuals, as well as in the interest of the public, whether we shall show the reasons for which those tenders had been rejected. I know, as a matter of experience, that men who have tendered, and whose tenders have been rejected, do not like to have reports made as to the reasons why they were rejected. They may have tendered at absurd prices, and there is no use in showing up these tenderers, unless it is in the public interest. The general return will certainly be brought down, but I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that the objection I take to the form of his motion is well founded.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman has referred to me as to my experience in the Privy Council, and I think there is a great deal in what he has stated. I think, where the reports refer to the character of the contractors, it would not be just to have them laid before the public, and it might do those contractors an injury to do so. But the Government can discriminate between such cases as that, and the information which my hon. friend is asking for. A system has grown up of late years, under which very important contracts, involving hundreds of thousands

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of dollars, have first been rejected, and then the claims have been left to the decision of an officer of the Government to make the arbitrament between the Government and the contractor. I think it is wrong in the public interest to place in the power of one individual the decision of claims involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, especially when that individual is a paid officer of the Administration. The right hon. gentleman has recently established a Court of Claims, and I believe that the proper way to settle claims between contractors and the Government, or claims for any public service rendered to the Government, would be to refer them to that Court of Claims, established as it has been for, I think, over two years or thereabouts. It is time to put a stop to references of extras and claims on contracts to an officer of the Government, no matter how much confidence the Government may have in him. It is even unfair to the officer himself to place him in such a position where he may be tempted to sacrifice the public interest for personal gain. I do not for a moment say that this has been done, but I think it is unwise and unfair to allow these references which have taken place to be made to a paid officer of the Government, and that has been done to an enormous extent in the last few years. Now the Court of Claims is established, and if it is not the policy of the Government to refer all these matters to that court, the Court of Claims is of no use and should be abolished; but I think that all claims for extras or other matters in connection with public contracts should be dealt with by that court in public, and should not be left to the decision of an officer of the Government in his own private office. I am sure the right hon. gentleman will see the force of what I say. I make no reflection upon anybody. I do not say that any wrong has been done in the past, but it has often struck me, when I have seen the large amount awarded to contractors for extras, that this placed too much power in the hands of an officer of the Government, and put before him a temptation which ought not to be placed before him, and I think the whole system should be put a stop to.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to hear what has fallen from my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), with which I perfectly agree. I desire to remove a misapprehension from the mind of the leader of the House. I am not so anxious to get at the personal reasons for the refusal of particular tenders, as I am to get at the reason for the rejection of tenders in a batch, on the ground that they were too low, and that the work could not be executed for the figure named. I do not admit the contention of the right hon. gentleman, that the reasons given by the Chief Engineer of Canals to the Government for rejecting particular tenders are private. I think the House is entitled to know for what reason any tender was rejected. I am not asking for that now, but I think we have a right to ask it, and to know whatever can be known in regard to any expenditure of public money. However, if it will relieve the hon. gentleman's scruples in this matter, I will be content to have a return in the cases where tenders have been rejected on the ground of being too low, and, if he desires it, I will amend the motion in that sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to it.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the motion may be left as it is, and after the hon. gentleman's remarks, and after what I have said, he may exercise his own responsibility as to what he brings down. What I want, particularly, is the reason for the rejection of tenders in a batch, on the ground that they were too low.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may be permitted to say a word in reference to what my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has stated in regard to the reference of these matters to a Government officer. That reference has always been made at the suggestion of the other party, and not at the suggestion of the Government. It occurs very frequently that, when there is a disputed

account, as for instance a canal case, reference is made, say, to Mr. Page. He makes his report on the claim of the contractor, and the Government say to the contractor: Well, under this report, we cannot grant you the amount of your claim, but, if you are not satisfied with our offer, you must go to the Court of Exchequer. Well, the party says: This causes delay and expense, and I will leave it to your own officer to go into the evidence. It is like two men quarelling about a matter, and they are satisfied to leave the question to the judgment of one of them or someone else. I mentioned Mr. Page's name because the hon. gentleman knows him, and we have always found that there is no danger in trusting to the award of that officer. If it is to be understood that, in every case where there is a difference of opinion between the department and the individual, it is to go to the Court of Exchequer, there is an end of it; but, in that case, the parties will be put to a very considerable expense and delay. As I have already stated, that it happens occasionally, where a contractor—knowing the fairness, the honesty and the uprightness of men like Mr. Page, or Mr. Schreiber, or Mr. Trudeau, in the different departments—says: Very well, I will leave it to your own officer; I know that if he goes into it, he will do justice. Hitherto, we have been in the habit of accepting that offer, because it shows that the contractor was confident in the justice of his claim. If, however, it is the general sense that we are to make no such reference, that it must go to the court, I do not think that the contractors, as a body, would like that change.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has just now made an illustration in applying this theory, and I may just as well follow him by putting another. He says that it is always at the instance of the contractors that reference is made to their own officer, and he has quoted Mr. Page and Mr. Schreiber. Now, as far as Mr. Page is concerned, and Mr. Schreiber, too, I believe they fairly enjoy the confidence of the community. We will take, for instance, Mr. Page, who has dealings to an enormous extent with the public contractors of this country in the construction of canals, railways and other public works. We know that when a contractor finishes work, or during the progress of the work, he gets advances upon it. When his work is completed he sends in his claim to Mr. Page, who either accepts, or rejects, or reduces that claim, and Mr. Page reports, acting on his final conviction upon the matter, that that man's claim, less \$100,000, for instance, should be allowed, or that his claim, less \$50,000, should be allowed. The contractor refuses to take it, and he goes to the Government and says: I will refer the matter to the arbitrament of your chief officer, Mr. Page. Why, Sir, Mr. Page has already arbitrated upon that matter in the interests of the Government and the public, and he has decided that the claim should be paid less a certain sum. Now, we all know how susceptible men are to a variety of influences—I do not mean monetary influences—I mean a variety of other influences, and I think it would be much safer, in the interests of the public, if it were understood that where a chief engineer like Mr. Page, on the one hand, or Mr. Schreiber on the other, or any other of the deputy heads of the several departments which are contract departments, that once they make a report upon the matter, the Government must either act upon the report or let the party go to the Court of Claims, which the hon. gentleman has established for the purpose of settling such matters. The hon. gentleman says that it may put the contractors to inconvenience. My opinion of the contractors of this country is that they can stand a good deal of inconvenience, they are quite willing to take the chances of some inconvenience, and I think it will be much safer if their claims are re-examined in open court, Mr. Page or Mr. Schreiber giving their testimony under oath. In that

case the public interest would be much better protected, than by having their claims again referred to these men who have reported in favor of a reduced amount. When the engineers have reported reducing the claims by \$100,000 or \$50,000, and the contractors are not satisfied, I think the public will be much better satisfied if, in the future, these claims are referred to the court specially established for settling them.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the illustration furnished by the First Minister hardly applies in this case. He says it is a case of one of the contracting parties putting himself in the hands of the other. That is the argument which the First Minister offers in defence of this system. Now, there is quite a difference between one of the parties, and an agent of one of the parties. In the case of any question arising, we can hardly consider that every departmental officer is the paymaster. In addition to what has fallen from my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I venture this, as my opinion, as to what is sound and proper. All public works ought to be done under contract, and if it happen that there are extras not contemplated by the contract, but are the outcome of the contract, those extras ought themselves to be especially referred to the Court of Claims. The extras are what the contractors are after, that is where the money is made. We do not need to look for a better illustration of that than at a couple of affairs that have come before this House within the last few years. Take the case of Section B, where the extras amounted to \$400,000; take the Onderdonk case, where an award, after an arbitration, was made for \$75,000, and it was not enough to satisfy the Administration of the day, and they had it increased, at their own motion, to \$200,000. Now, if the Government can cause an increase like that to be made by their arbitrators, what influence have they over a person who is in their employment, who is dismissable at their will? Where public tenders are invited, and a contract entered into by the Government as the result of public tenders, then there must be no difficulty in ascertaining the debt by the country to the contractor. But anything else that grows out of that contract, where the cost is not ascertainable by the express language of the contract, is a matter, I think, that should be investigated under the safeguard of a judicial tribunal like the Court of Claims. I think, having regard to the facts and the history of the country, and our experience for the last few years, the criticism of the hon. member for Northumberland was far too mild.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### THE CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. BERGIN moved for:

Copies of reports, plans and surveys of the then proposed Cornwall Canal by J. B. Mills and Benjamin Wright, Esq's, Civil Engineers, and by Capt. P. Cole, Royal Engineers, in the years 1832, 1833 and 1834; also for survey and report of Colin Carman, Esq., O.E., of a proposed change of location of Cornwall Canal, from Sand Bridge through Hooples' Creek to Archibald's Point, with plans, profile and estimates.

He said: I make this motion for the purpose of bringing before the House and the country the present state of the Cornwall Canal, and the plans proposed for its improvement by the Chief Engineer of Canals. I am aware, that in introducing this motion and in taking the course I propose to take, I am assuming a large responsibility, and that in taking exception to the plans proposed by the chief engineer, I am called upon to substantiate by the records the statements which I propose to make. It will be fresh in your recollection, Sir, and in the recollection of every member of this House, that a serious break took place in the Cornwall Canal, in the month of October last, near the village of Moulinette. This, Sir, was not the first or only break that has taken place in the Cornwall Canal

since it was opened nearly half a century ago. To explain the matter to the House and to the country in a manner that will be satisfactory to them, I shall be obliged to quote largely from the records to show that at no time, since the construction of the canal until to-day, has it been safe for the purposes of navigation. We all know that any serious breach in the Cornwall Canal must be attended with the most disastrous results to the commerce of this country. The last break which occurred, it has been estimated, cost not less than five millions of dollars to this country, and for that reason I feel that it is my duty to bring before Parliament the present state of the canal, the plans which are proposed by the chief engineer, the contracts which have been let, and the alternative nature of the plans which are now before the Government for the prevention of any further such accidents to this canal. No change of location, no plan for the strengthening of the banks, which does not put beyond peradventure any further breach of this kind, is one that can be accepted by the people of this country. The Boards of Trade, the Mariners' Association, the ship-owners, all view with alarm the present proposed plan of improvement, and they are all anxious that the attention of the Government shall be closely directed to the present contracts. The works proposed are, unfortunately, under contract, and it may be objected that, being under contract, we ought to allow the contracts to be carried out. But I, for one, hold—and I am not alone, for the most practical men in this country, and men of high scientific attainments, are of the opinion that the plans are not satisfactory—that they are not plans which will make the Cornwall Canal secure, that they are not plans which will prevent any further interruption to commerce. It must not for a moment be supposed that, in the criticism I am about to make, I am in any way censuring the Government of the country. The Government acts upon the report of its chief engineer, a man of high attainments, of long experience, who for more than a quarter of a century has been advising all the Governments that have held power in this country, and he has held that confidence up to the present. I do not impute to that gentleman any ulterior designs in the plans which he has proposed, but I do say, from all I have been able to learn, from the enquiries I have made, from what has been said to me by practical men and by scientific men, that his plans are not at all what they ought to be. This leads me to say this: that as the plan which he proposes to follow now is the plan which was adopted at the time of the construction of the canal, commenced in 1834, I am bound to show some reason why that location was adopted, and why the plan to which we seek to revert was not then carried into effect. Professional jealousy was the cause of the abandonment of the first survey and the selection of the second location. Professional jealousy, the same monster, rears its head to-day, and it is for this reason that the Chief Engineer of Canals refuses to listen to the propositions made by other engineers and practical men. Let me read to the House an extract from the address made by Mr. Samuel Keefer, at the meeting of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, at Montreal, a few weeks since. He said:

"It has been suggested that some reference should be made to the first construction of the Cornwall Canal, the enlargement of which is now in progress, especially to that portion of it between Moulinette and Mille Roches, where the breaches have occurred, and it is my intention to do so, not in this address but in a paper specially prepared with illustrations, to be read at one of the regular meetings of the society. Having spent nearly six years of my younger days as assistant engineer, under I. B. Mills and Colonel Phillpotts resident engineers in its construction, I may claim the privilege of contributing the facts in relation to the formation of the banks that have come under my own observation.

"This much, however, may be said here.

"The canal and its banks were constructed of ample dimensions. The canal was 100 feet at bottom and 10 feet deep. The embankment was raised to fourteen feet above canal bottom, and made twelve feet wide at top with slopes on either side of two to one.

Mr. BERGIN.

"That portion of the canal embankment on the upper-reach, which for upwards of a mile in length, from Moulinette to Mille Roches, holds the water in the canal at a level of about twenty feet above the branch of the St. Lawrence, which runs alongside, is in fact founded upon the treacherous clay bottom in which were found springs of water, and in part in side-cutting permeated by streaks of sand. The embankment over this ground was formed with extra care, the earth being laid on in courses with carts, and where the outer slope ran out into the river it was protected by boulder stones along its outer edge. Where springs were found under the seat of the embankment they were led out to the river's edge by French drains, and where the streaks of sand were encountered in the side-cutting they were cut off by puddle trenches, six feet deep or more, and the bottom and side bank lined with puddle three feet thick from the puddle trench to high-water mark. This mode of protection was not continuous over the whole line, but was confined to such parts of the bank only as appeared to require it.

"Since the opening of the canal, there have been several breaches in this bank, the last and worst of all was the breach of last fall, which inflicted such serious damage upon the trade of the St. Lawrence last year."

It will be evident from that statement that the greatest care and prudence should be exercised before the Government undertake to carry out the work under the plans proposed by Mr. Page. The fullest evidence should be presented by him to the Government to show that a different condition of the banks can be brought about by the proposed plans, and a different condition of the foundations. I may say that in 1826 a survey, with a view to the construction of a canal from the Long Sault to Cornwall, was made by Mr. Clewes, a very eminent man, who had devoted the greater portion of his life to the study of the rise and fall of the waters of the great lakes, and to the condition of the St. Lawrence. That gentleman published a great number of pamphlets in connection with the subject, and he attained so high a reputation that he was called upon to make this survey and report to the Parliament of Upper Canada. In 1830, four years after, Mr. Barrett, also an eminent engineer, and with whom I had many conversations on this subject in my younger days when he was employed on the Lachine Canal, also made a report, and it was confidently expected by everyone that when the construction of the canal was undertaken, although it was of larger dimensions than the canal on which Mr. Clewes was asked to report, and Mr. Barrett also, the plan suggested by Mr. Clewes would have been adopted. Unfortunately, the commissioners appointed by the Parliament of Upper Canada to construct the Cornwall Canal did not feel they could employ Mr. Clewes or act entirely upon his judgment, or on that of Mr. Barrett. Those engineers were Canadians, and the commissioners sent one of their number to the United States to employ American engineers, not that they had any desire to throw any doubt whatever on the scientific attainments of Mr. Clewes and Mr. Barrett, but because they believed American engineers would have had more practical experience in the construction of canals. The result was not at all what we could have wished, as I shall show by the records which I shall read presently. They obtained the services of Mr. Mills and of Judge Wright, who was at that time Chief Engineer of the Erie Canal. Those gentlemen, on their arrival in this country, entered upon an investigation of the works that were proposed. They felt, coming as they did from the United States, that it was necessary to their professional reputation to show that the Canadian gentlemen, who were employed to make the surveys and report upon them and locate the canal, did not possess skill and scientific attainments equal to their own and were not as capable of suggesting a canal route and a cheap and proper mode of construction, and as a consequence they reported a different plan. I quote from Mr. Mill's report. He says:

"It is well known to the members of the board that two separate and distinct surveys had been made over the same ground in general, and for the same object, upon a smaller scale—one by Mr. Clewes, in 1826, the other by Mr. Barrett, in 1830. As neither of these plans contemplated a canal of more than 8 feet depth of water, and only 60 feet width on the bottom, and locks of 40 feet in width and 132 feet in length; they did not conform in capacity in any respect to the terms of the Act under which this examination was directed to be made, and were of little use to me in the duties assigned."

Mr. Mills then made an estimate of his plan, as well as an estimate of the plan of Mr. Clewes. The plan of Mr. Clewes, I may mention, was to cut through Archibald's Point about a mile and a quarter further west than the present entrance to the canal, go through Hooples' Creek to a deep ravine and low ground which runs from the head of the Long Sault to Brownell's Bay, now called Sand Bridge, and at Brownell's Bay, or near the head of Sheik's Island, to construct a short dam, the river there being at summer level only about 150 feet from the present canal bank to the head of the island, and never at any time having more than two feet of water. That is called a branch of the river, but it is really not that. Oftentimes during the summer one can walk almost dryshod from the main shore to the head of Sheik's Island. He contemplated also placing a large dam at the foot of the island. This would have given us an inland canal with natural banks that could never break away; but Mr. Mills, in making his report, condemned that plan, as I shall show you presently, because he said it would cost thirty thousand pounds sterling more than the plan which he proposed, and which was to build along the bank of the river and not to have an inland canal. Further on, I will show you from the report that Mr. Mills was obliged to shift his banks over and over again; that he was obliged to shift his centre line fifty feet into the bank, and, finding that the bank was constantly slipping into the river as fast as constructed, so bad was the foundation, and in order to keep it from further danger, he was again obliged to shift his centre line twenty feet further. He then got into a bank of hard pan and boulders, which cost a large amount of money, and, although the bank is to-day within the natural bank, yet the foundation is the same bad, unsubstantial foundation tapped by quicksand and by running water that it was fifty years ago, and it is not in any better condition to-day to build a bank upon than it was then. The very fact of this bank breaking away last fall, as it was always predicted that it would break away, and as Mr. Mills himself, after two years of construction had been gone on with, admitted it would break away, shows that it is time we should direct the attention of the Government (whose attention was never directed to it before) and the attention of the Chief Engineer of Canals, to the actual state of the facts. Mr. Mills, in making his estimate, says this:

"Thence to Archibald's Point, distance  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles, the natural channel of the river presents no impediments to the navigation of steamboats of the class contemplated to be used; in truth, this is the most placid part of the stream from Prescott to Cornwall. I come now, Sir, to the point, Archibald's, where it has been proposed to leave the river, in order to pass the Long Sault. As the Canadian channel of this rapid does not afford a safe or convenient passage, even for descending boats, it becomes necessary to construct a canal to accommodate both ascending and descending trade. Therefore my calculations from said point to Cornwall, are based upon a canal of 100 feet width at bottom, and banks sloping according to a base of 2 feet to 1 foot vertical. From this point to Cornwall,  $11\frac{1}{2}$  miles, several plans have been suggested and considered, only two of which have been deemed worthy of particular examination. Mr. Clewes proposed cutting across said point and passing up the valley of Hooples' Creek,  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile; thence following a depression of the country, and dropping into the stream at Brownell's Bay. See plan No. 1 of this work. This plan I have examined, and have prepared minute calculations of its cost.

"The other plan examined, is to follow the river and its shore to the same point. I will now, Sir, compare these two routes or plans, to their union at Brownell's Bay. The route by Hooples' Creek, is three miles and 72 chains, in the course of which there occurs 1,461,000 yards excavation.

"The river route follows the natural channel of the river, which affords a good and easy navigation one and a quarter miles further down; thence I make a canal on the bank of the river to the said bay, distance two miles and 44 chains."

The point I wish to make with regard to this proposal and this report of Mr. Mills is, that his estimate of the number of yards of excavation was made for a channel 10 feet deep, and that, singular to say, the estimate which is made to-day for a channel 16 feet deep, through precisely the same ground calls but for one hundred or two hundred thousand yards more. The inference is plain that Mr. Mills pur-

posely over-estimated the expenditure upon that proposed plan, in order that his plan might be adopted. Here is what he says:

"You will perceive Sir, by the above comparison, that there is little difference in distance (counting the distance on the river from said point to the commencement of the river work  $1\frac{1}{2}$  mile), but that there is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  mile less distance to be improved, therefore less distance to keep in repair, and also that there is \$122,618.89 in favor of the river route."

I have shown you, Sir, the reason why Mr. Mills adopted that plan, and I propose to show you how, as the construction went on, every day developed the inaccuracies and the utter want of safety in that plan as proposed. The commissioners appointed by the Parliament of Upper Canada were not satisfied with the plan proposed by Mr. Mills, nor were they satisfied with his estimates or his location, and they asked His Excellency, Sir John Colborne, to lend them the assistance of Captain Cole, then at the head of the Royal Engineers in this country, and they consulted also Mr. Fleming, an engineer of repute, and Mr. Thompson, and asked them to report upon the plan of Mr. Mills, and particularly to report on the Hooples' Creek and Brownell's Bay route, that the utmost caution and circumspection should be observed before deciding upon the route. I propose to read to you, Sir, what Captain Cole said—and there can be no higher authority—upon that portion of the work which the present Chief Engineer of Canals to-day pooh-poohs:

"In altering their plan to meet the wishes of the country, Judge Wright and Mr. Mills stated that they were aware of the greater cost of No. 1 (the inland route), but preferred the latter as a more perfect work. The latter gentleman thought the saving might be £30,000. I imagine that this will be found under the mark, but nothing certain can be given until a survey of the points to be improved has been made. The first and principal feature of the natural course about to be adopted, is the damming below Brownell's Bay. Having given the subject such consideration as imperfect accounts of the localities, and Mr. Ridout's map of Canada, enabled me to give, before I visited the spot, I concluded that we might construct these works advantageously, and I found the reality greatly surpassing my expectations. If an embankment be thrown across the passage above Brownell's Bay to Sheik's Island, the water lot may be finished without pumping, and the dams below constructed without the usual expense of an artificial waste weir, or the shifting of a temporary one in the dam itself as the work progressed. The water being thrown around the outer channel by this embankment, no difficulties remained to contend with. This bank, I advise, should be permanent, with a masonry waste weir of sufficient dimensions to feed the locks and mills, with a spur or jetty thrown forwards (as at present from the wooden lock) to catch the upper level of rapid as it passes at right angles across the mouth of the passage. This difference of level is about two feet. The extra expense of making this work permanent would scarcely exceed that of a temporary coffer-dam, independent of the masonry cheeks of the sluice-way—and a guard of three or four feet against the spring floods would be much less costly than the same guard placed on the dam and lock at Moulinette. The advantage would be acquired of relieving the works below at any time, in case of leak in the dam or locks, which may be required in spite of all previous care of the engineers, from the carelessness of the contractor, or from some defect in the lock itself which would require remedy; much, it is true, may be done by previous care in the foundation of dams, and the examination of the rock under them and the locks—all apparent fissures being filled with cement and covered with a little masonry. The advantage, also, will be given by the bank above, of letting in water by degrees and watching the effect produced, so that all defects may be remedied before the navigation opens. The backing might also be allowed some time to consolidate before the water is let in. This work I call embankment because it does not raise the level of the water, but merely retains it at the level required. All these details, and many more, will better be known to the resident engineer. I will merely state, that the masonry of dams should be arched key work, well wedged up; this saves extra masonry, and if well performed, there is no use in mortar or cement being added, but broken stones and shingle should in either case be placed about 4 feet thick on the back of masonry to prevent the passage of the gravel and clay of the slope above. The water should not run over, for several reasons, and a guard of 2 feet will be ample against the wash of the surface water. All these arrangements were concurred in by the engineer, and from hence downwards, no discrepancy of opinion appeared; all details being left to the judgment of the resident engineer, including the formation of sluices at each dam."

Now, one would suppose, as Capt. Cole evidently supposed, that this proposition of his would have been carried out; but it was not. Mr. Geddes, who was also consulted by the engineers, speaks of this plan, too. He says:

"The lower level leaves the upper, by locking down 17 feet to the surface of Brownell's Bay: said bay being raised  $5\frac{1}{2}$  feet by a dam at



Mille Roches, holding up the water 13 feet above its present surface at that place, thus producing a depth of 10 feet water through the bay.

"The artificial lake thus produced, would afford a fine piece of navigation for three miles, but destroy the valuable water power of MoulINETTE, and what is more serious, produce, in the canal line to be carried from Mille Roches onward in much of the distance for the first three-quarters of a mile, cutting 17 feet deeper than by pursuing the upper level, beyond which there is 9 feet between the two levels.

"Few localities equal this in the facility of making said dam, or founding a water lock, at the head of Brownell's Bay: a low embankment shuts all the water from the north side at Sheik's Island, leaving dry land to build the water lock on at the head of Brownell's Bay, and the dam at Mille Roches. This embankment at the head of Sheik's Island, Mr. Mills values at but \$450; a canal from the head of Brownell's Bay to Mille Roches he estimates at \$103,980.

"The value of three miles of an artificial lake, instead of a canal, would be the set-off against some excess of expense which probably will be incurred by following the lower level."

Mr. Fleming also reported in the same way. He says:

"On considering the first of these, namely, an entire canal, as now laid down by the engineers mentioned, it appears to me to have been adopted under the impression of avoiding apprehended hazard from ice to any works which might be placed in the river between Brownell's Bay and Mille Roches, for, on the left bank of this branch of the river, the canal route is necessarily very circuitous, and would be expensive to construct from the steepness and the brokenness of the ground, whereon much deep side-cutting with heavy embankments must be made towards the river, for the level of the base of the canal must be from 13 to 23 feet above the surface of the river, which, in consideration of the magnitude of the canal proposed, becomes the more hazardous in point of stability by being thus supported by new embankments. At the upper side of Mille Roches village, the same route leaves the bank of the river and proceeds about one mile further on the same level to the first lock. On the last part the cutting is very deep, and through a soil of a quality, as indicated by several places here, much disposed to slip, and which may require, I would fear, somewhat more than the estimated expense, although this might be sufficient to accomplish the same quantity of excavation of better ground. The continuation of this route to its debouche into the St. Lawrence presents nothing remarkable but the deterioration of the lands and the town of Cornwall, which it passes through.

"Such being the features of this proposed route of an entire canal, I regard that part of it which extends from Brownell's Bay to Mille Roches as unnecessary and expensive, and which, in my opinion, should be entirely superseded, by adopting the river here in its stead, which brings me to consider the second route mentioned above.

"It now will appear on this route, there would be a great saving in expense by the mere construction of the dam proposed at Mille Roches, instead of forming a canal along the bank of the magnitude proposed. As additional to this dam is only required a stop gate in the entrance here of the canal. It would also be advisable to throw a dam of small height across the stream at a point above the position of the lock at Brownell's Bay, by which the waters from the Long Sault may be always regulated or occasionally absolutely stopped. The means of doing the latter would afford the dam at Mille Roches to be built on almost a dry foundation, and also the same for the locks at Brownell's Bay, which also would allow to remove any shallowness or impediments of the channel. Pools or buoys may be afterwards placed to direct the course of deep water.

"As the proposed part of this new route, on the canal, is not yet surveyed, the expense of it must remain undetermined. Until this is done, however, it is clear this proposed alteration of route, from Brownell's Bay, would afford a much better steamboat navigation than an entire canal, and which would be, evidently, many thousand pounds less expensive; also, if well constructed in the dams and locks, the whole would require little annual repairs; besides, this reach upon the river would afford a safe protection for vessels to lay up in the winter months, for the dam here would form a barrier against all movements which might hereafter happen from obstruction of the ice below, and with a very ordinary dam above the works at Brownell's Bay, there could be no danger apprehended on this side, while this last dam would regulate the supply of water as required for this grand basin, as well as for mill purposes, which then might be properly afforded from the dam at Mille Roches.

"Thus far I would decidedly recommend these alterations as superior, both in respect of utility in navigation and towards reducing the whole expense to that of an entire route, as proposed by Messrs. Wright and Mills."

Mr. Mills made a second report, in which he partially admitted all the objections which were made by the other engineers to be correct. He said:

"As such operations in large streams ever leave marks of their effects, I presume they were to be found along the banks of the river. Accordingly I observed such effects as the tearing up, breaking and scarifying of trees, and concluded that the accounts might be half true, and if so, there was good reason for keeping as clear of exposure as possible in the construction of the works in contemplation. Floods, though free from ice, when they deluge a line of canal with earthen banks, ever cause great derangement and expense of repairs, and it is generally considered by men conversant with matters of the kind in question that such works ought not to be exposed to the danger and hazard of inun-

Mr. BERGIN.

ation. Thus I view the subject, Sir, and accordingly, I acted as in the course of the past year, I am not aware of any important change in the laws of nature or in the consequences of their operations, I am to presume that the danger of exposing works of the kind in question is as great to-day as it was one year ago—therefore I have not seen any reasons for taking a different view of the said plans and locations."

And yet, admitting the danger that would certainly follow from inundation and from the rapid rush of water at particular seasons, he nevertheless persisted in following out the original plan and location; and when I come to read to you, as I shall after a little while, the report of Mr. Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, made the other day, you will find he attributes the destruction of this bank to the causes laid down by Mr. Mills in this report. He refers again to what evidently was a painful subject to him, Clewes' and Barrett's plan. He, somehow or other, was unable to rid himself of that, and on every occasion in which he got into difficulty, he endeavored to convince himself against his better judgment that the plans he had rejected in the first instance were the plans he ought to have followed. He says, although there was no necessity for him to refer to any other plans at that time:

"I wish briefly to refer to three plans that have been considered and, I believe, abandoned:

"1. The one proposed involving a dam of the St. Lawrence at Point Maligne, near Cornwall. This plan, I believe, is abandoned, not, however, because of its impracticability, but rather from its inexpediency, all things considered.

"2. Passing Long Sault by the original route—then dropping into Brownell's Bay, raised five or six feet by a dam at Mille Roches—thence passing the original line nearly, and reduced seventeen feet to Cornwall, I have made an estimate of the expense of this plan of improvement and find it costs about £4,000 more than the plan recommended to your board last year."

And with him £4,000 extra expenditure was not for a moment to be considered in connection with the safety of the canal, and the disastrous results that might at any time ensue, interrupting navigation and greatly injuring commerce.

"4th Plan. Drop into Brownell's Bay, raised five or six feet by a dam at MoulINETTE. At MoulINETTE drop into a pond made by a dam at Mille Roches. At Mille Roches drop into the river at the foot of the fall at this place; and then pursuing the river to French's Rift, through which cut, and drop into the river below it; thence following the river to Point Maligne, through which cut, and drop into the Cornwall Bay, where terminates the improvement. This plan, you may know, is not altogether new. At least it is as old as the spring of 1833, most of which was proposed to me by several persons at that time, and all of which has been more or less considered by me in the course of my surveys in reference to this improvement. However, it does not receive from me so much serious consideration, for the reasons which I have above stated. I believe this plan is thought well of by at least two of the gentlemen who have recently visited the ground. I am very decided in the opinion that it is the best plan, if the original one is to be departed from, and the levels reduced—therefore I determined to furnish the board with an estimate of the expense of it at this time. In the interval of the departure of the gentlemen who have visited us and the meeting of the Board of Commissioners there was not time for a minute survey with direct reference to this improvement."

Here we have an admission from the man on whose advice the canal was located, that the plan of Mr. Clewes was the best and proper plan, and we have the admission, a little further on, that because of a comparatively trifling expense of \$102,182, which the construction of a canal that would be safe for all time would cost, he abandoned the old and stuck to his own plan, which he admitted was not the good or the proper plan. In considering his plans I have brought you as far as MoulINETTE and Mille Roches, for by that time he had realised that he had made a tremendous engineering blunder; and after a large sum of money had been expended he abandoned his proposed plan of a river canal from French's Rift to Cornwall, and insisted upon the construction of that portion of the canal by the inland route. Fortunate it was for Canada that he had the good sense to abandon even that much of his proposed or river canal. Those who knew Mr. Mills, those who have any knowledge of the public works that he constructed, will tell you that he had a weakness for following the sinuosities of the river and building all his improvements upon its banks or as

near to the banks as possible, his desire being to show that by superior engineering skill he could overcome natural difficulties in a way they could be overcome by no other engineer; and owing to the overweening self-conceit of this engineer, the commerce of the country has been imperilled and actually stopped more than once, with the disastrous result which we all know followed the break in October last. In the subsequent report, Mr. Mills made the usual statement which he made every year during the progress of the construction of the canal:

"Although I have no doubt of the safety or permanence of the work."

Now, why should he, above all men, refer to the safety or the permanence of the work, if he did not feel in his heart of hearts that the work was not safe or permanent, and it could never be made so on the plan he had laid down. His consulting engineer, Mr. Wright, also had the same bogey before him at all times, and he too felt called upon, because of the reports which were made to the commissioners by the assistant engineer every month, to insist upon the safety and the solidity of the work. Speaking of that section of the canal, notwithstanding what the Chief Engineer of Canals may say, and notwithstanding what those who are wedded to his opinions may say—for I have heard one or two engineers say that they think that portion of the canal from the guard lock to Brownell's Bay may be safe—notwithstanding what they say, I shall be able to show from the reports that that portion of the bank is built upon a bad foundation, that it was improperly constructed at the beginning, and is to-day in a most unsatisfactory condition, and at any day may be swept into the river. This is what is said about section No. 1:

"From the first, and throughout the whole course of my duties in the service of your board, economy, permanency, and despatch, so far as they are relatively consistent, have been grand objects to which my attention has been directed; and in any proposition relative to construction, wherein plans are projected or changed, the above considerations have been in view, and they were in full view, when I proposed said piers on section No. 1. The following is simply the circumstance in which the suggestion originated: In prosecuting the work along a section of the upper part of this contract, I observed that an important portion of the earth thrown into the river was taken away by the current, which is made serious by a shoal putting out from the opposite shore, which has formed the channel bold on the north shore for about 2,000 feet. It became an object with me to counteract this current and throw it from the shore, by which I would not only save all the material carried out by forming a permanent protection against the abrasion and action of the river, but would be enabled to carry the bank farther into the river even than the original plan contemplated, thereby reducing the amount of excavation to an extent that the cost of the piers, even at double the estimate, would be much more than compensated, and the work finally more secure. That this would be the result I have no doubt."

But the result did not prove to be so. Notwithstanding that he had no doubt in regard to it, in the course of a few months, he was obliged to remove his centre line 50 feet into the bank, which was composed of boulders and hardpan; and, two years after, he was obliged to move it 20 feet further into the shore in order to save his bank. There can be no doubt that Mr. Wright, the consulting engineer, was thoroughly aware of the dangerous state of the bank, and of the effect which the ice and a rapid current, in case of flood, would produce. I need only refer to his report to the commissioners in June, 1835, after the bank had been carried away by the force of the river. On the 1st November, 1836, at the close of the season's work, Mr. Jones, the commissioner, who reported that Mr. Harvie's section No. 1—the most dangerous section, as I contend, now—had to be changed because of the slipping away of the banks, the quicksands, and the shifting sands, through which the water permeated from the river into the works, recommended puddle banks. Not only did the water permeate from the canal when there was water enough in it, but it oozed through between the natural bank and the artificial bank from the river, and thousands and thousands of dollars were thrown away in the attempt to make that a safe bank, which never ought to have been constructed there at all. Col. Philpotts, who

was appointed after the failure of Mr. Mills to satisfy the commissioners that he could construct it in an efficient manner and make it permanent, undertook to perform the work by puddling. I have it on the testimony of men who were connected with the construction of that canal, men who are living to-day and know of what they speak, that the puddle was made of the poorest material, that Col. Philpotts was not able to get the proper sort of clay to make the puddle, and that the puddle was put on the top of quicksands which should have been removed before the puddle was employed. Col. Philpotts, in all his reports, was obliged to say that the condition of the ground upon which the banks were raised was bad; he was obliged to say that there were hidden springs in the bottom of the canal which permeated through the work, and that there were quicksands there, but he hoped to save the work by the measures he was taking and by the puddling with which he was endeavoring to stop the leaks. Now, I come to the report of Mr. Page upon the proposed work, the only one which he has made since 1874, and I propose to deal with that report in the plainest possible terms, because I think we cannot put too clearly or too forcibly before the Government and the country the weakness of the present banks of the Cornwall Canal, and their insecurity. What this country demands is not a cheap work or a work of questionable safety, but a work that shall be perfectly safe and afford perfect security, a canal that will last during all time, and I maintain that this canal can be so constructed and can be made safe for all time at an expenditure no larger, if not less, than is now proposed by the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals. I have Mr. Page's report, which was laid on the Table the other day, in regard to a portion of this work, in regard to the dams which were approved by Capt. Cole in the year 1835, and also approved by Mr. Geddes, Mr. Thompson and other engineers, and, a few weeks since, revived by Mr. Keefer. But, before touching on that report, I propose to read a portion of a letter without which that report would never have been made, and the Government would never have been advised as to the insecurity of the canal. It is a letter, written by Mr. Samuel Keefer, who was engaged as assistant engineer in the construction of the canal, a man whose reputation as an engineer stands second to none, a man whose ability cannot be placed below that of even the chief engineer himself. This letter was addressed to the Minister of Railways, who very properly submitted it to the chief engineer. In that letter he says:

"In these troublous times, I can well understand how the great affairs of State demand your most earnest attention, and for fear of inopportune intrusion, I have hitherto refrained from reminding you of a matter of detail which just now is giving no little trouble and anxiety to those engaged in commerce; but I feel that I must discharge my Canadian conscience of its duty by reminding you of my views for the enlargement of the Cornwall Canal, as set forth in my letter addressed to you on the 17th February, 1885. My main object in suggesting the plan I did was to provide against disaster of the kind under which the navigation is now stopped by the breach near Mille Roches. I am informed it is the intention of your department to enlarge the upper reach of the old canal, *in situ*, following its sinuosities over the same treacherous ground. If such plan is persisted in, I think you may look for more serious breaches and stoppages after the enlargement than have happened before it, for the reasons I have pointed out, and, if the volume of trade by the St. Lawrence overreaches the magnitude expected, every stoppage of the traffic must be felt with tenfold severity."

Now, the plan that Mr. Keefer proposed to the Government in that letter in the month of October last, is the same plan which I brought before the Government about ten years ago. I laid the matter personally before the present Prime Minister and Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Minister of Railways and Canals, and he ordered a survey to be made; but, although that survey was made, and an estimate was made of the cost, just about the time Sir Charles Tupper resigned his position as chief of that department, no report was made by the chief engineer to the Government, so as to enable them to act intelligently upon it. He contented

himself with verbally saying to Sir Charles Tupper's successor, that the plan was a ridiculous one, and would not give a greater head of water. We did not ask for it in order to get a greater head of water, but because it would enable a larger volume of water to be brought into the canal for the purposes of manufacture and navigation. If that plan had been acted upon, it does not require that a man should be a sage to be able to inform this House that no such accident as that which happened the other day, could possibly have happened to the canal. I shall deal now with Mr. Page's objection to the plan proposed of an inland canal from the head of the canal to Mille Roches. In his report dated the 27th of February last, he says :

"When the work of enlarging and deepening it was placed under contract, provision was made that the widening might be done on either side that would be most likely to improve the line, that is to say, that although the widening was intended to be done principally on the north side of the present channel, it was thought that some salient or prominent points could, with advantage to the general line, be in part removed. The material excavated in widening and deepening the prism, was, of course, to be placed on the south or river side of those places where the banks of the canal are close to the margin of the river."

Here the Chief Engineer of Canals admits that he proposed tampering with the north side of the bank of the canal, to remove portions of it, and throw it over to the south side with a view of deepening the canal, yet, in the next paragraph he is obliged to admit that it would not be safe or prudent for him to do it, but that he must take the north side of the canal on the shore line. Speaking of the break, he says :

"The casualty above mentioned, and the information subsequently obtained, have, however, shown that it would be injudicious to cut into the north or canal side of the south or river bank, consequently the widening must be done wholly on the north or landward side, and the line of the south bank allowed to remain undisturbed, and the slope on the canal side continued down to the new bottom line at the same angle as at present."

And yet, Sir, it seems to me a curious sort of mental obliquity on the part of the Chief Engineer of Canals who could recommend that the north portion of the south bank should be taken away, and almost in the next paragraph admit that if he did so the bank would be destroyed, and recommending that the enlargement must be made from the north side. It is quite evident that he knew himself that the proposal he made, that the contract he let, was upon false premises, and could not be safely carried out. He says :

"This conclusion has been arrived at by ascertaining from some of the old contracts how the banks of the St. Lawrence Canals were intended to be formed, and it is unlikely that they would be made much different from the manner therein described, which is as follows:—All the best earth for making tight banks must be placed in the front or middle part of the same, that of inferior quality in rear. In forming the bank, the earth, if carried by carts, must be laid in courses not exceeding 12 inches, and all the best material must be placed in the front or middle of the bank. The information received from various reliable sources leads to the impression that certain precautionary measures were adopted in preparing the seats for some of the banks; all of them were, however, no doubt formed as above stated."

Now, the chief engineer is incorrect. That bank of which I have spoken, from the present guard-lock called now the head of the canal to Brownell's Bay, was constructed, not with carts, the greater portion of it, but with hand barrows. The earth was deposited transversely to the bank by the laborers, and so soon as the bank had risen to a height over which they could no longer dump the earth from the barrows, they laid down inch boards across the bank, and the boards were laid down so that the barrows might not sink into the soft clay, and that the men might be enabled to wheel their loads easily. What was the result? Every three feet of bank formed a sluice-way? The result of the construction was, when they abandoned the barrows, and the boards were split and of no further use, they were allowed to remain there, and to-day this part of the bank of the Cornwall Canal and during all these years, has been tapped by the sluice-ways which act as channels for the water, Mr. BERGIN.

sucking it in and sucking it out, to the destruction of the bank. This is not a matter of which the chief engineer can be ignorant, because I have it from the superintendent of the canal on more than one occasion, that in repairing the banks they have come upon portions of the old boards and planks, and although there was better material on the face of the bank, the part of the bank which was constructed with carts was constructed of good and durable material. The core of the bank, which ought to have been made of the best material, and the southern portion of the bank, that which is along the river, was made of the poorest material, anything that they could get; but they put on the inside, to keep the water in the canal, a face of 8 feet of the best material they could get, and that they made with carts and laid longitudinally. It is now a little more than half a century ago since the Cornwall Canal was constructed. During a great many years that sound, good face which was put on with carts saved the rotten outer banks of the canal, and prevented their being carried away; but after half a century, the wind, the sleet, the snow, the agitation of the banks of the canal by vessels going through, and by the natural wear and tear, this eight feet of good bank has been obliterated, and there is not to-day six inches of good face on the whole length of that canal from the head of the Sault to Mille Roches. And we are asked, Sir, to admit that a sound, and safe, and proper bank could be made by taking the soft material from the bottom of this canal by dredges and lifting it with derricks and throwing it over to the outside of the river; and we are told that any plan that we shall adopt in opposition to this, will cost a very much larger sum of money. Before I get through I shall be able to show you that the estimates prepared by the chief engineer, that the contracts which he has entered into, formed but a small portion of the expense that will be necessary for the safety of the canal under the plan that he proposes, and I shall show it from his own reports. He says :

"For two miles along the bank of the Sault Rapids, the soil is of strong clay and gravel, with stone and boulders imbedded in it, and is admirably adapted for making a strong and permanent embankment between the canal and the swift current of the river, the outer edge of which is well protected by the boulder stones taken out of the excavation of the canal."

This, he said, is Mr. Keefer's opinion. Mr. Keefer was not employed on that portion of the canal, and he spoke from memory, but Mr. Keefer now here said that the foundation upon which that bank was built was a safe and a proper foundation. On the contrary, we have the evidence of Col. Philpotts, of Mr. Mills, and of Mr. Wright, that this section No. 1 was the most difficult of the canal, because of its shifting sands, its hidden springs, and the quicksands. He objects to the plans which are proposed for dams across the head and foot of the canal, and says :

"It is not stated whether it is contemplated to place the dams at the narrowest part of the 'Sny' and use the present towing path with a bridge over each of the openings of the channel; or to place the dams obliquely, and in a position that would make them correspond as nearly as possible with the line of those parts of the island and canal bank with which they connect."

Well, Sir, I would have supposed that, after the long experience of the Chief Engineer of Canals, he would not at this time of day, tell us that it was necessary to have a towpath by which to tow the immense vessels we are going to have through 14 feet of water, so soon as this work is built, by horses along the bank. He must know that the day for towing vessels by horses in a 14-foot channel, is past; he must know that the plan which was proposed by these eminent engineers years ago, is a plan which most effectually forbade anything like a tow path, and, therefore, the objection which he makes on that score, is one which ought not to be entertained for a moment.

"The shore along the north side of Sheik's Island has a very tortuous and irregular outline, so that to make anything like a suitable towing path along it would be attended with a vast deal of uncertainty besides

expense; still were this not done in the case of making the "Sny" the navigable channel, a swing bridge would be required for canal purposes over each of the openings made in the bank, instead of one swing bridge for public travel across the canal at Moulinette."

I do not remember when I have read anything more disingenuous. If the dams are built, and in wording this paragraph he presupposes they are built, no bridge is necessary. Anyone who may desire to visit that island, the inhabitants of the island, coming to the main shore, would cross upon the tops of the dams from either end, and no bridge would be required, and the fine road along the island would be used by them. Probably the best road in the township of Cornwall is that on the north shore of Sheik's Island, and no bridge whatever would be necessary. In that connection let me say, that the plan Mr. Page sends down in connection with these proposed dams is a plan more misleading than calculated to give reliable information to the Government, to members of the House and the country. He lays down water lines as if that island were flooded. It is true that in one or two places where the banks are shelving, the water may come up on the shore a little distance, but a small bank of not over three feet high in any place, and not extending an entire length of more than 200 or 300 feet, would prevent one drop of water at the highest known flood injuring any portion of the island. The chief engineer proceeds:

"Having already stated how it is proposed to enlarge and deepen the present canal and the manner in which the material excavated is intended to be disposed of, namely, to strengthen the weakest and least secure parts of the present banks or those parts of them that are closest to the margin of the river, the aggregate extent of which, there is good reason to believe, is less than one-third of the whole distance, or less than three times the length of the two dams that would be required to connect Sheik's Island with the banks of the canal."

Well, Mr. Page, the chief engineer, when he penned that paragraph, must have reckoned on an entire want of knowledge by the Government, owing to his having concealed from them the true state of affairs, and he must have reckoned on their lack of knowledge in regard to the condition of the banks when he said that three times the length of the dams is the whole distance. Why, the length of the bank that is unsound, and which he cannot make safe by the plan he proposes, is between four and five miles, and the length of the dams which we ask him to construct so as to give us a free inland canal, safe at all times and which will furnish water for navigation and for manufacturing purposes, is as follows: One of about 300 feet and another of 600 feet, or altogether 900 feet, as against the distance of five miles. And we must not forget that the construction of those two dams would give us an inland lake over 15,000 feet long, with a depth at the head of not less than 18 feet and at the foot of 43 feet, an average depth of 34 feet and 1,200 feet wide. Is that not a desirable object to be attained, although Mr. Page says it would be six miles away from the foot of the Cornwall Canal. That is true; but the construction of that dam would give an unlimited water power in the village of Old Mill Roches. It would furnish power for many manufacturing establishments and would give employment to many thousands of hands, whereas to-day very frequently the mills in Cornwall are stopped for lack of water in the canal. Speaking of the water in the canal, let me point out to the Government the dangers of the tortuous entry to that canal. There could be nothing worse. Vessels frequently go against the piers and their cargoes are injured or lost. And we are to be told by the chief engineer of this country that we must construct the canal where defective, and that we must retain the same unsafe and unsatisfactory entrance? Let me call the attention of the Government to the change it is proposed to make in the construction of the canal. We say, and we say it advisedly, and I shall be able to prove it if the best engineering talent is consulted, that Lock 19 should not be put under contract at all, but the head of the canal should

be placed at Lock 20 instead of at the head of the Long Sault. Instead of taking vessels through lock after lock and consuming, as they do, from ten to twelve hours in passing from the head to the foot of the canal, by the plan proposed, which will make the canal safe, and so that it can never break away, we shall reduce the time consumed in passing from ten to twelve hours down to four to six hours. Is not this an important matter to be considered in the interests of the trade and commerce and navigation of this country, that we should not only minimise the expenses of transport, but we should also economise time, and by doing this necessarily lessen the charges attendant upon a great length of time being consumed in making the passage through a given portion of the canal. On this ground alone I think we are justified in calling the attention of the Government, and asking them to take some other advice in addition to that which they now possess. I want further to call attention to the disingenuous manner in which the chief engineer speaks of the construction of the dam. He says:

"Those who have given careful attention to such matters and are free to deal with the question on its merits,—"

I scarcely understand that phrase. My opinion is that every man in this country is free to deal with this question on its merits.—

"—will scarcely fail to observe that dams of such a height, made otherwise of moderate dimensions in the ordinary way, of the class of materials of which some of the banks are represented to consist, would not be likely to receive a favorable impression of their security."

Why should they be constructed in that way? Why should they be made of the material of which some of the banks are represented to consist? Why should they not be made of good material and be properly made? How, then, can he presume to condemn a work because of his own proposed construction of it in any but a proper and satisfactory manner?

"In fact they might reasonably be led to the conclusion that the adoption of the proposed means to meet uncertain risks might result in others quite as perplexing, if not even of a still more formidable kind, unless precautions were taken other than usual for even banks of the height required."

That would certainly be the case; and it would be his duty to see that they were properly constructed of good material and placed beyond a chance of breaking away. He, further, says:

"At places where the present banks are close to the margin of the river and the water alongside more than five feet in depth, a rough class of narrow crib-work will be placed to keep the bridge material in position until it is consolidated. The whole of the banks are afterwards to be well protected by a facing of stone."

It is said of a lady's letter that the gist is nearly always in the postscript. So it is in this document. We have before us his estimate of the cost of the construction of the works which he has proposed, but we have not before us the estimate of the cost of the stonework which he proposes to employ for the purpose of strengthening the banks made of the slush and soft material which he intends to throw over them. Practical men, who have been engaged in such work, and who have completed them and who know their cost, say that the strengthening of the bank with that crib-work and rough stone, as he calls it afterwards, would cost far more than the present work under contract. And Mr. Page himself admits that there is something wrong about his plans, because he says:

"It is, no doubt, true that placing the dredge material on the outer side is not the position where it would be most serviceable to banks of the description these are represented to be; still, the material will have a sectional area and extent, and be of a nature that, when fully consolidated, it would almost, if not altogether, retain the water in the canal were the old banks opposite the respective places where it is used removed altogether."

We desire to wholly retain the water; and this recalls to my memory the reports of Mr. Mills and Mr. Wright. Almost in identical words with theirs, he says:

"Of the feasibility, efficiency and safety of enlarging the present canal in the manner described in the specification on which the work is let, the slightest doubt is not entertained by me; but as regards forming the 'Sny' or north branch of the river into a navigable channel by means of dams at both ends of Sheik's Island, it must be confessed that my perception is quite as obtuse as was that of the late John B. Mills, who, it appears, failed to see the importance of it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, although he sees "the feasibility, efficiency and safety" of enlarging the canal in the way which he proposes, yet in another place he admits that the material is bad, and he proposes a plan by which, in raising the soft material and mixing it up in boxes and dredges, he hopes that at sometime or other it will become solid. He says that the plan proposed was objected to by Mr. Mills, and he adds, as regards forming the "Sny" or north branch of the river into a navigable channel by means of dams, that "his perception is quite as obtuse as that of the late John B. Mills, who, it appears, failed to see the importance of it." Would it be believed that Mr. John B. Mills did not fail to see the importance of it; will it be believed that Mr. John B. Mills recognised the importance of it, and that he was so fully alive to it, that, when leaving the canal, to the chief commissioners, he reported as follows. He was called upon to report as to the two plans: the Hooples' Creek plan, which I brought before the Government 10 years ago, as my right hon. friend at the head of the Government will remember, and his own plan along the river. Here are his words:

"It is a favorable feature of the river plan, that for so great a part of the distance you occupy the river, consequently that you have so much less canal in danger of derangement and requiring repair. The works in contemplation will certainly be safer at either extremes of the height of the floods than at any point between (considering the location as it respects the line the same); consequently, if the works are not quite up, then the nearer they are to the point of the water subsided the more safe they are. Upon the inland route you will observe that your works are not only up, but out of the way of danger from ice and flood. By these remarks, I wish not to disguise the fact, that there may be accidents and that there is danger of breaches and interruptions in the use of similar works, whatever be their situation and whatever be your forecast and precaution; but in the case before you, the probabilities of interruptions, derangements and expense of repairs in the one, hardly deserve to be named when considering the other.

"The river plan appears favorable, when considering the first expenditure."

And mark what he says:

"But before you pronounce it the economical, the judicious, and altogether the best plan to be pursued, you must consider what it accomplishes and what you have got for your money. In the first place, you have got an imperfect improvement, and one which does not secure the ends contemplated; secondly, the works and construction of the improvement, the business, the commercial operations of the whole country are jeopardized upon an unexpected and oft-occurring casualty, which may be avoided for the sum of £25,000 or £30,000; thirdly, in case of repairs being necessary they must be done at greater expense, and the same advantage cannot be taken of the season for repairs. These are matters which are perfectly within the comprehension of your board, and I hope they will receive the consideration which they deserve."

If a more emphatic or a more positive contradiction could be given to the report of Mr. Page by Mr. Mills, to whom he appeals, I should like to hear of it.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.—(Mr. Holton.)

#### QUEEN'S COLLEGE, KINGSTON.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 46) to amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.

Mr. BERGIN.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this Bill was referred to the Private Bills Committee, with the understanding that the House was not committed to its principle, to ascertain whether this Parliament had jurisdiction over the subject-matter with which the Bill deals. The committee, I understand, have reported the Bill back to this House without expressing any opinion on that question, leaving the responsibility of deciding it with the House itself. Now, I think it is pretty clear that this House has not jurisdiction over this subject, and if it has not, it would only be misleading the trustees of Queen's College to undertake to legislate on the subject at all. When we look at the provisions of the British North America Act, section 93, we find it there provided that the Local Legislatures of the different Provinces shall have exclusive control over the subject of education, subject to certain provisions, which are inserted, with a view to the protection of the various schools which have been established in the interest of the different religious denominations in the different Provinces. We have not the power to legislate on these subjects, but we may prevent the Provinces legislating in a way adverse to the interests of those on whose behalf those educational institutions have been established. I understand that the reason the authorities of Queen's College come here, is that they suppose, from the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Dobie vs. the Temporalities Board*, that this Parliament alone has jurisdiction over the subject. On looking at this decision, I do not think that it has any immediate bearing upon this case. It dealt with a subject wholly different from that of Queen's College at Kingston. In that decision, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that the Local Legislatures could not repeal or deal with the subject; and they did so on the ground that the interests sought to be affected were interests not exclusively confined to any one Province. The court says that although the Temporalities Board might have a forensic domicile in one Province, yet the actual domicile was not confined to one Province; that they find its properties are not under the exclusive control of the Legislature of any one Province; that one Province of Canada had as much right to legislate on the subject as another, and that by separate and distinct legislation in each particular Province the subject could not be effectively dealt with. And the board laid down this rule:

"The Quebec Act of 1775 does not deal directly with property or contracts affecting property, but with the civil rights of a corporation and of individuals present or future, for whose benefit the corporation was created and exists. If these rights and interests were capable of division according to the local position in Ontario and Quebec respectively, the Legislature of each Province would have power to deal with them so far as situate within the limits of its authority. If by a single Act of the Dominion Parliament, there had been constituted two separate corporations for the purpose of working, one a mine within the Province of Upper Canada, and the other a mine within the Province of Lower Canada, the Legislature of the Province of Quebec would clearly have had the authority to repeal the Act so far as it related to the latter mine and the corporation by which it is worked."

Then the board further says that:

"In every case where an Act is applicable to the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario can now be validly repealed by one of them, the result must be to leave the Act in full vigor in the other. But in the present case, the legislation of Quebec must necessarily affect the rights and status of the corporation as previously existing in Ontario, as well as the rights and interests of individuals incorporators in that Province."

So that the rule laid down by the Board of the Privy Council was that where a corporation has not its actual domicile exclusively within one Province, and where it had interests that were under the jurisdiction and control of the legislature in another Province, and it had been incorporated before the Union, neither Act could deal effectively with it, and it would be the duty of those who sought amendment or change to come to this Legislature, which alone could afford effective relief or legislate effectively in the case. But that is not the position of this corporation at all. This is a corporation created by Royal charter. It deals with

the subject of education, which is within the exclusive control of the Provinces, and we find, by looking at that royal charter, that it is there stated to be a corporation within the Province of Upper Canada. The charter reads:

"Whereas the establishment of a college within the Province of Upper Canada in North America in connection with the Church of Scotland—"

And so on. It is a corporation within the Province of Upper Canada; it has its actual domicile there, not merely a forensic domicile; and it cannot have its domicile anywhere else, because I find by a further provision in this Royal charter this paragraph, referring to the edifices that are to be erected for the use of the institution:

"Provided always, that such edifice or edifices shall not be more than three miles distant from St. Andrews in the town of Kingston, in the Province of Upper Canada."

So that the corporation is one having its domicile in Upper Canada exclusively. It is within the control of the Legislature of Upper Canada, and it has no interest or rights situated within any other Province. It is true that the Presbyterian Church, under whose control the management of this institution is, in a certain sense, placed, may have trustees appointed in other Provinces of the Dominion; but that is true of any corporation. Why, a corporation created by this Parliament may be composed altogether of foreigners. It is not necessary that any one of the incorporators should be a British subject or a resident of this country. We can incorporate it if we have the necessary jurisdiction. But this corporation, while the trustees may be residents of other Provinces and other portions of the Dominion, is situated within the Province of Ontario. Now let me suppose that the Province may think it necessary, in the public interest and in the interest of education, to exercise efficient control over the educational curriculum—it may be that the matriculation examination is not sufficiently strict, it may be that the course of study is not sufficiently comprehensive—the Provincial Legislature may say on what terms and conditions the power of granting degrees shall be continued to be held—it may legislate so as to bring this institution and others of a like character in line with the general educational policy of the country; but in order to do so, it must exercise control over this institution. Every one will admit that if this corporation was coming here seeking incorporation at our hands for the first time, it would be quite impossible for us to legislate on the subject. According to the provision of the British North America Act, not simply elementary education, but the whole subject of education is under the control of the different Provinces. There are certain rights with regard to education, as it existed at the time of Confederation, which are protected by giving this Government supervision over the Acts of the legislature, so as to see that the rights which were granted at the time that the constitution was adopted are not encroached upon or interfered with. But that is the extent of our authority. It does not go beyond that, and if any institution sought incorporation here for the first time, for the purpose of carrying on education, every one will admit that the subject matter is not within our control. We would say: You must go to the Local Legislature and seek for that legislation which you deem necessary in order to establish the institution you seek to erect. Unless it can be shown that this corporation has not its domicile exclusively within the Province of Ontario, it is perfectly clear we have no authority here to legislate upon the subject at all. There is the provision in the royal charter that it is an educational establishment to be established in Upper Canada, and there is the further provision that none of its educational buildings or works shall be carried on at a distance greater than three miles from the Church of St. Andrews, in the City of Kingston, and it is as exclusively within the control of the Provincial Legislature and as completely outside of the principles laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the

case of Dobie against the Temporalities Board, as any case can well be. In that case the court said:

"The domicile of the corporation is merely forensic and cannot alter its statutory incorporation as a board in and for the Province of Upper and Lower Canada."

But this has not merely a forensic domicile within the Province of Upper Canada. It is altogether within the Province of Upper Canada. The whole institution is within that Province, and the fact that the Board of Trustees, in whole or in part, may be taken from the other Provinces has nothing to do with the question of jurisdiction. Everyone knows that the Legislature of Ontario or the Legislature of the other Provinces might create a corporation, everyone of those members might come from outside of the Province in order to carry on business within the provinces and so might this Parliament. Therefore, we have to look at the objects and the purposes for which the charter of incorporation was granted, and we find that those purposes were exclusively within the Province of Ontario. That being the case, however necessary such a measure may be, however proper its provisions may be in themselves, this is not the proper Legislature in which to seek these amendments to the charter.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The objection which the hon. member (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) takes to the jurisdiction of this House in dealing with the matter embraced in this Bill, is, at first sight, perhaps, not to be wondered at, when we consider that the trustees, the governing body of Queen's College, at first held the same opinion as the hon. gentleman does. When the Presbyterian Churches of the whole of Canada were about to unite, in 1874, Queen's College, being then a college in connection with the old Presbyterian Church of Canada, made application to the Provincial Legislature of Ontario for an Act empowering them to hold the same relation to the new Presbyterian Church of Canada as they did to the old Presbyterian Church of Scotland in Canada; and, under that Act, they continued to govern the college for five or six years. During those years, as many hon. gentlemen will remember, the suit of Dobie *versus* The Temporalities Board of the Church of Scotland was taken to the Privy Council, and there it was decided that the Act of the Local Legislature in regard to the Temporalities Board was invalid; and, in order to legalise those proceedings, they had to come to this Legislature. Some clergymen of the Presbyterian Church immediately filed a bill in chancery to restrain the Board of Trustees of Queen's College from dealing with the funds under the Act of the Province of Ontario, on the ground that it was *ultra vires*. The governing body of Queen's College took advice on that matter, and they were told that there were grave doubts as to that Act, in consequence of the decision of the Privy Council. In consequence of that decision, and of the litigation which was brought against them, they came to this Legislature, and in 1882 they obtained an Act which passed, after discussion in the Committee, after a division in the Private Bills Committee, on the question of jurisdiction, and under that Act they have been governing the institution ever since. Now, it is desired, and it is necessary, to get some changes made in that Act, and I submit that the trustees have no other place to go to for those amendments than this Legislature. Surely they cannot be sent to a Provincial Legislature to amend an Act of this Parliament. It is here they must come. You cannot state that this Parliament can never touch this law, because there are some doubts as to the jurisdiction of this House, or of the Provincial Legislature. The Act is upon our Statute book, and if the authorities of Queen's College choose to come here to obtain the amendments, let them take the responsibility. I hold, however, that this is the proper place for them to come to. Queen's College was chartered by Royal Charter in 1841. It obtained

its charter under one of the ancient prerogatives of the Crown, from the Queen herself, and the charter was granted to the corporators named, and to "all and every such other person and persons as now is or are, or shall or may at any time or times hereafter be ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, or members of the said Presbyterian Church in such connection, and in full communion with the said Presbyterian Church." Observe that this is not the Presbyterians in the Province of Upper Canada, or the Presbyterians in the city of Kingston, but every member of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in communion with the Church of Scotland throughout the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. These are the incorporators; these are the people who form that corporation. They were in the Province of Lower Canada as well as in the Province of Upper Canada. I submit that the Legislature of Ontario has no power to dissolve that corporation, and the Legislature of Quebec has no power to dissolve that corporation. That is clearly laid down in the decision of the Privy Council in *Dobie vs. The Temporalities Board*. They are dealing with a similar case, where the Legislature of Quebec endeavored to deal with the Temporalities Board. That Board was composed of members of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, but the judges held that:

"The Quebec Act deals directly with the constitution and privileges of a corporation created by an Act of the Province of Canada, and having its corporate existence and corporate rights in the Province of Ontario as well as in the Province of Quebec. The professed object of the Act and the effect of its provisions is not to impose conditions on the dealings of the corporation with its funds within the Province of Quebec, but to destroy, in the first place, the old corporation and create a new one, and, in the second place, to alter materially the class of persons interested in the funds of the corporation."

There is just the point. What authority has the Legislature of Ontario to alter the class of persons interested in the funds of this corporation? Here is a corporation applying to both the Provinces, having funds scattered over both, authorised to hold meetings in either of those Provinces and compelled to advertise the meetings of trustees in both the Provinces, and to address notices to the trustees in both those Provinces. What authority has the Legislature of one of those Provinces to alter materially the class of persons interested in the funds of the corporation? That is the case in regard to Queen's College. Then the Judicial Committee says:

"According to the principles established by the judgment of this Board in the cases already referred to, the first step to be taken, with a view to test the validity of an Act of the Provincial Legislature, is to consider whether the subject-matter of the Act falls within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in section 92. If it does not, then the Act is of no validity. If it does, then these further questions may arise, viz., whether, notwithstanding that it is so, the subject of the Act does not also fall within one of the enumerated classes of subjects in section 91, and whether the power of the Provincial Legislature is or is not thereby overborne."

And again the Judicial Committee says:

"If the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec were allowed jointly to abolish the Board of 1858, which is one corporation in and for both Provinces, they could only create in its room two corporations, one of which would exist in and for Ontario and be a foreigner in Quebec, and the other of which would be foreign to Ontario but a domestic institution in Quebec."

These incorporators are members of the Presbyterian Church in Canada which extends over both the old Provinces. They have joined with the other Presbyterian bodies all through this Dominion of Canada. They came to this Legislature in 1882 to ask that all these members of the new Presbyterian Church in Canada should be substituted for the old incorporators, who were simply the Presbyterian Church in the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. It being, then, a fact that every member of the Presbyterian Church throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, is one of the incorporators of this college. I hold that this is the

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

proper place for them to come to get an Act relating to it. But the hon. gentleman says that it comes within clause 93 of the British North America Act, which says that in and for each Province the Provincial Legislatures shall have exclusive jurisdiction in regard to matters of education. Now I submit, with all confidence, that the meaning of that clause is the public system of education. It does not mean that it shall have jurisdiction over a corporation which has education for its object. You might as well say that if all the publishers in Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Toronto were to join together and form one corporation for the purpose of publishing educational works and to seek a Dominion charter, this Legislature would have no jurisdiction, because the object of the corporation related to matters of education. I submit that is not the meaning of the word "education" in this clause, it is simply the system of education. The hon. gentleman says that the Provincial Legislature may change the curriculum. It may do so, and the college authorities will then have to get into accord with whatever system the Local Legislature may adopt. But the Local Legislature cannot go beyond that, it cannot change the incorporators, it cannot abolish the corporation, it cannot confiscate its funds, or deal with any of those funds which are situated in another Province. Another reason for coming to this Legislature is that this college may hold property in all the Provinces. The incorporators of this college are situated in every Province in this Dominion, and there are persons who, by will and otherwise, may become benefactors of the college, it may become possessed of property in all the Provinces, and the college desires the right to hold this property. The hon. gentleman said that they might change the subject of education or the curriculum. We have an instance in which a Province may legislate in regard to business carried on by a corporation, and that corporation has to conform to it, I allude to the question of insurance companies. The hon. gentleman will remember that there are companies incorporated here to carry on business over the Dominion, yet they must conform to local laws in regard to policies, to the conditions under which their policies are underwritten. That is a very similar case, in which the object of the corporation is to do insurance business, and it has to conform to the local laws in regard to the condition under which their policies are underwritten. Just so, the object of this corporation may be to impart education, and in regard to the curriculum or any other matter touching the system of education, it may have to conform to the local laws. There is another argument which has been mentioned to me, and there is something in it. This charter is granted by virtue of the Queen's prerogative, and the hon. member who has raised this question of jurisdiction is well aware, as a constitutional lawyer, that none of the Queen's prerogatives can be altered, or amended, or affected, except with the Queen's consent. Now, the Provincial Legislatures have no authority to affect, alter, or to modify, any of the Queen's prerogatives, because she is not a party to the legislation. In the Province of New Brunswick that principle is recognised, because there the Queen is not, even by name, a party to the legislation; she is not mentioned in the Acts of the Legislature. The judges of the Supreme Court, Judges Taschereau, Gwynne and Henry, have all laid down in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, that the Queen is not a party to the legislation of the Local Legislature; it is the Lieutenant Governor who legislates there, he represents the royal authority, and therefore those Legislatures cannot do away with, or modify, or affect any of the Queen's prerogatives; therefore they could not amend, or alter a charter granted by virtue of the Queen's prerogative. I do not think it is necessary to go further into this argument, because the fact remains that this is a corporation, not for Provincial purposes, but for Dominion purposes; it is a corporation existing in the Provinces of

Ontario and Quebec; it is a corporation which has been already dealt with by this Legislature, and the only way that we can get that Act amended is by another Act of this Legislature. On this account I appeal confidently to this House and ask them to pass this Bill, and if any hon. gentleman have doubts, let them institute the proceedings and the governing body of Queen's College would be very glad to test the question in any court.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has spoken about the Queen's prerogative not being subject to local legislation. I entirely disagree with him on that point. I think that the Local Legislature, within its peculiar jurisdiction, is supreme, and has as much right to interfere with and alter a charter within the Province, as this Dominion Parliament can have in regard to matters within its jurisdiction. My hon. friend has referred to the legislation of New Brunswick since Confederation, and he says that Her Majesty's name is omitted in such legislation. To my recollection, and I am pretty positive, even before Confederation, the Queen's name was never used in the legislation of New Brunswick. But it seems to me that that question cannot apply to this case. Now, Mr. Speaker, with all my anxiety to carry out the views of Queen's College, the question that has been raised here is a very important constitutional one. When the Act of 1882 was before this House I believe there was a discussion in the Committee of Private Bills, but in this House the Bill passed the various stages without discussion and the question was not brought up. Now, I think there was a broad distinction between the case of Dobie and the Temporalities Board and this case. In the case of Dobie there was an interference by the Legislature of Quebec with an Act of the Province of Canada. The Act of the Legislature interfered with the property not only of a corporation created by the Legislature of Canada, but of a corporation created in the Province of Ontario as well as the Province of Quebec. Therefore the Privy Council held that the Legislature of Quebec had no authority to interfere with a corporation which had its existence under a statute of Canada. A corporation having its corporate existence and rights in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec could not be interfered with by the legislation of a particular Province, neither the Legislature of Ontario nor the Legislature of Quebec could interfere with that corporation. We find that the Temporalities Act, 22 Victoria, chapter 66, provided that while the funds were for the purpose of the sustenance of the ministers and missionaries of the church, they were also to be applied towards the construction and maintenance of churches and manses in connection with said church, throughout Canada; so that in reality the legislation of Quebec, by the Act which they attempted to pass, was declared *ultra vires* by the Privy Council, as an attempt to interfere with the matters in the Province of Ontario as well as in the Province of Quebec. There is a distinction between this case and the present position of Queen's College. The charter was granted in Upper Canada at a time shortly after the union of the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. The college as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), had a domicile conferred on it by that charter, and if so it is a corporation exclusively within the Province of Ontario. It has been said that the corporation might wish to acquire property in another Province. I do not see that even if it is within the jurisdiction of Ontario, that will prevent it holding property in another Province. It has been decided that if a corporation in Ontario held property in Quebec it was subject to the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Quebec for the purpose of taxing that property, but beyond that no power existed against the corporation. So that even although this corporation might be exclusively within the jurisdiction of Ontario, it would not prevent

it holding property in another Province. In this Dominion there are other corporations which have royal charters. The college where I was educated holds a royal charter, and is probably the oldest in the Dominion, King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia. Could this Dominion Parliament set to work and interfere with that charter? So in regard to the University of Fredericton. I cannot speak with respect to the University of Toronto; but if the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is correct, the Dominion Parliament can interfere with these three universities, and to carry out the principle it will be necessary to practically take those universities which are within the jurisdiction of the Provinces and which were created by royal charter and place them under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. I fail to see that this can legally be done, although I confess the question is surrounded by difficulty, but at the same time I must say, after giving the subject a good deal of attention, there is great force in the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in this case. So far as this college is concerned, and notwithstanding the fact that we passed in 1882 an Act which so far has not been called in question before any legal tribunal, this question having now come fairly before the House we are bound to consider whether it is one on which we can legislate. In my opinion the principles laid down by the Privy Council in the case of Dobie *versus* The Temporalities Fund are not applicable to the case of this college. The Privy Council in that case were dealing with a matter which existed in the old Provinces, and it was sought to repeal an Act of Canada comprising Ontario and Quebec. In this case we are only interfering with rights created in Ontario and with a subject that falls within the jurisdiction of that Province. With respect to the 93rd section, the hon. gentleman admits that so far as regards the system of education and the curriculum is concerned that subject falls within the local jurisdiction. The hon. gentleman admits that principle, but he says in regard to Queen's College that the internal corporation and arrangements may be within the province of the Dominion Parliament. Then every high school may be placed in the same category; but if the subject of education has been entrusted to the Provincial Legislatures, surely all incidents must have been given to them. My feeling would be to support this Act and to assent to the proposed legislation, but I feel bound to express my views on the subject, which I admit to be surrounded with difficulty, but it seems to me after hearing the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that my views are in accordance with those expressed by that hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid that in the short time remaining for the disposal of Private Bills it may be almost impossible, if the objections are insisted on, to close the discussion. If hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken intend to insist on those objections it is not worth while, I confess, to proceed; but, perhaps, they have merely spoken for the purpose of asserting their view of the jurisdiction of this Parliament and they will permit the Bill to pass. If the Bill is to be opposed I shall offer a few observations in regard to it. There has been much argument offered on both sides in which I cannot concur, but the strong point in favor of the passing of this Bill, if it is a Bill which commends itself to the House on its merits, is this: that this Parliament in 1832 asserted its jurisdiction and passed an Act by which it arranged the organisation of this college. I must assume that in passing that Act it made provisions and regulations which were unwise or inconvenient in their operation, and the promoters who submitted to that Act in 1882, come now to the same body and ask for the removal of those unwise or inconvenient restraints. I think the House under such circumstances ought not to decline jurisdiction, especially in regard to a Private Bill. If this were a Bil.



affecting, to any considerable extent, public interests, it could, perhaps, be urged with a good deal of force that we should not affect the rights of the public by legislating in a doubtful case of jurisdiction; but this is an application by a private party, whose application will fail in effect, even though we should pass the Bill, if it be decided that the matter is beyond our control; but, having taken the control in 1882, having passed a statute—and it must be admitted that it would be a very dangerous and bold measure for any Provincial Legislature to amend the Act of this Parliament—I think this Parliament should not stultify itself now by saying: “We adopted in 1882 and imposed on you restraints which were improper, and we now decline to exercise our power or authority over our own statute.” It seems to me this is not a statute, as it was contended by the hon. member for Bo. hwell (Mr. Mills), in relation to the subject of education. I agree with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), that the Provincial Legislature, notwithstanding our Act of 1882, and notwithstanding that we may pass this Bill to-night, has such ample power over education, that, in dealing with the subject of education, it may prevent this college teaching in Ontario; but it does not by any means follow that because the Provincial Legislature has control over education, or control over civil rights, or control over contracts, this Parliament may not have power to create a body for the purpose of carrying on education in more than one of the Provinces, as it may in relation to insurance, as has been decided, which is no more a matter within our control than is the subject of education. When we look at the charter under which the college was constituted, we find it was not, as was intimated, a charter of a provincial character, but a royal charter having distinct relation to the whole Province of Canada. The Province of Canada subsequently became divided, and the question is what Legislature is competent to repeal or amend its provisions, since the division of the Province of Canada into the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. How far the case is analogous to that of *Dobie vs. The Temporalities Fund* is to a great extent a question of fact, and I am not in possession of the facts stated in the discussion, and I was not on the Committee so as to be able to see how far the facts are within that case, but it is clearly a matter which may be within our authority under the rule laid down by the Privy Council, and it would be distinctly so, I humbly submit, if this corporation were created by royal charter, which was equivalent to a statute of the old Province of Canada for purposes which extended to the whole Province of Canada. It has property in the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec which it is necessary to administer under the authority of a new statute. As I said before I do not pretend to be so intimately acquainted with the facts as to be able to discuss that; I merely make this argument for the purpose of expressing my views, that it is not a statute dealing with the subject-matter of education; it professes to deal with a corporation established for the purpose of carrying on its operations in two of the Provinces of Canada. It has been treated by this Parliament as such and this Parliament has imposed restraints upon it as such, and I think it is only reasonable and fair that we should give the legislation which is necessary to remove restraints which we ourselves have imposed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If this were an ordinary statute of a private nature which did not involve the acceptance of a principle on the part of this House, it might perhaps be possible that the House would take the position the hon. Minister asks us to take. But as my friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) has shown, if we once assert the right to deal with this college we may be asked perhaps to-morrow or the day after, to assert a similar right with regard to other colleges such as Windsor, N.S., or the other college he has

Sir JOHN THOMPSON,

named. I may say that the balance of the argument appears to me to be very strongly against our having the power to pass this statute. The hon. Minister who has just sat down says it appears to him to be a very strong point that we did in 1882 exercise the power to pass a statute amending this charter. It has been already pointed out that that Act went through this House *sub silentio*. Our power to pass it was not criticised or called into question at the time, and it seems to me loose argument to advance, that if we have been wrong once we are to perpetuate that wrong year after year. If we have usurped jurisdiction one year, this House should not be called upon to follow up that usurpation. The hon. gentleman says, that this House having passed the Act and attempted to exercise jurisdiction it would be a very strong action on the part of the Local Legislature to attempt to repeal it. The hon. gentleman will see at once, that if we passed that Act without having jurisdiction to pass it, it requires no Act of the Local Legislature to repeal, but the statute itself is void, so that it stands not upon the question as to whether an attempt is made by the Local Legislature to repeal it, but on the point whether or not we had power to pass it. The question comes up whether or not the charter which it is now sought to amend was an incorporation for old Canada, or simply for the Province of Ontario. It strikes me that the hon. Minister is hardly correct in assuming that it is a corporation having its existence and rights in both Provinces. It is expressly laid down in the preamble to the charter that it is to be a college within the Province of Upper Canada. The preamble says:

“Whereas the establishment of a college in the Province of Upper Canada, in British North America, in connection with the Church of Scotland.”

And further on it states:

“It shall be known in deed and law by the name and style of the Queen’s College at Kingston.”

And again in the charter it provides:

“We further will that the trustees and their successors shall have sufficient power and authority to erect an edifice or edifices for the uses of the college, provided always that such edifice or edifices shall be not more than three miles distant from St. Andrews’ Church, in the town of Kingston, in the Province of Upper Canada.

So that the whole object and purview of the royal charter would appear to have been a statute of incorporation in the Province of Upper Canada. If that is the case, it appears to me to be almost conclusive against our right to legislate upon it. The case which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) cites in support of his argument appeared to me from the very first, to be dead against him. That was a decision upon an Act of the Quebec Legislature. That Act of the Quebec Legislature attempted to interfere with, and in fact, to destroy a corporation which had been created by the Province of Old Canada. A corporation was created by the Province of Old Canada, having its rights and existence in both of the Provinces, therefore, neither the Province of Ontario nor the Province of Quebec could attempt to alter that charter, for it was not within their powers. The power to alter any Act of the old Province of Canada, as I understand that decision, was limited simply to the direct powers of legislation which each Province had on the same subject. They decided in that case that this corporation having its corporate existence and rights in both Provinces could not be repealed or modified by the resolution of either Province, and, therefore, the only place they could come to was the general Parliament of Canada. The balance of arguments seem to be strongly in favor of the position that the charter we seek to amend is that of a corporation not having its rights and existence in both Provinces, but in the Province of Upper Canada, now Ontario, alone. If that is so, it seems to me that the Province of Ontario alone can legislate upon it. I think it would be a dangerous usurpation on our part, if we come to the conclu-

sion that we have no jurisdiction here, to exercise jurisdiction simply because we made a mistake in the same direction some years ago when the attention of the House was not called to it.

Mr. CASEY. I have to again protest against the jurisdiction of this House in dealing with this matter. As my friend who has just sat down has pointed out, if we deal with the affairs of Queen's College, Kingston, we have a right to deal with the affairs of Victoria College or of University College, Toronto, or any of the Catholic colleges in this city, or in Toronto, or in the Province of Quebec. I want to call the attention of the House to the importance of the question, and especially I want to call the attention of my friends who represent ridings in the Province of Quebec. If we have a right to deal with this matter, we have also a right to deal with the funds and with the administration of every Catholic college of the Province of Quebec. I say, therefore, that we have to look at what we are doing and to understand our position. I think the constitutional question has been fully discussed, and that it has been demonstrated to this House that we have no jurisdiction. Do our friends in Quebec want to have their colleges put under the jurisdiction of this Parliament?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. CASEY. I think they do not. As a Methodist and a Protestant, I do not want to have the Methodist College in the Province of Ontario put under the jurisdiction of this House. For these reasons, pertaining entirely to the jurisdiction of this House, and without the least criticism of the changes proposed to be made in the constitution of Queen's College, I am opposed to this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved the third reading of the Bill.

House divided :

YEAS :  
Messieurs

- |                     |                        |                       |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Armstrong,          | Hesson,                | Mitchell,             |
| Bain (Soulanges),   | Hickey,                | Moffat,               |
| Barnard,            | Holton,                | Mulock,               |
| Bell,               | Hudspeth,              | Paterson (Brant),     |
| Bergin,             | Ives,                  | Perley,               |
| Boisvert,           | Jamieson,              | Platt,                |
| Bowell,             | Joncas,                | Porter,               |
| Bowman,             | Kenny,                 | Purcell,              |
| Boyle,              | Kirk,                  | Putnam,               |
| Brien,              | Kirkpatrick,           | Riopel,               |
| Brown,              | Labelle,               | Robertson,            |
| Burdett,            | Landerkin,             | Roome,                |
| Cameron,            | Lang,                  | Rowand,               |
| Campbell,           | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Rykert,               |
| Cargill,            | La Rivière,            | Scarth,               |
| Carling,            | Lépine,                | Scriver,              |
| Charlton,           | Lister,                | Semple,               |
| Choquette,          | Lovitt,                | Skinner,              |
| Cimon,              | Macdonald (Sir John),  | Small,                |
| Cochrane,           | Macdonald (Huron),     | Smith (Ontario),      |
| Corby,              | Macdowall,             | Somerville,           |
| Coulombe,           | McGuill,               | Sproule,              |
| Davis,              | McDonald (Victoria),   | Sutherland,           |
| Dawson,             | McDonald (Pictou),     | Taylor,               |
| Denison,            | McIntyre,              | Thérien,              |
| Dewdney,            | McKay,                 | Thompson (Sir John),  |
| Eisenhauer,         | McKeen,                | Tisdale,              |
| Ellis,              | McMillan (Huron),      | Trow,                 |
| Ferguson (Benfrew), | McMullen,              | Vanasse,              |
| Ferguson (Welland), | McNeill,               | Waldie,               |
| Gillmor,            | Madill,                | Wallace,              |
| Gordon,             | Mars,                  | Watson,               |
| Grandbois,          | Marshall,              | Wilson (Elgin),       |
| Guillet,            | Masson,                | Wilson (Lennox).—104. |
| Haggart,            | Meigs,                 |                       |

NAYS :  
Messieurs

- |            |          |                      |
|------------|----------|----------------------|
| Audet,     | Edgar,   | Langellier (Quebec), |
| Béchar, d, | Edwards, | Laurier,             |

- Bernier,  
Casey,  
Casgrain,  
Culter,  
Cook,  
Couture,  
Davies,  
Deessaint,  
Doyon,  
Dupont,

- Fiset,  
Flynn,  
Freeman,  
Gauthier,  
Gecfrion,  
Gigault,  
Godbout,  
Guay,  
Labrosse,  
Langellier (Montmorcy)

- Lavergne,  
Mills (Bothwell),  
Rinfret,  
Ste. Marie,  
Turcot,  
Weldon (Albert),  
Weldon (St. John),  
Wilson (Argenteuil),  
Wood (Brockville).—36.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 3) to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals. He said: In moving, Mr. Speaker, that you do leave the Chair, I desire to emphasise the statement I made before the House on a late occasion, that understanding that certain hon. gentlemen have some objections to some of the latter clauses of this Bill, I propose in committee to make such modifications as I am sure will satisfy the House.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee)

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman who moved this Bill into Committee just now, declined, in all the discussions which have taken place upon the Bill, to withdraw or amend any of the clauses. As I understand the Bill, there is only one important clause in it, about which there is any particular question; the whole Bill, as was conceded in a previous discussion, depends upon that clause. At this stage of the matter, I do not propose to detain the Committee by any discussion. I move, seconded by Mr. Taylor, that the Committee do now rise.

Motion agreed to: yeas, 67; nays, 60.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2), an Act to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. When this Bill was before the Committee, we placed before the Committee the Bill which had been introduced in the House of Representatives at Washington last year, upon which a joint report had been passed and which, it was supposed, had become law. The committee were of opinion that it would be proper and right to adopt exactly the offer of the United States Government in this matter, and we adopted the form of the offer of reciprocity in wrecking which had been made by the Government of the United States. On that understanding I was ordered to report the Bill, in conformity with the one we understood had been passed at Washington. Subsequently I held communication with some authorities at Washington and have been officially informed that the joint resolution in wrecking last year failed to pass, the reason being, I suppose, that the Bill which was introduced here last Session, after passing a certain stage, had been thrown out and therefore the Americans would not proceed further with their measure. That leaves the law at Washington exactly as it was in 1878, and that is the offer which has been several years before us. This being the case, I now ask the Committee to change my Bill so that it will read exactly in accordance with that offer. The Bill now before you is a little larger and wider in scope, but by changing a few words it will meet the case as it stands, and be exactly in the same terms as the offer of the United States. The following is the law in the United States:—

"That Canadian vessels of all descriptions may render aid or assistance to Canadian or other vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada, and it is provided that this Act shall not take effect until proclamation by the President declaring that the privilege of aiding American or other vessels wrecked or disabled in American waters contiguous to the United States, has been extended by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and declaring this Act to be in force. And providing further that this Act shall cease to be in force from and after the date of the proclamation by the President to the effect that said reciprocal privilege has been withdrawn or revoked by the said Government of the Dominion of Canada."

That is the law in the United States. Now, I propose to make our law an exact acceptance of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are in favor of reciprocity, then?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; the Bill will read:

"United States vessels of all descriptions may render aid or assistance to United States or other vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States."

Then the 2nd clause which extends it to the waters of the Welland Canal and the Sault Ste. Marie Canal will be struck out as that was the provision made in Washington last year which is not law. That was the most material change. The third clause will provide:

"This Act shall come into force from and after the date to be named by proclamation of the Governor General, which proclamation may be issued when the Governor in Council is assured that the privileges of aiding Canadian or other vessels in United States waters contiguous to the Dominion of Canada will be extended to Canadian vessels of all descriptions."

The subsequent sub-section is left as it is.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be as well to strike out the words "contiguous to the United States?" They might lead to some misapprehension at times. As the Bill is intended to apply generally wherever assistance is required I do not see the object of keeping in these words.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think it is better to take the words exactly of the American Bill and leave it to the Department of Customs to make regulations for the working of the Act. I think that by joint communication, regulations will be established which will enable the Act to be worked satisfactorily.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is something in that, but at the same time it leaves the subject open to question, and in the event of the services of an American tug being available in our waters on the maritime coast, that would hardly be covered perhaps by the words in this section. I do not see the object of keeping them in since the view is to render perfect freedom to the two countries in that respect.

Mr. KENNY. I differ with the hon. gentleman. I think it is eminently desirable we should leave the wording of the Act as it is. As I understand the Act it will not apply to the waters of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no question in the wording of the Act as suggested by the hon. member for Halifax. As I understand the Bill, it will not apply to the Maritime Provinces as it does to the inland waters. If you do that you will have no reciprocity, because that is the point the Americans refuse in connection with their refusal to extend the coasting trade to both countries. If I were to express my individual feeling I would have no objection to that but it is alleged that the feeling of the House and the country is to accept the Bill as passed by the Congress of the United States and place the United States in the exact position in which they propose to place Canada, but not beyond that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to see the Minister of Customs takes a different view to my colleague, and also to notice that the mover of this Bill considers that the object he has in view to allow foreign vessels to be used in our maritime waters to be reached by the clause as it now stands. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, in reply

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

to my remarks, said that was his intention. If the hon. the Minister of Customs sees no objection on the part of the Government, I do not see the use of keeping in a phrase which may be liable to misconstruction.

Mr. MITCHELL. There cannot be a doubt about the effect of this Bill. My hon. friend's objection, it appears to me, is quite unnecessary, because it does not apply. We give permission to American vessels to relieve vessels in distress in proximity to the coasts of Canada, and that will not only apply to the upper lakes but both waters of the St. Lawrence. It will apply not only both upper lakes and to the waters of the St. Lawrence, but to the whole coasts of Canada.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My colleague says not.

Mr. MITCHELL. Your colleague is not always correct, as I think you will admit, and, if you had been on the other side, you would probably have been found advocating what he is advocating now. That is the experience of this House in regard to the senior member and the junior member for Halifax. However, a higher authority than the senior or junior member for Halifax, the Minister of Customs, has stated what interpretation his department will place on this Bill, and therefore there cannot be a doubt about it. I did not, however, rise for the purpose of stating what I have stated, but I desired to say that I was delighted to hear one statement which was made by the Minister of Customs, who, no doubt, speaks as the representative of the Government of which he is a member. He says that he proposes to give the Americans just that amount of reciprocity which they give us. That is a sound policy, to have reciprocal trade and reciprocal relations and reciprocal legislation, where we can arrange it. I hope the hon. gentleman will sustain that policy, not only during this Legislature, but if, unfortunately for the country, he and his Government should be maintained in power for another term, and not only in regard to such reciprocity as is referred to in this Bill, but wherever freedom of intercourse between our country and the United States is demanded; that he will be prepared in all cases to give the Americans all the reciprocal legislation which they give us, and that our policy in that regard may be based upon the reciprocal legislation passed on the other side.

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume, from the feeling that evidently exists in the country, that a somewhat different course will be taken in this House on this occasion from what was taken a year ago, but I desire to call the attention of the House to certain facts connected with this question. This offer of reciprocity in wrecking, which comes from the United States, is a reversal of the policy adopted by that country in 1874, when they enacted the very regulations about which they now complain. The action of the American Government in that regard compelled the Government of Canada to take the course which they did.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have come to a better state of mind.

Mr. CHARLTON. They may have come to a better state of mind, but at that time the American Government refused to accept our offer of reciprocity in coasting, which is contained in 33 Victoria, chapter 14, section 2. They wished to secure from us an advantage which we enjoyed in that matter, without giving a proper return, and that forced upon us the course which the Canadian Government took. I am quite willing and quite ready to accord to the American people any fair measure of reciprocity, but I advocate it so far only as reciprocity will be conducive to our interests as well as to theirs. The reciprocity which gives away any advantage which we enjoy without our getting anything in return is one which I do not advocate, and shall not support. When the American Government took the course to which I refer, it led to the formation of Tug Associations in

Canada. There was a tug company formed, of which the hon. gentleman who was formerly the member for Monck was a member. It was an efficient tug company which was formed at Windsor, and that has been succeeded by other tug companies and by wrecking companies. These companies have been formed in consequence of the action of the American Government, and I contend that the amount which has been invested in that interest in this country is deserving of some consideration at the hands of this House, and that any measure which will sacrifice those interests for the benefit of a foreign interest is neither reciprocity nor a measure which should commend itself to our consideration. While I am willing to abate very much of the ground which was taken last year, and to accept a slight modification of the American offer, yet I do think that the American offer should be modified, as I will shortly show. The view of the Government in 1879 is shown by the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House in the debate which took place on the motion for papers in regard to the seizure of the *Sarah E. Bryant*, which came to the relief of a vessel which was wrecked on the coast of Lake Erie. A charge was made that the Canadian Government had refused to allow aid and assistance to be given to that vessel from a foreign country, and had left people to perish on the wreck. The humanity cry was raised. The fact was that the Canadian tug *Jessie* had taken the passengers off before the American vessel came, and the latter came afterwards to wreck the vessel. She was seized under the law at that time, and was prevented from carrying out her plan. In the discussion, Sir John Macdonald said:

"The hon. gentleman correctly describes the position. It had been found that, with a larger capital engaged in wrecking, all the work was done by Americans. Preference was always given, it was found, to American vessels, and Canadian vessels were charged exorbitant prices. In self-defence, a Canadian tug company was got up, to give our wreckers a chance in the business, the profits of which would be considerable, as the largest number of wrecks took place on our coast. As soon as the owners of tug boats in the United States found this out, this measure was introduced in Congress. It was a sham reciprocity, which would not have been proposed had it not been for this order by the late Government. The order was quite explicit enough. A wrecked vessel was still afloat, and, by the maritime law, all vessels could go to its rescue and claim salvage, but a vessel once fairly ashore stood in quite a different position. It was especially necessary along our line of water that our Customs should not be interfered with. A vessel might be of small value and have a most valuable cargo, and she could be wrecked and the goods smuggled into our country. This order was made to prevent anything of that kind. When the papers came down, the matter could be discussed at greater length."

Now, in regard to the conduct of the Canadian Government in reference to wrecks, with regard to permits which have been granted to American tugs to engage in the relief of American vessels, it can be shown that the conduct of the Canadian Government has been in all cases humane and liberal, and that in no instance has the American Government granted a permit to a Canadian vessel to assist another Canadian vessel in American waters. I have here a short list of permits granted to American vessels to assist other American vessels in Canadian waters, when there was no question whatever of the saving of life. On 22nd May, 1883, the schooner *Ellsworth*, ashore near Sarnia, was permitted to use American tugs. On 12th September, 1883, the schooner *Winslow*, ashore near Point Edward, was permitted to use American tugs. On 18th October, 1883, the International Wrecking Company were permitted to use American tugs at Southampton. On 13th November, 1883, the International Wrecking Company were permitted to use the American tugs *Balize* and *Smith*, wrecking at Southampton. On 22nd November, 1883, the schooner *Carter*, ashore near Kincardine, was permitted to use American tugs. On 7th May, 1884, the American tug *Smith*, with wrecking outfit, was permitted to work at the wreck of the steamer *Manitoba* at Southampton, and the schooner *Carter* at Kincardine. On 9th April, 1885, permission was given to an American scow, with wrecking outfit, to raise the tug *Heron*,

sunk in the Georgian Bay. On 18th March, 1885, permission was given to one J. Donnelly to use American tools, &c., in relieving the propeller *Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie, in Canadian waters. On 30th May, 1885, permission was given to J. Donnelly to use United States tugs to relieve the *City of Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie. On 10th October, 1885, permission was given to the steam barge *J. H. Fairwell* to relieve the schooner *Godfrey*, ashore at Stag Island. Here are numerous cases where the Canadian Government has permitted the use of American wrecking plant in cases where there was no imminent danger of loss of life or property, because these vessels were stranded in places where wrecking operations had to be undertaken for their relief. Now, neither the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) nor any other member of this House can point to one instance where the American Government has acted with equal liberality towards ourselves. In the case of the wreck of the *Algoma* in Lake Superior the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not allowed to use their own plant in relieving the vessel, and they were compelled to send from that point to Port Huron, 600 miles away, for wrecking apparatus; so that the contrast between the conduct of the two Governments is very greatly to the credit and favor of the Canadian Government. But the position of the matter, as I have said, is one in which I suppose a modification of our law will have to be made, and I shall propose a very slight modification in this Bill. We are so situated that no wreck can be relieved on the American coast of the great lakes without the tug, if it is a Canadian tug, being engaged in coasting, because there is not a single dry dock from Buffalo westward to the head of Lake Superior, on the Canadian side, except on the Georgian Bay at Owen Sound and Collingwood. There are two dry docks at Buffalo, two or three in Cleveland, one in Toledo, two in Detroit, and two in Bay City, but on the whole stretch of that coast there is not a dry dock on the Canadian side except the two mentioned, which are far from the great route of commerce on the lakes. If a Canadian tug relieves an American vessel on the American shore she must necessarily engage in towing and in coasting in order to deliver that vessel to a dry dock; she has got to tow her to an American port to deliver her to an American dry dock, and in doing that she is contravening the American navigation laws. Now, I think, from the evidence I have of the advantages the American marine is likely to secure from this concession, that they will make other slight concessions in this matter. It must be borne in mind that the majority of the wrecks, except those on Lake Michigan, are upon the Canadian coast; it must also be borne in mind that the insurance companies, with the exception of the Western of Canada, are all in the United States. I presume three-fourths, perhaps nine-tenths of the risks are written by American insurance companies. Now, whenever a vessel is wrecked the insurance company having a risk upon that vessel, makes arrangements for her wrecking, and in all cases where that company is an American one, the American wrecking company will get the job.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not necessarily.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; by arrangement between these companies and the officers of wrecking associations, the job is given to an American company; and in this case you are simply giving away all the business that we might secure for our own companies, and allowing it to go into the hands of American companies. Now, I say that this is not reciprocity, this is surrendering an advantage which we possess, and an advantage which was thrust upon us by their own act, it is surrendering this advantage without a *quid pro quo*, and I am going to propose a most moderate amendment to this Bill of my hon. friend from Frontenac. I do not propose to take the position that we shall insist

upon our offer of reciprocity in coasting, but I propose that we shall make to the Americans an offer of a modified character, an offer eminently fair, eminently liberal, one that, if they are actuated by a spirit of fair play, will be accepted by them. I propose, in addition to the reciprocity in wrecking privileges that tugs, and other vessels but tugs, as these are the vessels engaged in wrecking, shall be allowed to tow vessels and rafts from port to port in the coast of either country and in the waters of either country contiguous to the waters of the other country. If they will give us that slight concession I for one would be willing to drop the present arrangement and make this new offer for the sake of amity and peace and good will. I propose this in the belief that it will be accepted by the American Government, and that it will mitigate somewhat the unpleasant consequences to ourselves of the passage of this Bill, and the surrender of the advantages that we possess under present arrangements. I propose that section 1 of this Bill read as follows:—

"United States vessels and wrecking appurtenances may render aid and assistance to United States or other vessels, wrecked, or disabled, or in distress in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States."

Adding these words:

"And United States tugs may tow vessels and rafts from one Canadian port to another in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States."

And I propose the following amendment to the third section:

"When the privilege of towing vessels and rafts from one United States port to another, in waters contiguous to Canada, is accorded to Canadian tugs."

That is simply extending the provisions of this reciprocity offer so far as embraced in the operations of the Bill for aiding vessels and rafts by the tugs of either nation. This amendment would obviate all difficulty as to coasting with wrecks from one port to another, and would give to us, perhaps, some light advantage in return for the advantages that we surrender. I think it would make the Bill more satisfactory to the navigation interests in this country, and without this small concession that we ask, being granted to us, I do not think that we ought to entertain the amendment proposed in the Bill. I advance this proposition, having some knowledge of the vessel interests, and knowing that if we accept the American offer, having ourselves first made that offer of entire reciprocity in coasting, we simply allow them to select from that broad offer the one particular item in which they will secure a great advantage and leave us with the husk while they take the kernel; and I think that we had better get a little of the meat ourselves. I believe it will be granted to us. I make this amendment aside from any political bias or standpoint whatever. It is a matter in which we should consult the interests of lake marine, in which we should consult the rights of men who have invested a large amount of capital. At all events, we should try to get this concession, we should make the offer, and if the offer is refused by the American Government, then we can come next year to the point of considering whether we will surrender the whole thing or not. I make this motion seconded by Mr. Lister, who also is thoroughly conversant with the lake marine of our coast, and knows that this small concession is one that we ought to ask.

Mr. KENNY. I was rather surprised at the remark which fell from my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), if I understood him aright, when he said that he supposed that my objection to this measure originated in the fact that my colleague was in favor of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what I said.

Mr. KENNY. Well, I think it is a most unfair criticism. My hostility to this Bill, if it is applied to the Maritime Provinces, is based entirely upon the argument advanced by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He says that he would be in favor of it if it was fair and reciprocal. Now, I contend that the action of such a Bill as this in the Maritime Provinces would not be reciprocal, inasmuch as all the benefits of it would accrue to the American wrecking companies. It so happens that we have, on the seaboard of the Atlantic Provinces, individuals who are prepared to carry on this wrecking business, and who are equipped with all the necessary plant. My hon. friend knows that this wrecking business is very largely controlled by the Americans. I am speaking of the Atlantic waters—and that any of these vessels that would meet with accidents on our coasts would be insured in the American companies, and that these underwriters, both of hulls and of cargoes, would put the business in the hands of their own wrecking companies, to the exclusion of ours, and we would never get a chance of working in the same way on the American coast. Hence my objection to the measure; but I am very glad to hear that it will not apply to the Atlantic coast. I make this explanation because it is due to myself.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will take the last statement made by the hon. gentleman first. I understood the statement of the Minister of Customs to be that the measure would apply to all the coasts of Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will take the last statement made by the hon. gentleman first. I understood the statement of the Minister of Customs to be that the measure would apply to all the coasts of Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite the contrary.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Only to inland waters.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it is to apply only to inland waters, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is right in what he understood the Minister of Customs to say, but I understood him to say that it would apply to all the coasts of Canada. At any rate, I do not understand why it should not apply to the Atlantic coast. I do not see why a principle that is applied on the inland waters of the great lakes should not apply to the harbors, shores and coasts of the Maritime Provinces. If wrecks occur there, as they very frequently do, the people of the Maritime Provinces should have the privilege of obtaining the assistance of the most effective wrecking craft. The hon. gentleman said that the American wrecking systems are more efficient.

Mr. KENNY. I say they are more immediately under the control of American underwriters.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see why the people, who will have to pay the money if the vessels are lost, should not have the privilege of obtaining the best wrecking craft, especially when the principle of reciprocity is adopted on the lakes. With respect to the personal matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred, the remark was made in a jocular sense. The hon. gentleman knows I respect him too much to say anything that would reflect on his consistency; but I appeal to this House, also in a jocular sense but with a good deal of reality about it, as to whether our experience of the senior and the junior members for Halifax, both of whom so ably and so persistently represent their respective parties and express the views of their parties, is not such that we have the assurance that when one of those members rises in his place and says something in black the other will immediately afterwards rise and say that it is not black, or at all events not quite black but some other color. While I said that in a jocular sense I repeat it now, for it is a matter remarked by everybody. No matter whether the junior member rises and makes a statement regarding United States craft, the senior member will rise—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. MITCHELL—and controvert it. At all events, that is our impression.

Mr. KENNY. The junior must always follow the senior.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. MITCHELL. My impression is that these hon. gentlemen never agree, and I have never known them to vote on the same side. As a matter of curiosity, I should like to see them vote together on one side on the question now before the House.

Mr. LABELLE. I am very sorry to differ from the opinions expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I thought that hon. gentleman was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and, being in favor of the adoption of that principle, I naturally imagined that a little concession made by the United States towards Canada would be grasped at by him as well as by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But they have not done so. This reminds me of the circumstance, that, when I came forward as a parliamentary candidate, my father told me there were two kinds of patriotism in the House: one was the old time patriotism, where you work with a view to promote the interests of the country and its people, and the other kind of patriotism was that in which individual interests were promoted. I do not desire to reflect on any hon. member of this House, but I may remark that I am in favor of the old time patriotism of working for our country and for our people. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said they had the permission of the Canadian Government and the American Government with respect to the tugs, so that they might assist each other; but I would ask if the captain of a vessel in a hurricane could wait until he had obtained permission from the Minister of Customs to enter Canadian waters. I will give an illustration of what I said the other day, when I was unable to complete the particulars. In 1844 the steamer *Spartan* went ashore during the night on Cariboo Island, in Lake Superior. The next morning the captain obtained the services of a tug—he did not wait to see if it was a Canadian tug or an American tug, but he took the first that arrived. This was an American tug, and she saved the passengers and rescued the vessel. She brought the *Spartan* to Sault Ste. Marie, passed through the canal, and when they had arrived at the foot of the Sault Rapids, the captain of the *Spartan* asked the captain of the tug to be taken to Owen Sound on the Canadian side. The captain replied: No, I dare not take you there, because my tug would be seized; I cannot and I will not do it. Accordingly the captain could not do otherwise than abide by the decision of the captain of the American tug. Then instead of going by Georgian Bay, a distance of 100 miles, and reaching Owen Sound by the inshore route, the vessel had to pass through Lake Huron, a distance of 250 miles, where, of course, they were exposed to the risk of a gale coming up and endangering the safety of the steamer. Fortunately we did not lose the vessel, but we had to pay \$26,000 to the Americans for repairs, whereas that amount would otherwise have gone into Canadian hands and assisted to pay Canadian workmen; and, in addition, when the vessel was brought to Canada the Customs authorities charged us for the new material put into the vessel. Under these circumstances the House should pass the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac, (Mr. Kirkpatrick) without any amendment, because all amendments are in the direction of killing the Bill. There is another side to the question, and that is the humane side. The Royal Humane Society of England bestows a premium on any one who saves the life of a human being. In this country we are proposing to give a premium for quite the contrary, and even if it is only from a humane spirit, hon. gentlemen who are opposing the Bill should certainly change their minds and vote in favor of it.

Mr. MULOCK. It must be satisfactory to members of the Committee to observe the educational effect of the discussion of this question within the last twelve months. This I understand from the mover of the Bill is substantially

the same measure that was voted on in Parliament in April, 1888.

An hon. MEMBER. It was not understood.

Mr. MULOCK. That goes to show how discussion informs us, liberalises us, and makes us equal to the occasion. Twelve months ago or less the Government and all its forces were arrayed against this measure for certain reasons. On that occasion the then Finance Minister, Sir Charles Tupper, briefly led the opposition to the measure, but the great opponent on that occasion was the Minister of Customs, and I am glad to see that with advancing years and increasing wisdom, he is able, at all events, to the extent of saving a human being's life, of indulging in a little reciprocal spirit such as has been very properly referred to by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle). But I should like to ask the Minister, who will no doubt announce on this occasion the policy of the Government, whether the statements he made to the House last Session, and on the strength of which he succeeded in defeating this measure for the time being; and in setting back this great forward movement for twelve months—I would like to ask the Minister of Customs if he goes back on all the utterances he made to the House on that occasion and if he will tell us that he was wrong in his arguments then, or if he still maintains some of them, which does he maintain and which has he rejected? He told the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) last year that that hon. gentleman seemed to be very much interested in this Bill from a local standpoint and that although the member for Frontenac had proved that the Bill was most necessary in the eastern part of Lake Ontario, still the Minister of Customs informed the House that this Bill was not required in the west. The hon. Minister sitting here to-night and controlling the legislation will of course be able to explain to us wherein the changed circumstances have occurred which will justify him in telling the House now that the assurances he gave us a year ago do not exist to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. You should not press him too hard.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I want to be satisfied on the point for the sake of the great industries that the Minister was protecting a year ago, and I think it is right that the House should be assured that these dangers do not longer exist. For example, in reply to the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) the Minister of Customs said last Session:

"My hon. friend from Frontenac says it is in our interest. It may be in the interests of the particular locality in which he lives, but it is not so in the west."

I would ask the Minister of Customs whether it is now in the interests of the west, and, if so, I am sure the House will have no difficulty, so far as that objection is concerned, in supporting the Bill. He will tell us, of course, what change of circumstances happened that make this Bill now in the interest to the west.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you promise to do that on all occasions if I change my mind and give you the reasons?

Mr. MULOCK. No doubt a conscientious man like the Minister of Customs—

Mr. BOWELL. You are not answering the question.

Mr. MULOCK. When I am on the Treasury benches I will account for my policy, but I am now asking you for yours. When the time comes that I am a responsible Minister it will be for me to say what I am to do. We are now discussing the interests of the country, as well as the great principle of which the Minister of Customs is the guardian. I presume that the Minister is supporting this measure now and he will tell us, of course, why he has got a change of heart, or why this change has come over the spirit of his dreams.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a change of conduct.

**Mr. MULOCK.** Whatever it may be we do not find him to-night on the warpath against this Bill as he was a year ago. I presume his change of action is taken with due regard to the interests of the country. If those arguments he advanced to us last Session were a good reason for his voting against the measure I presume he can tell us how to proceed safely on this occasion. Speaking of this international civility as proposed last Session the Minister said:

"Such liberality has not been extended by the American Government to Canadian tug owners or to Canadian wreckers and I see good reasons for adopting the suggestion made by the Minister of Finance that we should not give this privilege without some return, particularly in a case of this kind where it is in our interest, where as I believe it to be in the interest of the American shipowners as well, that we should have freest possible intercourse in coasting trade in inland waters at least, and if it is possible, on the sea coast."

Speaking of the consequences of the adoption of this Bill the Minister of Customs goes on to say:

"Now if we adopt the reciprocity as suggested by the Bill before the House, they [referring to the Americans] will have achieved all that they want and all that they ask, together with the destruction of our wrecking industry, and most certainly refusal will follow in respect to reciprocity in the coasting trade of this country."

A year ago the Minister of Customs stated that if we entered into reciprocal wrecking relations with the States it would result in the total destruction of the wrecking property of the people of Canada. Is he now going to vote for the destruction of the wrecking property of our people? If not; when the Minister of Customs is able to bring his massive mind from the consideration of peach baskets and other important state affairs to the minor interests of saving human life, I would ask him whether any change has taken place so that to-day reciprocity in wrecking will not do what he said it would do a year ago—destroy the wrecking appliances of the people of Canada. Again the Minister of Customs said:

"I believe it to be in the interests of the wrecking industry, in the interests of this country and in the interests of the coasting trade that we should hold the position we are in at the present time."

He goes on in his speech to say that so important is it to the people of Canada that we should get the coasting trade that he does not think that we should concede this one point that is now asked for unless we get the coasting trade secure, and he argues in his speech that to enter into reciprocal wrecking relations would for all time prevent us securing what he conceived to be of vast importance to the people of Canada, viz., reciprocity in coasting. This is a speech that had a great deal of influence with this House a year ago, and it is due to us now that the Minister of Customs should take us into his confidence and assure us that those great interests that were in danger a year ago when we threatened to pass this Bill, will not be endangered if we pass it to-day. I suppose a great many who took his word last Session, will take him at his word, or by his silence, this Session and vote as he directs them to vote. But there are some who are not in his confidence and do not receive those bits of information in whispered words which he imparts, and they would like to be told in an open way across the floor of this House whether the interests of the country are safe to-day if we pass this Bill. I pause for a reply.

**Mr. WALDIE.** I said a few words on the introduction of this Bill and I wish to state, now, that I think the House ought to consider the measure from the point of view of its necessity to the parties whose property is in danger, the owners of the stranded vessels, and not from the interests of the tug owners pure and simple. From the list of cases quoted by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wherein the Minister of Customs permitted the employment of American tugs, it is quite evident that the property of the people of Canada was very frequently in danger and could only be rescued by the employment of those tugs.

**Mr. MULOCK.**

The very fact that there is such a list of cases in which the Minister of Customs had to intervene and set the law aside is the best proof we can have of the necessity of this measure in the interests of the vessel owners. I deprecate the discussion of the broader principles of reciprocity in connection with this Bill, for I am most anxious that this Bill should pass on its own merits alone. This Bill has the element of humanity in its favor which separates it from general questions of trade, and I think it has also important advantages to the wrecking industries of this country. It is said that insurance companies will control the wrecking if this Bill should pass. My experience is that although the vessel is insured, its owner controls the employment of the wrecking tug, and will employ that tug which will save his property in the most economical and speedy way, and that he will have it conveyed to the port where repairs can be made most cheaply. He will not cause a Canadian bottom to be conveyed to an American port for repairs when he knows that on its return to Canadian waters he will have to pay a duty on it, but he will cause the distressed property to be conveyed to our own ports for repairs, giving employment to Canadian labor. I do think that any amendment to the Bill as it is now before the Committee would have the effect of entirely destroying it. As we have an offer on the part of the American Government of reciprocity in this matter, and as it is in the interest of our inland marine that that offer should be accepted, I trust that the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac will pass just as he has introduced it.

**Mr. CURRAN.** Last year, when this measure was before the House, I had the honor of making some observations based upon the information which had been furnished me by some leading men in Canada who were interested in the business affected by this legislation. I then spoke in favor of the Bill; but as the Minister of Finance appealed to the House, asking us to suspend our judgment for a certain time, I supported his view by my vote, hoping that by this Session we should have had the concessions made to us that were deemed to be of importance, in order that justice might be done to Canadian interests in the matter of wrecking. The last speaker has deprecated the introduction of the general reciprocity question into this discussion. I think he has done very wisely on behalf of the hon. gentleman who has proposed the amendment, which, as he says, if carried, would have the effect of killing the Bill altogether, inasmuch as it would make it absolutely inoperative. The hon. gentleman has stated to us, and I agree with him entirely, that no member of this House can point out any liberality on the part of the United States Government similar to that which has been extended by this Government. I believe it will be admitted by every candid member of this House and by every candid man in the country, that there has been no liberality on the part of the United States towards Canada. Whenever they can crush us, they do so; whenever they can put us in a corner, or by any action on their part can cripple us in any way, they are perfectly willing to do it for purposes which are manifest.

**Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)** Where is the evidence of that?

**Mr. CURRAN.** One evidence is in the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

**Mr. CURRAN.** Hon. gentlemen say "Oh, oh!" It is hardly the time to go into the discussion of that subject now, but I think I shall be borne out by the country when I say that wherever it has been possible to interfere with Canadian interests and prevent Canadian prosperity and progress they have sought to do it. I have the evidence, which I may take occasion to lay before the House on another occasion, that there have not been wanting public speakers in

Congress and the Senate, in the press and on the platform, to declare that Canada shall get nothing unless she joins the United States, and throws in her fortunes with that country. But that statement I have been drawn into by my hon. friend, who cannot very well tolerate the truth; it aggravates him so much that he must interrupt on all occasions. But this discussion, and the speech which has been made by my hon. friend who has proposed the amendment, simply exemplify the old adage, that it makes all the difference in the world whose ox is gored. Under the legislation of the United States, which, he has pointed out, forced the Canadian Government into the position it has occupied for some time, a wrecking interest grew up in this country, and I think the hon. gentleman stated that he himself has invested money in that interest—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. CURRAN—or is closely connected with people who have invested money in that interest. Now, he tells us, and he tells us truly, that we should consult the interests of those who have invested their money in wrecking. Well, just as the action of the United States Government forced the Canadian Government to adopt the course they did and to put on the Statute-book the law at present in force, so the action of the United States Government forced us to adopt the National Policy, which has caused millions and millions of dollars to be invested in the industries of this country; and yet the hon. gentleman who says that we should look to the money interest of the few who have invested their money in this wrecking business, is prepared, at one fell swoop, to wipe out the manufacturing industries in which capital has been invested on the pledge of this Government, sanctioned by the people at several general elections. I sympathise heartily with those who have invested their money in this wrecking industry; but we have the statements of a host of gentlemen who have overwhelmingly larger interests than those centered in the wrecking business, and they appeal and have appealed again and again to this Parliament, to pass the legislation which has been brought in by my hon. friend at my right. Under these circumstances, with the light that has been cast on the subject, I say we cannot do otherwise than pass the Bill as it has been proposed to the House, because the amendment suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk, although we should all like to see it carried into effect if we could secure the concurrence of the United States therein, cannot accomplish anything; and it is the interest of the country that this legislation should go into force at once. We shall be thrown back for years if we do not adopt the measure now proposed, and I am against the amendment simply because it will make our proceedings inoperative and kill the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. It is always interesting to hear an hon. member explaining to this House how he came to speak one way on a measure and vote another way, and I am sure the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has done his best to make that clear to the Committee to-night. But how much more interesting would it be if we could only induce the hon. Minister of Customs to get up to-night and explain to us how he came to change not only his speech but his vote as well. I rejoice that he has done so; I do not object to any gentleman changing his views; there is always time to repent; and I hope the hon. Minister has shown us that on the larger question of reciprocity of which this is only a part, but a material part, he will be prepared to change his mind also. But since last Session we remember he has received a new colleague into the Cabinet. When the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was not in his place last Session, this Bill was moved by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who on that occasion said that it was true reciprocity. That hon. member has been

taken into the Government, and of course on so important a question as that the Postmaster General must have made it a condition with the Minister of Customs that he would swallow his words and follow him on this question. With reference to the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I am sure that we all desire to see the towing of vessels and rafts from one port in the United States to another permitted to Canadian vessels, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring that up as a substantive Bill on a future occasion and I will support it. The hon. gentleman is too old a parliamentarian not to know perfectly well that if his proposed amendment be added to the Bill, it will utterly destroy the whole value of the Bill. The Americans have, since 1878, made a simple offer to us on this subject of wrecking. We would like them undoubtedly to go further and include coasting privileges and the privileges of towing vessels and rafts, but they have not done so. I would say, therefore, let us take what they give, and if we can get the other let us take that too hereafter. I am sure that is the sense of the House. The House almost unanimously, a few weeks ago, carried the second reading of this Bill on that principle, and I hope, therefore, the House has not changed its mind on that point.

Mr. DAWSON. This a question which affects the shipping at large as much as it does wrecking interests, and I think we should consider its effect on our shipping generally. The constituency I have the honor to represent covers the greater part of those inland waters, and many hard cases have occurred, some of which have been referred to here to-night. On some occasions vessels have gone to the relief of strange ships in Canadian waters, and afterwards been seized and kept in custody until fines were paid or until they were relieved, and in order that there may be freedom in this matter, in order that United States tugs may be free to come to the relief of Canadian vessels and Canadian tugs equally free to go to the relief of American vessels, in either Canadian or American waters, I think the Bill ought to be supported. My constituency lies along the shores of the great lakes, the shores of Lakes Huron and Superior, and the people are largely engaged in shipping. I have had many letters, since this subject came before the House, from owners of vessels and others engaged in navigating the lakes, all recommending me to support this Bill. I quite agree with hon. members that to adopt the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk would be to kill the Bill. Desirable as general reciprocity in the coasting trade and in other respects would be, the Americans will not grant it, and the simple fact of adding that amendment to the Bill would be to render it inoperative. Therefore I shall support the Bill in its present form and oppose the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. COOK. When this Bill was before the House last Session, I supported it, and made a few remarks in its favor. I am glad to see there is not a dissenting voice on the subject to-day. I do not rise to deal specially with the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), but to refer to the amendment made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) which amendment I consider to be a perfectly fair proposition. No one in Canada knows better than the hon. the Minister of Customs the necessity for this amendment, because applications have been made to him frequently to allow American tugs to tow rafts into Canadian waters. We have to tow a large quantity of logs from the north shore of Georgian Bay, and our tugs are insufficient for the large rafts that are brought from there. Frequently, therefore, the Minister of Customs has been applied to for permits to allow American tugs to tow these rafts. I have no doubt that the Americans will accede to the proposition of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I believe that in the interest of their tugs and in the interest of wrecking companies, they will at



once accept it, and have, therefore, much pleasure in supporting his amendment.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Judging from the discussion one would suppose that the only waters of the Dominion are the lakes, and that there was no such place as the Atlantic Ocean. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said that this Bill would apply to the waters of the Maritime Provinces, and with the second clause eliminated, there would be no doubt on that point, but if the second clause remains the wording should be such as to leave the section clearly applicable to Canadian waters on the Atlantic coast. As far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I have been always in favor of it. American vessels have always been ready to render assistance to ours, and more particularly American revenue cutters. They have never hesitated as to the nationality of a vessel, but rendered vessels in distress every assistance they could gratuitously. That was until lately the principal object for which they were put at the American light stations, but in consequence of the way in which we deal with American vessels in distress, the American revenue cutters instead of being on the look-out to aid our vessels when they require it, are on the watch to see that on entering American harbors for refuge, they do not violate the Customs Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) In dealing with a matter of this importance, it is of great advantage to have a thorough understanding as to the application of any measure concerning it. Reading the clause to which I refer, and seeing it is only applicable to waters contiguous to the United States, I was naturally led to the conclusion that it was intended for the inland waters, and not for the Atlantic coast of the Maritime Provinces. It appears to me that this is a question too large to be dealt with in the small way in which it is proposed to be dealt with by some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject. I was glad to learn from the observations of the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, that he had accepted the view which I propounded, that the Bill would apply to the Maritime Provinces, and I certainly understood the Minister of Customs to give his approbation to that view of the case, though he has since stated that he was misunderstood. I think that question should be understood now, so that no future misunderstanding will take place. My hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) took exception to my view as to the application of this Bill to the Maritime Provinces, and it was natural that he should do so, because, since he has been in this House, he has always been opposed to anything and everything in the way of reciprocity with the United States, and has not seen his way clear up to this time—though his political digestion is known to be very good—to come down to the view which appears to be entertained by the Minister of Customs and those who are supporting the Bill. I think, however, even that hon. gentleman will admit that it would be no disadvantage to the people of the Maritime Provinces to have in case of need the services of American tugs if they were required. My hon. colleague stated that there were wrecking companies in the Maritime Provinces which could attend to all that business. In the brief time which has been at my disposal, I have thought of the wrecking companies which exist in Nova Scotia, and, leaving out one or two tugs in Halifax which go out to assist vessels when they are required, I am not aware of any wrecking company, properly so-called, in the Maritime Provinces to-day. My hon. friend to my right (Mr. Weldon) says there are none in New Brunswick, and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) says there are none in Yarmouth, so it is plain that there is no company equipped as a wrecking company in the Maritime Provinces. Therefore, if on the extensive coasts of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick a vessel requires the assistance of a wrecking company to save it or the property which it is carrying, by

Mr. Cook.

which a large amount could be saved to the underwriters or to the owners of that property, it would be very hard if those people could not have the benefit of employing American tugs. As it stands now, I am not aware of any wrecking company in Nova Scotia. I think this should be made clear and should not be left liable to any doubt in the future, or to the interpretation of the department. We are dealing with a question of so much importance that people who are called upon to act suddenly, as these emergencies arise, will have to act on the interpretation of the Statute before them. If they have to wait to communicate with the department in order to find what is their construction of the Act, and whether an American tug may be employed on the Atlantic or in the Bay of Fundy, a very serious loss of property may take place during the interval. It is only for that purpose that I was anxious that all expressions calculated to leave any doubt as to the application of this Bill should be eliminated from it before it passed its final stage, and I again call the attention of the Minister of Customs and the promoter of the Bill to the fact that it would be in the interest of the public at large if it were understood that the measure is to apply to the whole Dominion, or if these gentlemen are legislating only for these small Canadian lakes—that is, small in comparison with our great waters below. If they do not intend us to have any part or parcel in this measure, let them say so; but if the Bill is intended to apply, as I understand, to the Atlantic sea coast and the Bay of Fundy, under circumstances that may arise there, it should be so stated.

Mr. BOWELL. I intended to rise before, because I was somewhat surprised at the remarks made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), when he rose and said that he was glad to find that I differed from his colleague from that city. Evidently, I did not make myself understood, because not only that hon. member but also the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) misunderstood my remark. I confess that I am surprised at what some hon. gentlemen have said as to the opinion I expressed in reference to this Bill. My recollection is tolerably good on ordinary occasions, and I have no recollection of expressing any particular opinion either in favor of the Bill or in opposition to it. What I rose to point out was that the Bill passed by the American Congress did not, as I understood it, apply to the Maritime Provinces, as far as the sea-coast is concerned. I think, on looking at it, it might apply to the Bay of Fundy which is in a somewhat different position from the Atlantic coast. However, that measure is rather difficult to understand. That is the only expression of opinion which I recollect giving. The Bill passed by the American Congress reads as follows:—

“That Canadian vessels of all descriptions may render aid and assistance to Canadian or other vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada.”

That is the whole Bill. Whether that applies to the sea coast or only to the inland waters of Canada is a matter which I must leave to the lawyers and those who are better able to decide it than I am. It then goes on:

“This Act shall take force by proclamation of the United States so soon as the Canadian Government will grant like privileges to those which are contained in this Bill.”

The member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) proposed to go a good deal further and to give greater concessions than are contained in this Bill. However, after consultation with the Committee which was appointed to consider it, he has consented to adopt the American Bill *verbatim*, simply changing the name of the United States to that of Canada, and Canada to that of the United States. That is the proposition now before the Committee. If anyone will take the little Bill of the United States and read it, in coming to a conclusion he will find some difficulty as to what

it really means, and particularly in regard to the practical operation of the measure if it becomes law. There is not a word in that Bill which would allow a tug to tow a wrecked vessel after it had rendered assistance to it. If the American Government should enforce the coasting law, which gives the right only to their own vessels to tow in their own waters, and should say that the privilege of towing is not conceded in this proposition of reciprocity, then, as I pointed out to my hon. friend, the Canadian Government ought to be in a position to deny that right to American vessels. If the right to tow, after rendering assistance to a vessel, was denied by the American Government, then the Bill is utterly useless; and, if it were passed at all, it would leave us practically in the same position. We ought to be in precisely the same position as they are. But if, after raising a wrecked vessel or rendering assistance to a vessel in distress, they refuse to allow them to tug it or tow it in their waters, then we ought to be precisely in the same position. Now, I have heard a good deal said on the humanitarian side of this question. My hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) pointed out a case in which an American tug owner refused to tow his boat into Owen Sound. Any one who will read the orders and instructions which have been issued by the Customs Department since 1878, will know that no refusal, either direct or indirect, has ever been made to an American tug or any American vessel to render assistance when there was any immediate prospect of the loss of property or the loss of life; and why this tug owner should have refused, under the circumstances, to tow this vessel into Owen Sound, I cannot understand, unless it was for the purpose of taking it into their own waters, by which their tugs and their mechanics would receive whatever benefits would be derived from repairing the vessels or in order to put the profits into the pockets of the tug owners and the underwriters who might have an interest in the vessel or in the profits arising from repairs. There has been, I repeat, no instructions given which were not of a more liberal character than were the orders issued by circular, when I think my hon. friend had the pleasure, or had the honor, of being Minister of Militia in the Government which issued it. That circular was much more stringent in its character than the orders and circulars which have been issued since the time my hon. friend was in the Government, which was in 1876 or 1877, or if he was not in the Government, he was one of its most ardent supporters, and I suppose he supported that measure as well. Now, in reference to tugging, hon. gentlemen who have read this correspondence have seen that the principle now embodied in the amendment made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, was contained in the first despatch that I drafted on this subject, in 1879. In that dispatch the Canadian Government proposed to the American Government to grant the fullest privileges, not only in wrecking but in coasting laws, and those who are acquainted with the subject know that there is a law upon our Statute-book which gives the Governor in Council power at any time to give to any country in the world the coasting privileges of the Dominion of Canada, so soon as they open their ports to us. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk being exactly in the line that the Canadian Government have proposed to the American Government over and over again, I shall feel myself, in duty bound, as an individual, to support it. I am not speaking on behalf of the Government, I am speaking for myself, as I am not aware that the Government has had any policy on this Bill, consequently, to be consistent with the position that I have taken in reference to this matter in the correspondence that has taken place between Canada and the United States, I shall vote for that proposition. If this wrecking is of so great an advantage to the American tug owners, to American wrecking companies and to American shipping interests, surely they should

grant that which is absolutely necessary in order to make their Bill worth one cent. I admit that the feeling of this House and the feeling in the country has changed to a certain extent upon this question, but if we are to have a Bill at all, let us have one which will be of some value. Therefore there is no reason why the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk which is of a still wider character, should not also be added.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be better, under the circumstances, to make a Bill that would suit the people of Canada, and leave it inoperative until the Americans reciprocate?

Mr. BOWELL. I am very glad, for once, that I am in accord with the hon. member. That is just such a Bill as I would like to see placed upon the Statute-book. I would like to see the proposition adopted because it is one that I previously made, and it should be added to this Bill. I should also like to see the proposition of the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk added to the Bill. Then, if it will confer the advantage which has been pointed out to the shipping interests of both countries, surely from a humanitarian standpoint, or from any other standpoint the Americans ought to accept it. The hon. member for Northumberland was a little facetious about my views on the reciprocity question. I can tell him that not only myself individually, but this Government, have always been in favor of fair reciprocal trade relations with the United States; but we do not propose to accept anything that they may offer which is to their immediate advantage, unless we are to have something in return. Those are my ideas of reciprocity.

Mr. MITCHELL. Nor concede anything?

Mr. BOWELL. Nor concede one single  *iota*. That is just precisely what I mean, and when they offer us something, I think the Government of this country will do what they have always been prepared to do in the past, and that is to accept anything that is fair and reasonable. I am not going to discuss the question of unrestricted reciprocity, by which our free trade friends hope to have a much higher tariff than they have at present, and which the leader of the Government has expressed his wish to have. I will discuss that question probably before this debate is over.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I desire to say a few words with reference to a question of much interest to the counties along the Bay of Fundy in regard to the meaning of the words in the second section of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac. They are an exact reproduction, *mutatis mutandis* of the words of the American Bill. That Bill says:

"Canadian vessels of all descriptions may render aid or assistance to Canadian or other vessels that are disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada."

These words are reproduced, with the necessary changes, in this Bill now before the Committee.

"United States vessels of all descriptions may render aid or assistance to United States or other vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters of Canada contiguous to the United States."

The geographical position is this: The character of the waters was settled, with a degree of certainty, 45 years ago, as was brought out in the debates of last Session, in reference to a fishery seizure which occurred in the year 1843. The United States and Great Britain referred the question of the territorial character of the waters of the Bay of Fundy to a mixed commission. Mr. Bates was the umpire of that commission, which decided that the Bay of Fundy was a part of the high seas, that it was not a British bay.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not a part of the high seas?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). They decided that it was not a British bay. They defined the headlands of the Bay of

Fundy very clearly. There is one on the Nova Scotian coast, there is one on the coast of Maine, a few miles west of the mouth of the St. Croix River. Therefore, the waters of the Bay of Fundy are of this character; they are high seas, with the exception of a three mile belt along the New Brunswick shore and along the Nova Scotian shore. There is a triangular piece along the Bay of Fundy, with one apex of the triangle at the mouth of the St. Croix River, with another on the Bay of Fundy, and a third west of the State of Maine. The triangular piece at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy is clearly either high seas or United States water. The north shore of the Bay of Fundy is divided between the two nations; that portion within the three mile limit which washes the State of Maine belongs to the United States, that portion washing New Brunswick belongs to Canada, and the middle of the bay is the high sea. Take the wording of the Act:

"United States vessels and wrecking appurtenances may render aid and assistance to vessels and property wrecked, disabled or in distress in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States."

It is reasonably clear that of the three-mile belt of the bay, the portion washing New Brunswick will be held to be within the operation of this Act, as being Canadian waters contiguous to the United States. It is also reasonably clear that the three-mile belt along the Nova Scotia shore is not within the scope of the Bill, although they are Canadian waters, because they are not contiguous to the United States. If that is a sound argument, and I believe it is a reasonable contention, then the Counties of Albert, St. John, Charlotte and part of Westmoreland will be very materially affected by the Bill; and, speaking from a very imperfect knowledge of the case, my sympathies are in favor of the Bill, for it is in the interests not only of humanity but of our shipping, that our vessels in distress should have the opportunity of obtaining the assistance of American wrecking craft.

Mr. MITCHELL. I fail to understand what the proposition of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has to do with the question of the Wrecking Bill. He has evidently misstated the position of the Bay of Fundy in relation to the relative rights of the American people and the British people in that bay. The hon. gentleman has not correctly understood, I think, the decision given in the case of the schooner *George Washington*, which was seized about the time he named. She was seized by British cruisers for fishing within a British bay. But the point upon which the vessel was released was not because it was not in British waters, but because it was not clearly proved that she was within British waters, because we failed to be able to prove that she was within a line drawn from headland to headland, both of which were British territory. If it could have been proved that she had been within that line, the whole of the bay would have been declared to be British waters and would not have been given away to the Americans. That was a most unfortunate decision, and the effect to this country of the British not being able to show clearly that that vessel was within British waters was that the Americans shortly afterwards claimed admission to all our bays. The immediate effect of the decision was that the weak-kneed Administration of that day in England, of which Lord Aberdeen was the head, declared that the whole Bay of Fundy was to be considered as common waters. Another effect of that decision was this: that as the seizure was not shown to be within British headlands on both sides it was not held to be in British territory, but from the point of St. Croix River, where American territory ceased, British territory began across to a point on the Nova Scotia coast and all to the north-east—this was not held to be common territory.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). That was not the decision.  
Mr. WELDON (Albert).

Mr. MITCHELL. It was the decision of the court at that time.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). No.

Mr. MITCHELL. And the consequence was, that the British Government, anxious to maintain peace with the United States, and ready to give up all the wife's relations so long as it did not come home to themselves, surrendered the principle of the exclusive right to the Bay of Fundy, the result being that the Americans set up a claim to every bay on our coasts. That was the effect of that decision, and the reason why it was arrived at was, not that the vessel had not been seized within the line from headland to headland, but that this had not been proved. I will now come to the point to which the Minister of Customs has alluded. I thought I was right some time ago when I was contradicted by the mover of the Bill and the Minister of Customs, who stated that the Bill did not apply to the Maritime Provinces. It certainly applies to the western portion of the Maritime Provinces. The American Bill refers to Canadian vessels rendering assistance to vessels and property wrecked, disabled or in distress in American waters contiguous to the Dominion of Canada. We alter that by saying Canadian waters contiguous to the United States. That would certainly mean the whole of the south-western portion of New Brunswick, because it is contiguous to the United States. I venture to tell the mover of the Bill that if it is passed in its present form, it will give the Maritime Provinces equal rights and privileges with those sought to be given in regard to the inland waters of the St. Lawrence, and we certainly would be entitled under this Bill to have the south-western portion of New Brunswick considered as contiguous to the United States and be entitled to the privileges of this Bill. The Minister of Customs has referred to the principle of reciprocity, and he has chosen to remark on what I said a short time ago in regard to it. With respect to trade relations there is no doubt a great difference, but with respect to legislative reciprocity, which is the subject under discussion, there is very little difference between the hon. gentleman and myself. I would give the United States no privilege they would not immediately concede to us, and I would, as a matter of precaution, provide that the privileges accorded by this Bill should not go into effect until similar privileges were accorded to us by the United States.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is in the Bill now.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a condition that I would impose. No doubt I disagree with the Minister of Customs on principles of trade, for I doubt if the hon. gentleman would go as far as I would go in order to enter into reciprocal relations with the United States in a matter of trade. But with respect to legislation we do not differ one iota. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he favored power being given to the Government only to put this Bill into operation when the United States have put into operation a similar measure. The other point mentioned by the hon. gentleman was stated by him to be a very imaginary one, and I certainly admit it is not one of a very comprehensive character. He is in favor, when a vessel is in distress or wrecked, of the principle that she should be taken into a port either in the United States or in Canada. What is meant by these words:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States that Canadian vessels of all descriptions may render aid or assistance to Canadian or other vessels wreck or disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada."

What I understand by that is this, that if a vessel in Lake Huron is in distress and requires aid, either an American or Canadian tug can go to its assistance. That if an American tug comes alongside of her and gives her relief and takes her in tow, she could take her to a port in the United States or in Canada, as the master of that vessel

may demand. About that there cannot be a question. You have got to put a broad and generous construction on an Act of this kind, and no court in the United States or in Canada either would venture to condemn a tug, because after rendering a vessel assistance she did not leave her to the mercy of the waves. It is a duty, and it is a humanitarian principle, that when you do relieve a vessel you should also take her to a place of safety and no court in any country would declare otherwise. I quite agree with my hon. friend to my left, as also with the hon. Minister of Customs who has endorsed the statements he made, that if we can get the amendments proposed by the hon. gentleman added to this Bill with safety, and without endangering the object we all have in view of getting this reciprocity in wrecking, I would vote for it at once. What I fear is that on account of—I will not say hostility—but knowing the suspicions that have been created in the United States since the war, knowing that they look with suspicion on everything that we do, it will be difficult to get that. I do not agree with the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) that the Americans wished to crush out Canada, and I feel it is due to the people of the United States to resent the statement made by the member for Montreal Centre. I say that so far from a hostile feeling existing in the United States towards Canada or Canadians, I believe the most friendly feelings exist and the desire for extending our friendly feelings and reciprocal trade relations is quite as much in the United States as it is in Canada. I believe it is not politic to make such statements as the member for Montreal Centre has made in relation to the feelings of the people of the United States. I believe that the evidence we had recently in Congress of the adoption of Mr. Hitt's resolution for commercial union almost unanimously, is an assurance of this friendly feeling. I may say that commercial union is not exactly reciprocal free trade, although it is very nearly akin to it, but reciprocity does not require that we should increase our duty to the same standard as that of the Americans. I believe that the hon. gentleman opposite fails to see the difference between the two, but there is a difference and a considerable difference although they are approximate and akin one to the other. Does it follow that because we may choose to adopt reciprocal relations with the United States that it necessarily means a uniform tariff? Not at all. That point I explained the other day, but I feel bound to refer to it again, owing to a remark made by the hon. gentleman. We may make our tariff as high as the United States, which it nearly is now, and the United States may make theirs much higher than ours, but the difference between commercial union and reciprocal free trade is this: that under commercial union the tariff will be a common one, under reciprocal free trade the tariff might be one thing on one side of the line and another thing on the other. Under commercial union, the Customs lines might be done away with in everything except for statistical purposes, but under reciprocal free trade the Customs offices would still be required to be maintained along the border, and that is the great distinction between the two. Under unrestricted reciprocity we would make our own tariff and they would make theirs, but it would involve the maintenance of Customs offices along the border to insure that no foreign goods would be imported and passed from one country to another as products of the United States or of Canada. That is the distinction. I have never been a commercial union man; not because I believe it would not be beneficial as well to Canada as the United States, but because I have seen the impossibility of carrying it out or of accomplishing it. It would mean that the American Congress or Senate would regulate the tariff of Canada, and that I know we would never consent to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen say "hear hear." I say it is one of the things I have always contended that it is impossible to carry commercial union in the present temper of the people of Canada or of the people of the United States; not that I believe it would be injurious to us, but that I believe it is foreign to the sentiments and desires of our people that we should have our tariff laws controlled by any other country. On the other hand, reciprocal free trade is nearly akin to commercial union, but it provides that each country should make its own tariff and arrange by negotiations to have the tariff as nearly alike as would meet the wishes of the two peoples, although not necessarily uniform tariffs. The only objection against that is the fact that we would still have to maintain our Customs offices along the border and which it might be necessary to maintain for statistical purposes under any circumstances. Every one with the true interests of this country at heart demands that the Government should in the interests of this country take early steps to reopen negotiations with the United States with a view of bringing about reciprocal trade relation between the two countries. Is there any man amongst us who supposes that from 1854 to 1866, during the continuation of the first Reciprocity Treaty, that the greatest benefits did not accrue to both countries? Every one admits that. The statistics of our country show it, and gentlemen on both sides of the House have brought forward figures to prove that reciprocity was beneficial both to Canada and the United States. Does it follow that because reciprocity was advantageous then, it should not be advantageous now? On the contrary, I believe that if reciprocal arrangements were made our trade would immensely increase, and the farmers of our country, by having access to the markets of the United States, would derive greater advantages than they do to-day.

Mr. MASSON. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says "no." What are the millers hanging about the corridors for now? What was the big delegation down here a short time ago for, but to get a dollar a barrel tax on the flour of the people? As some of them told me it would be granted, but the Government dare not put it on because the people of the Maritime Provinces would not stand it. I see my hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) sitting on the Government benches; he would not like the Government to put a dollar a barrel duty on flour and have to face his people and attempt to justify it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. They say "oh." I met one of the millers yesterday or the day before, and he complained to me very much of the injustice that was done to the millers of the country, and said there should be some remedy. I was in accord with him entirely, and I said "there ought to be a remedy for it, and I am prepared to help you in that remedy." He was delighted to hear it, and then he proposed that a duty of a dollar a barrel should be put on flour. But I said: "That is not my remedy at all. Take the duty off wheat and flour, let the people have free bread and let there be no discrimination in favor of millers any more than there is in favor of the farmers of the country." That is the policy I would advocate. I only mention this because I felt it necessary, after the remarks of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) and the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Customs. I wanted to let him see how near we are in accord in many things.

Mr. BOWELL. Except unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does not the hon. gentleman want any kind of reciprocity?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not what I said.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the question, does he want any kind of reciprocity? If he does not want it unrestricted, what does he want? Let him answer the question. I will answer it for him. He and his Government are sustained by the combines and the protected manufacturers of the country.

Mr. MASSON. And the farmers.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, Sir, not by the farmers; and they will find it out in the next election. The hon. gentleman following up the argument of my hon. friend here (Mr. Charlton), contended that vested interests were involved in this question, and that we should not legislate in any way to affect them. Sir, I do not believe in these vested interests. Every man who puts his money into any enterprise in this country has to do so taking the chance of legislation being changed.

An hon. MEMBER. Will you apply that to the brewers?

Mr. MITCHELL. I apply it to everything, I am with you there. I would simply, in conclusion, say, that I think the hon. Minister of Customs need not have any doubt of the power, under the Bill, of a tug to take a vessel either to the ports of Canada or the ports of the United States.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was entirely wrong when he undertook to correct me as to what was decided in 1843 by the commission in reference to the territorial jurisdiction of the Bay of Fundy. I will read the decision of the umpire, Mr. Joshua Bates, as to the matter in controversy. I affirmed that the decision of the commission was that the Bay of Fundy was not a British Bay.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Within the meaning of the treaty.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you allow me to state what I did say? I did not say that they did not declare that it was not a British bay. I said that they were unable to prove that the vessel was seized within a line drawn between two points of British territory, and they were unable to decide whether it was seized within British territory or not.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). That was not the point the hon. gentleman made. The point was as to whether the Bay of Fundy was British territorial water or part of the high seas. I affirmed that Mr. Bates declared that the Bay of Fundy was not a British bay, and the hon. gentleman said I was mistaken. I will read the decision of the umpire:

"The Bay of Fundy is from 65 to 75 miles wide, and 130 to 140 miles long; it has several bays on its coast; thus the word 'bay,' as applied to this great body of water, has the same meaning as that applied to the Bay of Biscay, the Bay of Bengal, over which no nation can have the right to assume sovereignty. One of the headlands of the Bay of Fundy is in the United States, and ships bound to Passamaquoddy must sail through a large space of it. The Islands of Grand Manan (British) and the Little Manan (American) are situated nearly on a line from headland to headland. These islands, as represented in all geographies, are situated in the Atlantic Ocean. The conclusion is therefore in my mind irresistible, that the Bay of Fundy is not a British bay, nor a bay within the meaning of the word as used in the Treaties of 1783 and 1818."

That is precisely what I affirmed in the first place. Therefore, speaking of the construction to be placed upon the very ambiguous and uncertain words of the American statute, I ventured in a guarded way to suggest what was the most reasonable meaning of those words. Whatever their statute means, ours has a correlative meaning, and on the assumption that the waters washing the shores of the County of Albert will be within the jurisdiction of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac, I desire to support it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will state to the Committee what I did say. That decision arose out of the seizure of an American vessel called the *Washington*. She was seized at a point so near the line between the St. Croix River and the southernmost point of Nova Scotia, that it was uncertain whether she was seized within the line of British territory or outside. Now, the decision of Mr. Bates, to which I did not allude, but to which the hon. gentleman alluded, referred, not to the Bay of Fundy as a whole, but to that particular portion of it; and in consequence of the British Government being unable to say that that vessel was seized within a line drawn between two points within British territory, the claim had to be abandoned. The commission of which Mr. Bates was a member was not appointed to defend the limits of the bays, but to settle the point whether the schooner *George Washington* was seized within the limits of the Bay of Fundy or not, and he decided that she was not.

Mr. MASSON. I do not think the question of reciprocity of trade has anything to do with reciprocity in wrecking. So far as reciprocity of trade is concerned, I am opposed to it, because I believe reciprocity of trade would be a disadvantage to Canadians, especially to farmers, and especially to the farmers of Ontario. I think I have on previous occasions advanced very good reasons—reasons that have never been answered—to show that, so far as the farmers are concerned, reciprocity of trade means a direct loss on their products, especially on the three principal kinds of grain they produce, wheat, oats and peas, as well as on pork and other things. I do not think that has anything to do with this question. I am opposed to general reciprocity, because I believe it would be to the disadvantage of Canada; but reciprocity in wrecking would be to the advantage of both Canada and the United States. The two cases are entirely different. Reciprocity in wrecking, if the interests of the wreckers alone were regarded, would be to the disadvantage of Canadian wreckers; and I can quite understand that Americans, with their superior wrecking plant, would be able to compete successfully in many cases against Canadian wreckers. But I do not consider that of any importance in this connection. This measure is to the advantage of the ship-owners and the men engaged in traffic in our inland lakes, for the simple reason that the sooner help can be got to a disabled vessel, the better it is for the owners of that vessel, and for the people whose cargo it carries. As to the amendment proposing to add reciprocity in towing, I object to that being made part of this Bill, for the reason that I believe the Americans, being so jealous of their towing, and having advanced more than we have in wrecking, would object to that. But I think it is fairly within the power of the two Governments, when issuing the proclamations provided for by the respective measures, to say that when a disabled vessel can be taken into the ports of either country. The courts of either country would say that a vessel rendering assistance to another would have the right to take it in; but if there be any doubt, it is in the power of the Government, before issuing their respective proclamations, to make that a special arrangement. For that reason I would support the Bill as amended in Committee, and will oppose the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am very sorry I cannot ask the supporters of this Bill to accept the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I am sorry because I would like to see reciprocity in towage and in the coasting trade, but I cannot agree that reciprocity in these should be tacked on to this Bill, and that this Bill shall not come into force unless such reciprocity is granted. I agree with the hon. the Minister of Customs that if we are going to accept the offer of the Americans at all, we must accept it in the shape in which it has been on their Statute-books for the last eleven years. It has often been

cast up against Canadians by the Americans, in all their despatches during those years, that we have sinned against the common cause of humanity in not accepting their offer; and now if we say we will accept it provided they will give us the towage of rafts from port to port, which is a matter not connected with wrecking, the result will be that things will remain as they are at present. There are two kinds of towage. There is the towage spoken of by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule)—that is when rendering assistance to vessels in distress. That towage unquestionably will be permitted under this Bill, but the other towage—the towage of rafts and of vessels from port to port—is a totally different matter. We may bring in a different Bill with regard to that, or ask the Government to enter into negotiations with the American Government with the view of obtaining reciprocity in that as well as in the coasting trade, and I hope that next Session the Government will be able to bring down a measure dealing with this question. But if the amendment proposed be accepted, it will tie up this Bill, and the reciprocity I ask for will not be able to come into force until next year, because the President of the United States can only bring the American measure into force when similar rights are given to the United States; and if we give them similar rights only on condition that they give us reciprocity in towage, the President will not be able to issue his proclamation. Therefore, this Bill which I propose and which the country is in favor of, which every gentleman who has spoken here has spoken in favor of, will be rendered inoperative. I would therefore ask hon. gentlemen who have promised assistance to this Bill to vote down the amendment and vote for the Bill as it stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the House to consider the moderate nature of my proposition. I simply ask that we should propose to the American Government that the offer they have made to the Canadian Government shall be slightly extended, and be put in a shape which will give to us some slight return for the advantage they ask us to confer upon them.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Does the hon. gentleman not know that Congress is not sitting and will not be in session until next December, and, therefore, cannot amend their offer until next December?

Mr. CHARLTON. But are we to throw away the advantage we possess, are we to surrender anything we possess because our proposition cannot be acted on instantly? Not an hon. gentleman who has spoken in this House has taken the ground that the amendment in itself is one that would not be satisfactory to us and desirable to obtain. Not one has declared that if we can get this concession from the Americans—not the right of coasting but of towing vessels and rafts, reciprocal rights on the part of tugs only in the waters contiguous to the territories of either country—it would not be a desirable thing to get. Now, it is said by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) and by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and by other gentlemen: Why not pass this Bill and then introduce a Bill asking for the privileges you have embodied in your amendment? But that would be giving away everything we have to offer in consideration for this concession; it would be giving away all the hand we hold, and then we could only ask the Americans that restitution, when we have nothing to offer in return, which I propose shall be made a condition of this Bill. I do not believe the assertion that we will not get anything is well founded. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has said that we have had thrown up to us by the Americans, as something discreditable to ourselves, the fact that we have failed to accept their offer from year to year. Well, suppose we throw up to the Americans, as something discre-

ditable to them, that they have failed from year to year to accept our offer of reciprocity in coasting, an offer more reasonable than the other, an offer wider in its scope and better calculated to confer benefits on both countries. We have had this broad offer of coasting and reciprocity on our Statute-books since 1877, and the Americans select out of the incidents of coasting the one particular thing that will be of exclusive advantage to themselves, and they propose to give us reciprocity in that one item, in which we shall make nothing and lose all, and in none of the others. I hold this is a concession we ought not to make. I believe if we make this simple, moderate proposition that we will accept the American Bill, with the slightly varied condition that they will make some compensation to us for that which we undoubtedly surrender and lose in this matter, by giving to the few tugs we have in the inland waters reciprocity in towage—and they have a greater number of tugs than we, and I am not sure that their position would not be more improved than ours—I believe if we make this a condition of the acceptance of their offer, we will get it. But if we make this offer without making this condition, we will afterwards get nothing at all. For that reason I hold that if this thing is desirable and reasonable—and it is reasonable and moderate—we should make it a condition of the offer. We should say to them: Your offer is not entirely satisfactory, but if you will vary it slightly and put it in a shape more reasonable and satisfactory to us, if you will extend its conditions and embrace simply the towing of vessels and rafts by the tugs of the two nationalities, then we will close the arrangement. I will not say that should the Americans decline the proposition, I would not go for my hon. friend's Bill; I presume I would. But under the circumstances I will not support that Bill because I want to get better terms, and if we support it as it is, we lose every chance for getting better terms. For that reason I oppose the Bill, and ask the House to support my amendment. The hon. Minister of Customs says this is an amendment right in the line of what the Government has offered. It is, but it falls very far short of the terms the Government did offer and insist upon. It is an amendment in the line of reciprocity in coasting, but it only takes one of the smallest parts of coasting, and asks for reciprocity in that. I think the proposition is a moderate one. We have surrendered nine-tenths of what we asked last year, and I think if we make that a condition we will get it, while I know that if we do not make it a condition we will neither get that nor anything else.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the fact that I represent a constituency that is bordering on the Georgian Bay, where such an important trade is being built up latterly, is a sufficient reason why I should express my opinion in reference to this Bill without any unseemly interruptions. From all the sources of information at our command, in my part of the country at least, the consensus of opinion is that this Bill should become law. We have that not only from the shippers themselves, but from the shipowners, and from the only important wrecking company in my part of the country, the McCarthy Wrecking Company. We have also had an expression of opinion from the Boards of Trade in the Dominion, or especially in the Province of Ontario, and the object they all seem to have in view is to have some Bill passed which will allow these reciprocal conditions to be brought into operation immediately. The effect of this Bill, as it is proposed to be amended, will allow it to come into force immediately. I do not think the amendments of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have been pressed upon him by the McCarthy company, but that company have asked that some Bill should be passed to give the advantages of the reciprocal wrecking privileges which are proposed in this Bill; and, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says, if the Bill is not passed as it is now, we may

at some indefinite time in the future, receive the advantages which we should receive now; but, if it is allowed to pass, and thereby give the country the immediate advantages of it, we may consider at a later date the amendments proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk. I say that, in view of all the requests which have been made, and especially from our part of the country, in favor of having this measure become law immediately, the Bill should be adopted as it has been proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In reference to the amendments which have been proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) I may say that I see no objection to the amendments if they did not affect the rest of the Bill, but I do not see any reason why the Bill as it originally stood should not go into effect and allow the further propositions to be made to operate at a later date. We should not say we will take nothing unless we can get everything, and that is the proposition. Let us have reciprocity, as far as the Bill goes, and we can make a further offer afterwards. I see no objection to that, but I do see serious objection to our saying that we will not take what we can get because we cannot get all we think desirable. There are other interests than those of the owners of tugs to be considered. There are the interests of the owners of vessels and of the mariners who are employed on vessels, and they are paramount. I think, both on the ground of humanity and on that of property, if the hon. gentleman desires to propose his amendments without affecting the provisions of the Bill as it stands, there is no objection, but to say that these are to be added to the Bill and that we are to take nothing until we can get everything would be very objectionable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not inclined to propose the amendments after we have surrendered the only chance we have to get them adopted.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). If the House is going to adopt the principle of the Bill, it would be well to remove all ambiguity from it, and I think the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is really an essential part of the scheme of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), because the law of the United States does not give power to tow in American waters, and the Bill which we are discussing to-night does not give the Americans power to tow in Canadian waters. If we desire to put into effect really useful legislation which shall be beneficial to wrecked vessels and to the shipping interest of both countries, the suggestion of the hon. member for North Norfolk should be adopted. Otherwise, the Bill will be ambiguous in its terms and will give rise to litigation between the owners of vessels and tug owners.

Mr. HESSON. It is not often that I am able to agree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but on this occasion I am in full accord with him. I do not think we should give away the rights and privileges which we pride ourselves on possessing without some consideration, and I shall support the amendment of the hon. gentleman with all my influence and with my vote.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 21; nays, 67.

Bill reported.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved the consideration of the amendments.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think a Bill that has elicited so much discussion, ought to be printed before we go on with it.

Mr. BOWELL. The Bill has been materially changed since it was introduced, and it is also changed from what it was when it came from the Committee. I would suggest that it be reprinted so that the House may understand what they are doing.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We should consider the amendments now and then let the Bill stand for the third reading.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It would be better if the hon. gentleman would allow the Bill to stand over. Many changes have been made to the Bill, and the Committee just now was not very full.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I submit that the proper course is to consider the amendments now and then let the motion for the third reading stand.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not understand the Bill thoroughly myself, and I would like to see it in print.

Mr. MITCHELL. The amendments should be taken into consideration, but not the third reading.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read the first and second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:05 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 14th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### MESSAGE TO THE SENATE.

Mr. RYKERT moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate asking that their Honors will be pleased to grant leave to the Hon. W.E. Sanford, a member of the Senate, to attend the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts of the House of Commons, to give evidence in the enquiry respecting the supply of militia clothing.

Motion agreed to.

### TITLE AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH moved:

That that part of the twelfth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders which refers to the preliminary petition of J. J. Curran, Esq., praying to be permitted to lay before the House a petition for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Title and Mortgage Insurance Company of Canada, be referred back to the said Committee for further consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this motion?

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. The reason the petition was not presented earlier is that the gentleman principally interested in it was confined to bed through illness, and was not able to attend to it; but every necessary information will be given to the committee if the House will permit that part of the report to be referred back.

Motion agreed to.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the wires of telephone, telegraph and electric light companies.—(Mr. Perley.)

### NEW LONDON BREAKWATER AND HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to repair and improve the New London breakwater during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have enquired from my chief engineer with regard to this question, and his answer is as follows:—The department is not aware, from the report of any of its officers, that repairs or improvements are required on the breakwater at New London.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to send the steam dredge to dredge the channel of New London harbor during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid the engagements made for the steam dredge, next season, will make it very difficult for the department to send it to New London.

#### PIER AT CHINA POINT.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to rebuild or repair the pier at China Point, Prince Edward Island, during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down. Perhaps he may then have an answer.

#### PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have surveys held on the harbor of Pinette and Wood Island during the coming summer; and if so, in what month?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to make surveys at Pinette and Wood Island, and, as recommended by the chief engineer of the Maritime Provinces, they will be proceeded with at once, to take advantage of the ice for soundings and borings.

#### HICKEY WHARF.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the pier called "Hickey Wharf" put in a good state of repair during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The authority has already been given for that work.

#### MOUNT STEWART PIER.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to build a pier at or near Mount Stewart, Prince Edward Island, as prayed for by the inhabitants of that section?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is under the consideration of the Government.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act to provide that the salary of the Clerk of the Board of Civil Service Examiners shall be a sum not exceeding \$700 per annum, and the annual remuneration of each Examiner a sum not exceeding \$400; that Post Office Inspectors may be appointed without examination; that in the Inland Revenue Service the annual salaries of Clerks (Accountants) shall be from \$600 to \$1,400, and of special class Excisemen who are chief officers in charge of distilleries, \$1,400 to \$1,600; that in the Postal Service the annual salaries of Railway Mail Clerks shall be the same for night as for day service, and that each Railway Mail Clerk may be paid a mileage rate of half a cent for day service and of one cent for night service; that in city post offices where the annual revenue exceeds \$250,000, the Postmaster may be paid an annual salary not exceeding \$4,000; if revenue is from \$200,000 to \$250,000, a salary not exceeding \$3,750; if revenue is from \$150,000 to \$200,000, a salary not exceeding \$3,500; if revenue is from \$100,000 to \$150,000, a salary not exceeding \$3,250, and if the revenue is from \$80,000 to \$100,000, a salary not exceeding \$2,800.

#### RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the condition of the returns ordered so far this Session. I observe there have been three returns presented to-day, and before they had been laid on the Table, only fifteen had been brought down out of fifty ordered by the House. I desire to use a return ordered with respect to the money expended on the streets of Ottawa. It was ordered seventeen or eighteen days ago, and I wish the Minister of Public Works would have it brought down early. I should also like to obtain the return ordered for copies of tenders for the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that in the Public Accounts Committee to-day there was a matter brought up with respect to A. W. Webster, an immigration agent under the control of the hon. gentleman's department. Accounts were ordered to be brought before the Public Accounts Committee, and I understand a return in connection with them is in the hands either of the Secretary of State or the Minister of Agriculture. The Auditor General drew my attention to the impossibility of complying with the resolution of the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the papers, because they were in the hands of one of those departments. As we cannot proceed until this return is presented to the House, I hope the Minister of Agriculture will note the fact and have it presented at once, in order that the matter may be taken up before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. CARLING. I will make a note of it, and see that it has attention.

Mr. WELSH. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a notice of motion I placed on the paper on the 14th of February, for a return. As we are approaching that item very slowly, I wish the Minister would order the paper for the return to be prepared. If not, I shall have to imagine all sorts of things.

#### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. WOOD (Westmorland). Mr. Speaker, I recognise, at this stage of the debate, the difficulty of adducing anything that would be new in its character, or of special interest to the House. We must always expect in these discussions, that hon. members are allowed a great deal of latitude. The debate on the present occasion has taken a very wide range, and I think, already, there has been introduced into it almost every conceivable subject-matter which bears either directly or indirectly on the question under consideration. Indeed, Sir, the great variety of the subjects treated of, and the arguments presented, is rather bewildering than otherwise. I could not help, when we were listening to the eloquent address of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter), the very interesting address of the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Perry), being induced to follow those hon. gentlemen in their flights of fancy, but we were afterwards brought back by the relevant remarks of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Laundry), to have our attention called to the fact that we were discussing the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that the subject of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was the subject which was engaging the attention of this assembly at the present time. I must admit, at the outset, that I do not propose to follow the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me over all the ground they have travelled; I do not under-



take to enter upon all the subjects that have been discussed, nor do I intend to supply new material that has not been introduced into the debate. I shall devote the time I occupy in drawing the attention of the House to what I regard as the principal and most important arguments that have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, in support of the resolution we are considering, and give what I consider to be the answers to those arguments. In the first place, Sir, the arguments which have been addressed to the House, and which have been more persisted in by hon. gentlemen opposite than any other, are arguments based on the prosperity of Canada, and the benefit which the people of Canada derived from trade with the United States during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866. Hon. gentlemen have given us statistics to show the growth of the trade between Canada and the United States during that period, and upon that they have based their estimate of the advantages that would accrue to the country if we had unrestricted reciprocity at the present time. The force of these arguments is entirely destroyed by reference to two important facts. The first is that during the existence of that treaty, from 1861 to 1866 the people of the United States were engaged in a civil war, and that hundreds, and thousands, and millions from the productive classes in that country were called away from their ordinary avocations, and compelled to do duty on the field of battle. In consequence, the productive power of the nation was seriously impaired, and the result of that state of things was that the demand for all the principal articles that we produce, and which we are in a position to export to the United States, exceeded the supply; prices, in consequence, were enormously enhanced, and what proved to be to the American people a great national calamity, proved to the people of this country a great source of advantage and profit. The second important fact is this: since the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 the United States have made wonderful progress and advancement. The development of their agricultural interests has been especially large, the extension of their railway system and the settlement of their agricultural districts in the west have largely increased the productive powers of the nation, and they are able to-day not only to supply their own markets with all the descriptions of agricultural produce which they require, but they have a surplus to export to other countries. Now, Sir, it must be evident to everyone that arguments based on the condition of things for some years previous to 1866 are entirely inapplicable to the condition of the case to-day. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made an estimate that if the Reciprocity Treaty had continued in force up to this time the trade of Canada with the United States would have reached, I believe he said \$150,000,000 annually. That estimate, Mr. Speaker, would have been far more accurate if he had based it on the continuance of the civil war rather than upon the continuance of the Reciprocity Treaty. The hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Perry) expressed an earnest desire to restore to the farmers of that Island and to the farmers of the Maritime Provinces generally, the prosperity which they enjoyed under the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866. That hon. gentleman would gain his object much more effectually if he could succeed in inciting another civil war in the United States, rather than by devoting his energies to securing another reciprocity treaty, and, in my humble judgment, I may say that I think he would have about as good prospects of success in the one direction as in the other. It must be evident to any one who seriously considers all the features of this case, that any arguments based on the condition of things in 1866, when the demand for our products in the United States exceeded the supply, and the seller fixed the price, are entirely inapplicable to the condition of things at the present time, when the

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

supply exceeds the demand, and the buyer fixes the price. Any arguments, therefore, based on that condition of things, are entirely misleading, and have little bearing upon the question we are now considering. Then, Sir, there was another class of arguments addressed to the House, based upon the prosperity of the United States. Almost every gentleman who has addressed the House from that side, has called our attention to the wonderful growth and prosperity of that great country in the past. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) elaborated that idea and this argument more fully, I believe, than any other gentleman who has yet addressed the House. That hon. gentleman furnished us with a great mass of statistics relative to the growth and progress of our neighbors across the line. He pointed out to us the remarkable growth and prosperity of that country, and he traced its history from 1776 to the present time. I, for one, and I believe also that the majority of the members of this House feel under a debt of gratitude to that hon. gentleman for the valuable information which his speech contained, and I am sure that we all admired the eloquent manner in which it was delivered to this House; but while these statistics may be valuable for many important purposes, yet, so far as proving that unrestricted reciprocity would be advantageous to the people of Canada to-day, they are, in my opinion, entirely valueless. I will give my reasons why. When the hon. gentleman points to the growth and prosperity of the United States in the past, and presents that to us as the measure of the prosperity which the Dominion would have enjoyed as a part of that great republic, or if she had free trade with that great republic, he proceeds upon the supposition that the advantages of that free trade would have been equally distributed between the two countries. Now, Sir, that is a false assumption. That is an assumption which the history of the United States itself proves to be entirely unwarranted. If that assumption were correct it would follow, for the same reason, that the different States of the Union, the different sections of that great republic, would have shared equally in the past in the generally prosperity of the country. But, Sir, has that been the case? Has Maine prospered as the neighboring State of Massachusetts has prospered? Has Massachusetts grown in population and wealth equally with the State of New York? Have the New England States had the same progress and prosperity, and the same growth in population and in wealth, as the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Indiana? Have the States of Virginia and Georgia and the Carolinas had as large a share in the general prosperity of the republic as the States of New York and Pennsylvania? Why, Sir, if there is one feature that to-day is conspicuous in the United States, it is the great disparity that exists between the growth and prosperity and the present condition of the different sections of that great Republic. Let me, for the information of the House, read a few statistics on that point. I find, by turning to the United States census for 1880, that the increase in the value of real and personal property in thirty years, from 1850 to 1880, in the State of Maine, scarcely reached \$400,000,000, in the State of Massachusetts over \$2,200,000,000, and in the State of New York over \$7,500,000,000. I might continue these comparisons much further, as I have them here, but I do not wish to weary the House; and I will simply call attention to two other facts gathered from the census of 1880. The value of property in the two States of New York and Pennsylvania exceeded the value of property in all the other States east of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, including nineteen States of the Union. West of the Ohio River, the increase in the value of property in the three States of Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, was 150 per cent. greater than it was in Wisconsin, Minnesota and Iowa. If the hon. gentleman had desired to

ascertain what would have been the position of the Provinces of Canada to-day if they had been a portion of the American Republic from 1776 to the present time, instead of furnishing general statistics regarding the growth of the whole nation, he should have examined into the condition of those States of the Union and those sections of the Republic which most nearly correspond with the Provinces of the Dominion, in climate, natural resources, geographical position, and other respects. If he had desired to ascertain whether the Provinces of Canada would have been more prosperous to-day than they are if they had been a portion of the American Republic, he should have compared their progress and development with the progress of the states immediately adjoining them. He should have compared Maine with New Brunswick, the Maritime Provinces with the New England States, Quebec with the States adjoining, and Ontario with the great State of New York. That was the comparison made the other evening by the hon. member for Welland, and that is the only true method of comparison, if we wish to arrive at sound conclusions on this subject. Now, Sir, what did that comparison show? I do not wish to repeat the figures which that hon. gentleman presented to the House, although I have them here; I will merely refer to some of the results. In regard to population, the increase in the three States of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont during thirty years, was a little over 9 per cent., and in ten years it was only 4 per cent.; while in the three Maritime Provinces the increase of population in the same periods was 60 per cent. and 13 per cent. respectively. From 1870 to 1880 the increase in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont, which lie contiguous to the Province of Quebec, was a little over 4 per cent., while the increase in the population of Quebec was over 14 per cent. Then, if we go west and compare Ontario with New York, we find that the increase of population in ten years in the great empire state of New York, including as it does the great commercial metropolis of the nation, was only a little over 15 per cent., while in Ontario, from 1871 to 1881, the increase exceeded 18 per cent. Now, let me just call the attention of the House for a moment or two to a comparison of the agricultural development in the Maritime Provinces and in the states adjoining. I find that in the four States of Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont and New Hampshire the increase in the quantity of improved agricultural lands in twenty years was 1,200,000 acres, or 11½ per cent.; during the same time, in the four Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, the increase in the quantity of improved agricultural lands was 3,000,000 acres, or 43 per cent. During the same period, in the four states referred to, the number of horses and cattle actually decreased by 300,000, while in the four Provinces referred to the number of horses and cattle increased by 765,000. During the same period the quantity of grain and potatoes raised in the four states referred to decreased 3,500,000 bushels, while in the four Provinces it increased 16,300,000 bushels. Then, if we go further west, I find by the State Report of the State of New York, this extraordinary statement, that in 1887, three-fourths of the farms of that state were under mortgage, and that one in every twenty of the farmers, representing in all 75,000 farmers of that state, were hopelessly in debt. I find by the same report that from 1870 to 1880 there was a decrease in the value of lands in the State of New York of \$216,000,000, and that decrease has continued. By the report of the Province of Ontario, I find that in four years, from 1882 to 1886, the increase in the value of farm lands in that Province was \$66,750,000. Then, from 1870 to 1880 the increase in the seven principal crops in the Province of Ontario was 66 per cent., while the increase in the same crops in the State of New York was only 16 per cent. I will only trouble the

House by a reference to one other matter in this connection, that is, a comparison of the distribution of the commerce of the two countries. In the Dominion of Canada we find that in the past the commerce of our principal seaports has gradually increased. This is the case with St. John, Halifax and all the other seaports of the Maritime Provinces. It is also the case with Quebec and Montreal, the great seaports on the River St. Lawrence. Now, Sir, what is the condition of the commerce of the United States to-day? The great city of New York has had remarkable growth. That city to-day controls 65 per cent of the entire import and export trade of the country between the Province of New Brunswick and Mexico; the cities of Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia and New Orleans control 25 per cent., and of the remaining 10 per cent., the principal part is distributed among the seaports of the southern states such as Galveston, Mobile, Pensacola, Charleston, and Savannah. But when we come to the seaports of the northern states, we find that their commerce is practically annihilated. New York, Boston, and Baltimore to-day practically control the entire import and export trade of the eastern, central and western states of the Union. Now, is there any possible reason, if this Dominion had been a part of the American Republic from 1776 to the present time, that can be assigned why New York or Boston would not have controlled the trade of Ontario in the same way that they control the trade of every state west of the Ohio River or Lake Michigan? I ask hon. gentlemen if there is any possible reason why the commerce of the ports of Quebec and Montreal, standing on the great St. Lawrence River, should have gradually increased, so that to-day their commerce is represented by upwards of 1,100,000 tons of shipping which entered and departed from those ports during the last year, while the commerce of New Orleans, at the mouth of the Mississippi, is gradually being reduced, so that it is represented to-day by a tonnage of not more than half the commerce of the cities to which I have referred, and that it is actually less by something like 100,000 tons of shipping than it was thirty years ago. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen, also, to consider whether under those circumstances, that the commerce of St. John during ten years would show an increase of 25 per cent. in the tonnage of vessels from foreign ports entering and departing from that port, or that the commerce of Halifax would have increased 50 per cent. during the same period, while the commerce of Bangor, Bath, Salem, Lynn and New Haven, and almost every other port on the north Atlantic coast, is a matter, to-day, of history only. There is only one exception, and that is the city of Portland, which retains some commercial importance from the fact that it is the outlet for a considerable portion of the products of this Dominion. I would ask hon. gentlemen also to consider whether any reason can be assigned, if this country had been a part of the American Republic from 1776 to the present, why New Brunswick should present, to-day, a more rapid growth in population and agricultural development than the adjoining State of Maine, or whether there is any reason why the comparison between the Maritime Provinces and the New England States should be so favorable to the former, or why Quebec should compare favorably with the states adjoining, and Ontario with the great State of New York? Why, to suppose that this condition of things would exist, if this country had belonged to the United States, is not only contrary to reason and common sense, but such a supposition is positively contradicted by the historical facts to which I have referred; and hon. gentlemen cannot, to-day, furnish one good reason or one sound argument, and they cannot find one, among all the masses of statistics which have been presented to this House to support the contention that the Provinces of this Dominion would enjoy greater prosperity at present as a portion of the American

Republic than they do as a portion of the British Empire. The history of the United States proves conclusively that the effect of free commercial intercourse between adjoining states and adjoining countries is not to distribute equally among them all the advantages of that free trade. It proves conclusively that all do not participate equally in the growth and prosperity of the whole—but just the reverse. It proves that the favored portions of the country grow at the expense of the less favored. It proves that the strong absorbs the weak, that the result of extending free trade over a large area is to create great centres of manufacturing industry, that these centres of manufacturing industry grow and prosper with the growth of the nation, while the weaker interests languish and die. So far as the commerce of the country is concerned, the effect of extending this free trade principle is to develop the commerce of those parts which are most favorably situated in regard to geographical position or which have other advantages. It places them in a position to control a large part of the commerce of the country, so that they gradually concentrate within themselves the business enterprise and the capital of the nation, with the result that they gradually, from time to time, absorb the entire commercial interests of the country. Now, there is one other lesson which Canadians should learn from the facts to which I have referred, and that is that the Provinces of this Dominion, if they had been a part of the American Republic from 1776 to the present, would have, from their geographical position, enjoyed the least share of the benefits of free commercial intercourse between the two countries, and the result would have been, instead of occupying the proud position which they do to-day, instead of, by their remarkable growth and progress and prosperity during the last few years, attracting the attention and commanding the admiration of the civilised world to-day, they would have been a mere insignificant fringe on the outskirts of that great Republic, without a history and without a name; and that is the position to which they will be rapidly reduced if this policy is adopted at the present time. There is another class of arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite, based upon the growth and development and prosperity of the United States. Hon. gentlemen point to that prosperity. They tell us it is largely due to the fact that these states have enjoyed free and unrestricted commercial intercourse with each other, and that if they have prospered under those circumstances, Canada would have prospered under like circumstances. As the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) put it, that if unrestricted reciprocity was good for 40 states or commonwealths, it was better still for 47. That is the free trade argument pure and simple; that is the argument which might be used by its advocates in its most innocent and harmless form. The answer to that argument is this. It is of the very highest importance that the same people, living under the same government, in which they are all represented, subject to the same laws, in the making of which they all have a voice, should for various reasons enjoy the freest social and commercial intercourse; but it does not follow by any means that a different people, living under a different form of government, subject to different laws, existing under conditions entirely different in respect of climate, geographical position, natural resources, and in other respects, would enjoy the same benefit from free trade. The history of the world proves the very contrary. We have examples in history of countries which have prospered under the free trade policy, and of countries which have prospered under the protective policy. The relative advantages which every country must derive from the adoption of either policy must be governed in each individual case by the circumstances to which I have referred—by the geographical position, by the natural resources, by the facilities

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

they possess for carrying on manufacturing industries, by the relative advancement of their people in industrial and manufacturing pursuits. The hon. gentleman omits entirely from his argument all these considerations, which are essential and vital in order to enable us to reach sound conclusions upon this subject. The arguments, therefore, which have been addressed to the House from the other side upon this line are entirely misleading and of no value in relation to the subject which we are considering. Then, I will call the attention of the House to another feature of the arguments which have been presented for our consideration, and that is that every argument which has been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite in favor of this policy of unrestricted reciprocity might have been used with equal force and with equal propriety if they had been advocating commercial union or annexation. I may refer to this subject later, but, before I leave the point I have just been discussing, allow me to add this further observation, that the history of the United States has, for the people of this country, some important and instructive lessons. Of the New England States, those which have grown most rapidly in population, in wealth, and in material prosperity, have been the State of Massachusetts, the State of Rhode Island, and the State of Connecticut. In the west, the states which have made the same relative progress have been those of Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana, and the other agricultural states adjoining them. The causes for this are obvious. The protective policy which was adopted by the Government of the United States, built up and placed on a permanent foundation the manufacturing industries of the eastern states to which I have referred. They became great centres of manufacturing industry. They attracted within their borders wealth, capital, skill, and a large laboring population, and they have grown and prospered with the growth of the nation. The extension of the railways of the United States westward, opening up, as they did, a rich and fertile land west of Ohio and of Lake Michigan, induced a large amount of emigration to take place in that direction. The superior agricultural facilities, and the superior quality of land offered there, attracted thousands and tens of thousands of people to enter upon those lands from foreign countries and also from the older states of the Union. Now, what has been the experience in the United States in that respect, is our experience to-day. The same causes which produced those results there are producing similar results at this time in our own country. The policy of protection which was introduced in 1879 has been stimulating the manufacturers of the older Provinces, and it is known to everyone that the cities and towns of those Provinces have, since that time, grown rapidly in population and in wealth. The extension of our railway system westward, opening up, as it has, the fertile lands of the North-West, and rendering them available for settlement, is rapidly filling up that country with an industrious and thrifty population. We have been repeatedly told in this House that in some portions of Ontario and in the Maritime Provinces, the population is decreasing. It would be unreasonable to imagine that it could be otherwise, that in the poorer agricultural districts of the older Provinces at the present time the growth of population should be anything but slow. It is possible that it may be stationary. But I venture to predict that, when the census of 1891 is taken, it will show an increase in the population and wealth of Canada which hon. gentlemen will seek in vain to find a parallel for in the United States or any other country on the face of the globe. Other arguments which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite have been based upon the increase of the debt of the country, and upon the present financial condition of the country. Had I spoken earlier in this debate, I would have referred at greater length to this feature of the subject, but now I must pass it over with a few general remarks. The general line

of argument followed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think, may be fairly and briefly stated as follows. The debt of the country has rapidly increased. It was \$76,000,000 at the time of Confederation. Ten years after it was \$140,000,000. Ten years later on it was \$234,500,000. The *per capita* tax in 1867 was \$22.47; in 1878 it was \$34.41, and in 1888 it was \$47. Hon. gentlemen proceed to argue that this state of things is sufficient to excite alarm in the minds of the people in this country, and that we have good grounds for apprehending that a crisis is approaching; that, unless some radical change takes place in the policy of the country, such as that which is now proposed, disaster must be inevitable. In answer to that argument, let me simply point out to the House this fact. Neither the gross amount of the debt, nor the *per capita* amount of the debt, nor the increase of the debt within a given time, is sufficient of itself to determine the relative financial condition of this country at different periods of our history. There are other conditions which are not only important, but are absolutely necessary to be considered, in order to enable us to reach a sound conclusion. These are the purposes for which the money is borrowed, the manner in which it is expended, and the results of that expenditure. The city of Ottawa to-day has, I believe, a debt of between \$2,500,000 and \$3,000,000. The old city of Bytown, a quarter of a century ago, was, I assume, comparatively free from debt. Yet no one will argue from that that Ottawa to-day is in a worse financial position or is nearer a position of embarrassment than Bytown was a quarter of a century ago. The financial position must be judged, not by the increase of the debt, but by the relation of the debt to the wealth of the city, and the financial position of Canada to-day or at any previous period must be ascertained, not by the amount of the debt, or by the increase of the debt, but by the relation of the debt to the wealth of the country at the different periods which are compared. Everyone knows that the debt of Canada has rapidly increased, but the result of the large expenditures which have been made, and for which that debt has been incurred, has been to increase the wealth of the country in a far more rapid ratio, and the financial condition is, therefore, materially improved. I entertain, in regard to the debt, the same opinion which I believe is entertained by a majority of the members of this House, and a majority of the people of this country. The debt is large, it has rapidly increased, but that was necessary under the peculiar circumstances in which the country was placed. It was necessary in the earlier years of our history as a united people, to make large expenditures, to incur large liabilities, in order to bind together the different sections of the country, to provide for the development of our resources, and to insure our rapid growth in population and in wealth. The results to-day fully justify the policy that was pursued. I can understand how hon. gentlemen years ago might honestly oppose that policy; I can understand how, at the inception of the great undertakings in which we have been engaged, hon. gentlemen might question the practicability, or the utility, or the ultimate success, of these great undertakings; I can understand how, in view of the enormous expenditure involved, financial disaster might be feared; but, Sir, I am utterly at loss to know to-day how, in view of the remarkable results that have followed, how, in view of the remarkable growth, progress and prosperity of this country, how, in view of the indications of accumulating wealth which we see on every side, there can be any two opinions in this country in regard to the wisdom of the policy that has been pursued, how any one can question the practical advantage and the utility of the expenditures which have been made, or can have any doubts or fears in regard to the present position or future prospects of Canada. Why, Sir, I think the statements which were made the other day by the hon. Minister of Finance should be satis-

factory both to this House and to the country. I think we should congratulate that hon. gentleman, not only upon the very clear, and forcible, and eloquent language in which that statement was presented, but the very remarkable exhibit he was able to make of the growth and development of the country. The progress of this country since Confederation has been such that it should excite feelings of gratitude and pride in the breast of every patriotic Canadian. I believe, Sir, the House will also agree with me, that there is nothing in the amount of our debt at the present time, or in the taxation which the people of this country are called upon to bear, which demands a radical change in the policy of the present Administration. I think, too, that the House will agree with me that there is nothing in the wonderful growth and prosperity of our great American neighbors, that is sufficient to excite within us feelings of envy, or jealousy, or discontent; much more, that there is nothing in all the arguments which have been addressed to the House by hon. gentlemen opposite to call for a change of Government, which, after all, I believe, is the change which hon. gentlemen most earnestly desire. What would be the effect of a change of Government upon the country it is difficult to conjecture, for the reason that such grave doubts exist at the present time in regard to the policy that would be pursued if those hon. gentlemen were returned to power. I think we may fairly conclude, from the speeches which have been delivered in this House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that he is a firm believer in free trade principles. Those who have listened to him during the last two Sessions can have no doubt that he is a warm advocate of free trade with the United States; and from the position which that hon. gentleman occupies in this House, and in the party to which he belongs, he is entitled to be regarded as a very high authority in regard to the fiscal policy of the party. But, Sir, if that is the fiscal policy of the party to-day, it is directly opposed to the policy of the party only two years ago. The leader of the Opposition at that time announced to the people of Canada that if the Liberal party were returned to power, there would be no radical change in the fiscal policy of the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I say yes. That hon. gentleman said that the necessities of the country were such that a high rate of taxation must be maintained, that those who had invested their capital in manufacturing industries, in industries which owed their existence to the National Policy, in industries which could only be successfully carried on by the maintenance of that policy, had nothing to fear from a return of the Liberal party to power in this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to tell to-day, if a change of Government should take place, which of these opposing policies would prevail. It is quite as possible that, if a new leader arose, a new policy would be propounded. However, Sir, I will not weary the House with speculations on this point, but I shall pass it by with this additional observation. Whatever might be the effect of a change of Government upon the country at large, I think we are justified in believing that its effect would be beneficial upon the Liberal party generally, and especially upon the views and the opinions of their leaders. We all know that the same persons, under different circumstances, often take very different views of the same subject. As an illustration, a person who has gone successfully down one of our toboggan slides, has a better idea of the sport than the person who is standing shivering in the cold, waiting for his turn. As another illustration, the merchant who has carried on his business successfully, who enjoys the public's favor and a large share of the public patronage, has usually a better idea of the community in which he lives

than his unsuccessful rival. This, we must admit, is a weakness of our human nature, and I feel inclined to believe that it is a weakness from which hon. gentlemen opposite are not entirely free; and I believe that this largely accounts for the extraordinary expressions of views and opinions which we have heard from that side of the House, and the wonderful changes of policy which have taken place during the last few years. Hon. gentlemen have been so long in the atmosphere of opposition waiting for their turn, that their views upon great questions of public policy seem to be thrown into hopeless confusion. While we cannot conjecture what benefit would result to the country generally by a change of Government, I think we are justified in hoping that a change of Government would at least restore greater harmony in the views and opinions of their leaders. Now, Sir, of all the different policies which have been proposed, perhaps the policy that we are considering at the present time is, in many respects, the most extraordinary. This policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was first brought prominently to the attention of this House and the country when the hon. gentleman opposite introduced his resolution a year ago. It was pointed out at that time by those who addressed the House on this side, that that policy would not only be disadvantageous to this country generally, but that it was entirely impracticable. I think anyone who considers the results of the discussions since must conclude that that opinion has been since confirmed. Since that policy was proposed last year, this subject has been discussed in the press and on the platform, from one end of this country to the other, and the result of that discussion to-day is that, outside of the party which sit in this House, outside of the very strongest of their supporters in the country, outside of that portion of the press which is devoted to their interests, there is no important class of our people, there are no important personages among our public men, who are supporting this policy. Mr. Erastus Wiman and Professor Goldwin Smith, who laid the foundation of the platform on which the Liberal party stand to-day, are advocates either of commercial union or of annexation. If we cross the line the result of the discussion there has been even more remarkable. Anyone who follows the current of public opinion as expressed in the press of that country will find there is a portion of the people who advocate annexation, and there is another portion who advocate commercial union. If we take the utterances of the public men belonging to both political parties, we find the same result. This policy of unrestricted reciprocity appears to be entirely ignored. It has not received, so far as I am aware, the slightest consideration across the line. It is true that, a year ago, a Bill was introduced in Congress embodying this principle. What was its fate? It was withdrawn before it had even passed its initial stage in its progress through the House, and a Bill was substituted embodying the principle of commercial union. The resolution which passed the House only a few days ago embodied the principle of commercial union. I have the resolution in my desk and I intended to read it to the House, but I believe it was read yesterday, and I shall have to refer hon. gentlemen to *Hansard*. But if hon. gentlemen will follow to-day not only the discussion in the public press of the country, but if they will follow and examine the opinions expressed by the leading public men of the country upon every platform where this question has been referred to, they will find that the people of the neighboring republic either advocate annexation, or if they advocate commercial union, they advocate it as a necessary initial step to the accomplishment of the other end. What object do hon. gentlemen have in advocating this policy of unrestricted reciprocity in this country? It is, no doubt, true that there may be some persons in Canada who, from the peculiarity of the locality in which they reside, or from the

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland.)

business in which they are engaged, would be benefited by unrestricted reciprocity with the United States; and hon. gentlemen hope to gain the political support of that class among our people, and, at the same time, to conceal from the great masses of our people the inevitable result to which this policy, if it could be adopted, must inevitably lead. They advocate this policy, this impracticable policy of unrestricted reciprocity, utterly regardless of the fact that it must, if adopted, lead eventually to the annexation of this country to the United States. I wish to offer a few observations in regard to another line of policy which has been advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite during the present Session. Hon. gentlemen have been advocating a policy of conciliation, they have been asking the Government to conciliate the Government and people of the United States, they have taken the unwise and, in my humble judgment, the unpatriotic course of denouncing the Government of this country for firmly maintaining our rights upon the fisheries question. They have characterised the treatment of American fishermen by the Dominion Government as harsh and cruel. They have told us that the interpretation which we put upon the Treaty of 1813 is too rigid, is too strict, is too much in the interests of Canada, and too unfavorable to the interests of the neighboring republic. The absurdity of this contention, the inconsistent position which hon. gentlemen occupy on this subject, was fully exposed the other day by the Minister of Justice, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite unanimously supporting a resolution, introduced by the leader of the Opposition party, asking the Government of the day to extend to American fishermen, for another year, the *modus vivendi* provided for in connection with the late treaty. For what purpose? To reconcile or to conciliate the people of the United States. Why, is there any hon. gentleman in this House who knows so little of business transactions as to suppose that the Government, or the people of the United States, can be conciliated by any such policy as that? Is there anyone here so ignorant of the principles on which commercial arrangements are negotiated as to suppose, for one moment, that friendship in trade can be purchased by voluntary concession of undoubted right? Such a policy inevitably defeats the very object had in view, and if that policy was followed in this instance, if it had any influence whatever, its effect would be rather to retard and embarrass than to promote the settlement of the fisheries question. Then we have been told that we cannot afford to be unfriendly with the people of the United States, that it is of paramount importance, not only to this country but to Great Britain, that friendly relations should be maintained, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) went so far as to say that in the event of invasion we would be unable to defend ourselves although we were aided by all the military and naval forces of the British Empire. I do not profess to be a very high authority on military matters, I am not sure the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is a better authority than I am; but I venture to express this opinion that, if I know anything whatever of the character of the Canadian people, they will not propose to surrender themselves to the great republic before an invasion is even threatened; and, unless I mistake them entirely, they will not surrender their heritage under any circumstances without a struggle. I believe in this case we can successfully maintain the rights for which we are now contending. Those rights have been secured to us by treaty, they have been maintained by Great Britain, on our behalf, for upwards of seventy years, they have been recognised in every possible way, they have been acknowledged in the most public and positive manner by the chief executive of the American nation within the last twelve months. Under these circumstances, I believe we can maintain these rights. I feel more. I feel that, with such

a cause, with a cause the equity and justice of which is unquestioned, we rely not merely on our own numerical strength, we rely not alone on the power and prestige of Great Britain, but, unless we have lost all confidence in the civilisation of the nineteenth century, we can rely upon the support of the civilised world, and I think I may surely add, we can rely on the honest sentiment of the people of the United States themselves to support us in this contention. I referred in the outset of my remarks to the condition in which Canada would have been placed to-day if she had been from 1776—as it was suggested she might have been—a portion of the American Republic. Let me very briefly refer to some of the results which would follow if this free trade principle were adopted now. The result of adopting free trade with the United States would, in the first instance, utterly annihilate all those manufacturing industries which have been brought into existence by the National Policy, and which depend for their continued prosperity upon the maintenance of that policy. In addition to that, the adoption of free trade with the United States would utterly destroy the foreign trade of this country. That, Sir, has been fully established by the history of the past. Hon. gentlemen tell us that if the barriers to trade were thrown down, the trade between this country and the United States would be enormously increased. I have no doubt there would be an increase, but that increase would be gained at the sacrifice of our trade with every other country in the world. We would be compelled to buy in the United States the manufactured goods which we consume, and we would soon be compelled to rely upon them for a market for our own products. The imports of this country and the exports of this country would be diverted from Canadian to American channels, and the business enterprise and energy of our great commercial cities would be transferred to New York and Boston and the other commercial centres across the line. But, Sir, there are still other dangers to be apprehended. We are, during this present Session, considering legislation regarding Trade Combinations. The people of this country recognise the possible disastrous results which might follow to the masses of the people if monopolies were allowed to assume large proportions within our borders. I believe, Sir, that this Parliament now and always will be ready to adopt any legislation which may be necessary to prevent the growth of this evil, but shall we at the same time expose the people of this country to a similar and a greater danger from abroad? While we protect our people from our own merchants and our own manufacturers, shall we expose them to the greater and the stronger combinations that exist across the line? Every person knows that there is no country in the world to-day where combinations of capital exist on a more extended scale, or with more perfect organisation, and with more extended and dangerous powers, than they do in the United States at the present time. In this country we have a power to-day which entirely protects us from this danger. In Canada to-day we are able to prevent any combination of foreign capitalists, however powerful, from entering this country to control our markets, to destroy our industry, or to demoralise our trade. That power is the power which this Parliament possesses to form our own fiscal policy and to make our own tariff. Deprive us of that power and we are helpless. Adopt this free trade policy and you open this whole country as one rich harvest field for American speculation, you open the storehouses which nature has filled with wealth for our use and for our benefit, to be plundered by any combination of foreign capitalists that may choose to enter them. Our fields, our forests, our mines, and our fisheries would be robbed of their wealth and for what—to build up the industries of a foreign nation, to enrich their capitalists and to provide food and employment for their people. Why, Sir, if there is one thing which the people of Canada should learn from the

history of the past, it is to maintain unimpaired the commercial independence which we enjoy to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the effects of retaliations. We all recognise and fully recognise, the disastrous consequence that would result to this country if that policy were adopted. I, for one, Sir, do not believe that that policy will be adopted. I cannot believe that the American people, without provocation, and without any good reason for their act, will adopt a policy which would be disastrous not only to this country, but to themselves. But, Sir, if they do adopt that policy, I am glad to know that the people of Canada are in a better position to-day to accept that policy than at any previous period in the history of the country. While we recognise these disastrous effects, while we recognise the fact that retaliation might impede, for a time, our prosperity, yet we know that such a policy could not long prevent our growth and future development. I would say in addition, that in my opinion we had far better suffer all the disastrous consequences of retaliation or non-intercourse, rather than surrender for one moment the absolute control of our own affairs which we enjoy at the present time. The United States in the past always have legislated in their own interests, entirely regardless of the interests of this country, and it is folly to suppose that they would do otherwise in the future. It was the Government of the United States, and not the Government of Canada, that erected that tariff wall which now obstructs our trade, and which hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to remove. They framed that tariff in their own interests, to protect their own merchants and their own manufacturers, to give their own people the control of their own markets, and at the same time to place them in the position that they could control the markets of this country by making Canada a slaughter market for their wares. That policy succeeded until it was checked by our tariff policy of 1879. Every time the door for reciprocity has been opened between the two countries since then, it has been opened at our request, and every time it has been closed it has been closed by the American people in their own interests and against our wishes. The Treaty of 1888, which was acknowledged on all sides to be a fair and honorable settlement of the negotiations then pending, was rejected by the Senate of the United States, not because there was anything unjust in the least of its provisions, but because the exigencies of the dominant political party on the eve of a presidential election rendered it expedient to do so. With these facts fresh in our minds, I believe the people of Canada will hesitate long before they will adopt a policy which will place the framing of our tariff in the hands of a foreign legislature, and before they will place themselves in a position at the very mercy of a power that will not hesitate to sacrifice any or all of the important interest of this country, if even the exigencies of a political contest render it expedient to do so. The Dominion of Canada has within itself all the elements necessary to insure its future growth and greatness. We have natural resources of great variety, fertility and extent; we have a superabundance of food and fuel; we have a great variety of raw material, and we have natural facilities for carrying on successfully a large number of manufacturing industries. If we desire to develop the resources which we possess in such a manner that they will contribute most largely to our own benefit and advantage; if we wish to protect the varied interests of this country so that they will insure its most rapid growth in population and in wealth; if we wish to create in this country an internal trade vast in its volume, full of life and ceaseless activity; we can only do so by retaining the power we possess to-day to frame our own tariffs and make our own customs laws. The Dominion of Canada has also many advantages for the development of a foreign trade. We all admit that if we had free access to the American markets, we would derive

some advantages from those markets; but at best those advantages would be but local in their character and limited in their extent. We must look in entirely different directions for the greater, more important, and more profitable development of our commercial interests. There are great continents across the sea, to the south of us, to the west of us, to the east of us, the products of which our people are importing and consuming very largely every year; products which they require to use as food, as clothing, or as raw material for manufacturing purposes; products which are at the present time entering into daily and common use among the masses of our people, contributing to their comfort or their pleasure. Those same continents offer an unlimited market for the surplus of all, or almost all, of our natural and manufactured products. We desire to extend our trade in those directions. The people of this country, a large portion of them, naturally incline to commercial pursuits. Canada's foreign trade to-day is double that of the United States in proportion to population. We are seeking to extend it still more. We are devising means at this very time to establish direct steam communication with the countries to which I have referred; and we are devising means to render the exchange of our commodities as direct, easy and inexpensive as possible, in order that our own people may derive all the advantages possible to be derived from that exchange. All our efforts in this direction must be utterly futile, utterly useless, unless we retain unimpaired the power we possess to-day to frame our own fiscal policy and impose our own duties. And, Sir, in connection with our commercial interests let me call the attention of the House to the importance of maintaining our present friendly relations with Great Britain. We must not undervalue the importance of the British markets to us. It is the natural market of very many of our products. We export largely to that market to-day, and we must become still more dependent upon it in the future. We must remember, too, that Great Britain gives us the freedom of her market, and asks for no equivalent in return. We must also bear in mind that the people of this country go to Great Britain for aid in all their important public and private undertakings; that, by contributions from her treasury and guarantees of credit, Great Britain has lent us material aid in the past in some of the most important undertakings in which we have been engaged; that she has only recently granted us subsidies which have enabled us to establish steamship lines on the Pacific Ocean; that we must continue to look to her for her aid and friendly co-operation if we hope to make this country the highway between Great Britain and the East. Great Britain has always aided us, and is ready still to listen to any proposal for aid in the development of our common commercial interests. I trust that the people of this country will never undervalue the advantages they derive from their present position as a portion of the British Empire; I trust that they will never fail to appreciate the value of the great national resources we possess, and that they will always fully recognize the importance of retaining the power within ourselves to develop them for our own profit and our advantage; I trust that they will always maintain those important safeguards which are necessary for the proper protection of our great agricultural, manufacturing and commercial interests; above all, Sir, I trust that the people of this country will never barter away at any price the political or the commercial freedom which they enjoy to-day, or surrender to any foreign people, however friendly, the power which this Parliament alone possesses to frame our own fiscal policy, to make our own tariffs, and to change them from time to time as the necessity of this growing country may demand—a power, Sir, upon the maintenance and proper exercise of which the whole future destiny of Canada depends.

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, the policy involved in the proposition contained in the amendment laid before the Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) meets my hearty concurrence; and I consider that I would not be serving the interests of my constituency, which is composed almost exclusively of farmers, and generally of that class to which I belong, should I be hostile or even indifferent to the adoption of that policy. The farmers of Canada, Sir, have not lost remembrance of the great advantages and comfortable circumstances which resulted to them from the operation of the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. They deeply regretted the abrogation of that treaty, and its renewal has been ever since the constant object of their aspirations. I am sure, Sir, that the farmers of this country will receive with but little sympathy the warning given to them the other day by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), who, with burning love gushing from his heart for the farmers, advised them not to be led away by the belief that the American market could be of any great advantage to them for the sale of their produce. The farmers are not blind, Sir. They know their own interests, and they understand what is doing them good. I am sure that they would rather be persuaded by facts of daily occurrence under their eyes than by speeches such as those delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite, in their attempts to veil those facts and the commercial movement to which they belong. The hon. member for Kent, N.B., told us that the Treaty of 1854 was beneficial only during the time of the American war. Well, Sir, if such is the case, I would like to know what reason has induced the Canadian Government to make several attempts for its renewal. I would not invite my hon. friend to go to the Province of Quebec and give the farmers there the same advice which he gave the other day to the farmers of the Dominion, for he would soon find out that he was losing his time, as they would, in their turn, advise him to spare his eloquence for more glorious occasions. It is my honest conviction that free trade with the United States is one of the principal channels through which this country could reach rapid and full development of its natural wealth and its material resources. This does not mean that, deprived of that trade, this country cannot prosper, but I maintain that trade being an essential element of prosperity, the more extensive and easy it is the more beneficial ought to be the result. The opinion that free trade with the United States would strongly contribute to stimulate the prosperity of this country is not groundless, it is not a caprice, it is not a dream of the imagination, but it is based upon the history of our trade with that country since 1854. In 1853, the year immediately preceding the treaty, the volume of our trade with the United States amounted, in round numbers, to about \$23,000,000; in 1854, the first year of the treaty, it amounted to \$33,000,000, and in 1866, the last year of the treaty, the volume of our trade with the United States had reached the considerable amount of \$84,000,000. It is only fair to admit that that year, being the last of the existence of the treaty, people on both sides of the line forced their imports, particularly the people on the other side of the frontier. They imported that year to an extent which was abnormal, and which would not likely have occurred under ordinary circumstances. The treaty was abrogated, and that abrogation seriously affected our trade with the United States, and it could not develop in the same ratio, in the same ascending progression, as if the treaty had been maintained. However, it is in vain that men will erect artificial obstacles to obstruct its operation. The law of nature will triumph and have its course; and we find that, from 1870 to 1871, the volume of our trade with the United States reached the value of \$59,998,029, and from 1871 to 1872, it reached the value of \$66,114,785. In 1873, its value was \$39,808,204, and in 1874 that trade had reached the value of \$90,524,000—in spite of the heavy restrictions impeding it on the other side of the

frontier. In 1874, we touched a period of great commercial depression from which this country suffered severely, as well as the United States and England, and our trade with the United States gradually decreased every year until it fell as low as \$63,696,857 in 1880. But, in 1883, that trade increased again to the considerable amount of \$97,701,056, and this notwithstanding the fact that at that time that trade was impeded by a double wall of restrictions, after the adoption of our present tariff. From 1884 that trade being subject to the ordinary fluctuations which occur in the course of business, decreased gradually until it went down to \$81,436,808, but in 1886 it increased again, and, during 1888, reached the sum of \$91,053,913; so that this trade with the United States, last year, was nearly 50 per cent. of our trade with the whole world. Let me call the attention of the House to a comparative statement of our exports to England and the United States in 1888:

	To Great Britain.	To the United States.
Produce of the Mines.....	\$ 478,260	\$ 3,341,308
Products of the Fisheries.....	1,514,901	3,123,853
Products of the Forest.....	8,932,177	10,622,338
Animals and their products.....	16,571,072	7,545,743
Agricultural products.....	4,392,640	10,306,278
Manufactures.....	1,732,874	1,632,025
Miscellaneous.....	66,340	701,616
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$33,648,284</b>	<b>\$37,323,161</b>

Or a difference in favor of the United States of \$3,674,877. Such is the comparative statement of our exports of goods produced in Canada to England where those goods are received duty free, and of the same goods to the United States, where they are met at the frontier with severe restrictions in the form of Customs duties. Now, how is it with regard to our imports? Last year we imported from Great Britain for home consumption the value of \$39,298,721, while from the United States for the same purpose we imported \$48,481,848, or \$9,183,127 more from the United States than from Great Britain. These facts are eloquent, they are ascertained from statistics which are taken from official reports placed in our hands by the Government of this country, and they constitute, in my humble judgment, a most convincing piece of evidence that natural law is more powerful than all means invented by men to prevent its legitimate results. In presence of these facts, I say that it is in the power of no mortal man to say to-day what the expansion of our trade with the United States would be if those obnoxious restrictions which are impeding it were removed. There is on this vast globe no country where all classes of the community are enjoying so plentifully the blessings of material prosperity as the United States. They have within their own limits all the necessary elements which concur to bring about the development of that unrivalled prosperity. They cover an immense area of territory possessing all varieties of soil, all conditions of climate, all sorts of natural productions and natural wealth, and these rich and powerful sources of wealth are acted upon by an immense capital, by a people of sixty millions of souls, and by a mercantile spirit and business genius which is surpassed nowhere. The result of the cooperation of these powerful elements is a wonderful prosperity and an internal trade which is simply enormous, amounting yearly to the sum of more than \$32,000,000,000, as stated the other day by my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whose statement is based on the official report of Mr. Switzler, the chief of the Bureau of Statistics in Washington. Let our farmers and our laborers, let our merchants and our manufacturers, let all the classes of our people secure, by way of unrestricted reciprocity, a full share in that marvellous trade, and before ten years have elapsed, the face of our country will have changed, and you will see living and flourishing here in Canada under our own political institutions, the happiest and most contented people in the world. But I

am forgetting that hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to reciprocity. I do not wish to misrepresent them. I know that during last Session, whilst they took a most decidedly hostile attitude to unrestricted reciprocity, they said they would be favorable to a certain measure of reciprocity restricted to the interchange of farm products. It is clear that they take the same hostile position in regard to unrestricted reciprocity, but it is not quite so clear to me that they assume the same favorable position with regard to reciprocity in farmer's produce. However, I think I must take it for granted that they are favorable to such limited reciprocity, otherwise, hostile as they are to unrestricted reciprocity, what meaning could be given to the language of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who said the other day that they hope to secure a fair, liberal treaty with the United States. They hope to secure a fair, liberal treaty with the United States, but restricted to the interchange of natural and farm products. Repeated attempts have been made by the Canadian Government to obtain such a treaty, and all these attempts were unsuccessful. The American authorities would not even consent to open negotiations on that narrow and restricted basis. After the experience we have acquired in this respect, when a man comes and tells me he is in favor of reciprocity, but only as far as the interests of farmers are concerned, he gives me a right to tell him that practically he is in favor of no reciprocity at all. Be that as it may, it is to be noticed that, whilst hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be in favor of reciprocity as far as the interests of the farmers are concerned, they take great care at the same time in their speeches to depreciate the American market. The other evening the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) cited figures to show that the price of oats in Buffalo is to-day lower than it is in Toronto. He referred also to the fact that the United States possess a very large surplus of farm produce, which must find its way into foreign markets, and that, therefore, the market of the United States could not be of any advantage to the farmers of Canada. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) and the hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), spoke in the same manner. Well, Sir, those hon. members must have forgotten that we send to the American market a considerable quantity of farm produce for which there exists no other market. I find, in looking over the official reports, that during the year 1883 we exported altogether 20,397 horses, and of that number 19,925 went to the United States. The whole exports of our horned cattle amounted to 100,747, of that number 40,047 went to the United States. Our whole export of sheep was 395,074, of that number 353,999 went to the United States. Our whole export of poultry yielded \$127,043, of that sum \$122,222 were paid by the United States. Our whole exports in eggs amounted to 14,170,859 dozen, of that quantity we sent to the United States 14,147,739 doz. Our whole exports of barley amounted to 9,370,158 bushels, of that quantity 9,360,521 bushels went to the United States. Our whole export of wool was 954,975 lbs., of that quantity 954,189 lbs went to the United States. Our exports in hay amounted to more than 93,000 tons, of that quantity more than 84,000 tons went to the United States. Sir, this article of hay has become a very important article of export for a large portion of the farmers of the Province of Quebec. Our farmers raise a great deal of hay, which they prefer to sell than to give it to cattle. Hay is a crop which requires but very little labor, and consequently but very little expense, and when our farmers find that they can raise an average of at least one ton of hay to the acre, they find it more profitable to sell it than feed it to cattle. But that is not all. During last year our whole export, under the head of animals and their produce, and agricultural products, amounted in value to \$40,155,657, and of that sum we exported to the United States to the value of \$17,902,021; or, in other words, whilst



our whole exports under these two heads amounted, in round numbers, to \$40,000,000, the value of our exports under the same heads to the United States, was about \$18,000,000, or very nearly 50 per cent. of the whole export. Now, Sir, in presence of these facts, I ask how can any one be justified in saying that the American market is of no great advantage to the farmers of Canada? On the contrary, it is clear to everybody who wishes to keep his eyes open, that it is one of our best markets, and that it would be greatly more advantageous to our farmers if the restrictions were removed which are now impeding it, or if the doors of that market were freely opened to them. At all events, it is refreshing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be favorable to reciprocity so far as the interests of the farmers are concerned, for it is an admission on their part that reciprocity with the United States would be much better for the farmers than the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak in laudatory terms of the National Policy, of its beneficial results to the country, of the great good that it has accomplished for the farmers. They may say what they please, but their laudations will not alter the fact that while the fishermen and farmers of the Maritime Provinces and Quebec pay Customs duties upon breadstuffs which they must import, the National Policy is powerless to raise the price of those articles of which they have a surplus in the home market, for the prices of those products which constitute that surplus, and which must find their way to foreign countries, depend entirely upon the prices at which those articles are sold in foreign markets. None of us, I suppose, have forgotten that during the electoral campaign in 1878 the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, proclaimed from every hustings that he wanted the adoption of a protective tariff in order to obtain reciprocity with the United States. Well, Sir, circumstances seem to be favorable to give him and hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity to realise their expectations. The recent vote of Congress on this subject appears to open the door to them. It is true that the action of Congress implies a larger measure of reciprocity than probably would be appreciated by hon. gentlemen opposite, but, at all events, it involves the general principle of free trade between the two countries, and gives those hon. gentlemen an opportunity to redeem the pledges they made to the people in 1878. But I must confess that if the Liberal party were in power, I would have greater hope of successful negotiations being carried out with the American people. The Liberal party advocate unrestricted reciprocity, a policy which seems to-day to be more in harmony with the views of American statesmen on this subject, while hon. gentlemen opposite are favorable, and I might say reluctantly favorable, if I can judge from their speeches of to-day, only to a restrictive policy something like that involved in the Treaty of 1854, which the American authorities repeatedly refused to renew. Those hon. gentlemen profess, it is true, great sympathy with the farming class of this country, and that sympathy seems to be so developed, that it could not induce those hon. gentlemen to sacrifice the interests of the manufacturing classes to the interests of the farmers; such was their language last year, such is their language to-day, or at least its meaning. I do not believe, Sir, that unrestricted reciprocity would have the effect of favoring one class of the community at the expense of another; but I say here, as one of the representatives in this House of the farming class, that if on any occasion we were placed in the unfortunate position of being compelled to serve the interests of one class at the expense of another, I would unhesitatingly serve at first the interests of the farming class, as composing the most important class of the people, and as being the backbone of this country. But I know of but one policy that serves the interests of one class at the expense of another class, the interests of

Mr. BICHARD.

the manufacturers at the expense of the interests of the farmers, and that policy is the so-called protection National Policy of to-day. Sir, a curious fact to be noticed in connection with this subject, and which has a bearing in favor of the position of the friends of unrestricted reciprocity in this country is, that you find on the other side of the frontier line men who are hostile to this policy on precisely the same grounds as is assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I remember after the Treaty of 1874 had been negotiated between Hon. George Brown, on behalf of the Canadian Government, and the American authorities, that treaty which provided, not only for the interchange of natural products, but also of different classes of manufactured goods, was denounced in some places in the United States. Several meetings took place in the border states, and the speakers there denounced the treaty, asserting that if it were adopted it would have the effect of creating in Canada on their border a great manufacturing country against which the manufacturing power of the United States could never compete. What were the reasons that inspired those views? No doubt it was the fact that we in this country are advantageously situated for successful manufacturing, and it was doubtless the knowledge of that fact that induced such remarkable men as Senators Edmunds and Morrill of Vermont to be hostile to the recent vote of Congress on the ground that the adoption of such a policy would bring ruin to American manufacturers. Those men know the superiority of our natural advantages, they know that improved machinery can be obtained in Canada as well as in the United States, and what they fear above all is the cheap labor in this country. But permit me to say that, on this point I think, their fears are exaggerated, for under unrestricted reciprocity the Canadian and American markets having become one and the same market, the prices of goods being the same in New York, Toronto and Montreal, it is obvious that in a very short time the price of labor would also be equalised. I know that a considerable number of our manufacturers are opposed to the adoption of this policy, particularly those who, under the protective policy of 1878, have been able to secure profits of 50 per cent. It cannot be expected that they would be willing to accept a policy which might compel them to be satisfied with profits of 25 per cent. or perhaps 20 per cent. But there are those among our manufacturers who are in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Those, who, in order to give stability to their establishments have taken care to equalise all conditions of manufacturing between themselves and all competitors. A few days ago I had the pleasure of meeting one of our most successful manufacturers, and he told me he was thoroughly in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. What he wanted was the large market of the United States, he stated that from time to time he was obliged, in order to prevent losing money, to cease manufacturing for a short time, because in his line of goods the market became flooded. "Give us the markets of the United States," he said, "and I fear no competition from American manufacturers." Sir, there is in this country an evil which all men and all political parties deplore—the exodus. Our people are leaving the country, and the National Policy certainly has not responded to the expectations and promises of its promoters and friends in this respect. The other day the hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), admitted that for the last ten years our people had continued leaving the country, and, if I understood him rightly, he charged the Liberal party with the responsibility for the exodus. Surely the hon. gentleman must only have intended to be jocular, for he ought to know and understand that the Liberal party, having been in Opposition for the last ten years, cannot be held responsible for the legislation and the administration of public affairs in this country during that period. But I will charge no political party with being responsible for the exodus, and

I think the proper remedy has not yet been applied. Our people emigrate, and where do they go? Do they go to England, to France, or Germany? Do they go to the West Indies, to South America, to those countries with which the hon. the Minister of Finance expects to negotiate commercial relations, although to great cost. No, Sir; they go to the most prosperous country in the world, and which is our nearest neighbor—they go to the United States. Give us unrestricted reciprocity, let us have free trade between Canada and the United States, and you will see American capital flowing into this country, contributing to develop our great natural resources, and to stimulate the prosperity of our country. After a few years, our people finding here what they find on the other side of the line, finding in this country the same prosperity which they find in the United States, will have no reason to go to these States. They will remain at home, and you will have succeeded in checking emigration as much as it can be done. Hon. gentlemen opposite have another reason for opposing unrestricted reciprocity, and that reason seems to be paramount to all others. They say that that policy would lead this country to annexation, but I confess that I cannot understand how annexation should inevitably be the result of free trade between Canada and the United States. Is it true, and are we to believe, that because the American Government collects a duty on our goods when they cross the American frontier, and because the Canadian Government collects also a duty upon American goods coming into this country, that this is a protection to us against annexation? Are we to believe that the Customs officers on both sides of the frontier are really the guardians of our political independence from the United States? There was a time when an annexation feeling and an annexation movement existed in Canada. That movement did not originate in political motives or political aspirations, but it was based upon economical reasons. That movement became so important, headed as it was by men of high standing in the country, that the then Canadian Government thought it proper to punish as much as they could the leaders of that movement in every locality. But, Sir, no sooner had the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 been negotiated, no sooner had the beneficial results of that treaty been felt by our population, than that annexation feeling vanished away and we heard no more of it. Well, if such a narrow and restricted measure of reciprocity as the Treaty of 1854 had the effect, not only of not leading this country to annexation, but even to annihilate the previously existing annexation sentiment, are we not logically led to the conclusion that the broader measure of reciprocity, which we now seek to obtain, would work still more powerfully against the springing up of any such feeling? By removing all economical reasons which could possibly give rise to any temptation for annexation feeling, unrestricted reciprocity, instead of leading us to such a result, would prevent it, and it would give us in this country all the advantages of annexation without its inconveniences. Hon. gentlemen opposite have again raised the old cry of loyalty, and we heard the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) tell us the other night that unrestricted reciprocity would very likely compel us to raise our tariff, that such a course would be unjust to England, and that as loyal subjects we should not do anything which would in any way impair our relations with England. There was a time when those hon. gentlemen were not quite so exuberant in their loyalty to England as they are to-day. I remember in 1878 that while they were advocating the adoption of a high tariff in this House, being told that such a high tariff would work harshly on England, they made an answer, emphasising their loyalty in a peculiar way. "So much the worse for England." I do not believe that unrestricted reciprocity would in any way impair our trade with England; but should it be so, I would say, following the example of hon. gentlemen opposite. "While we look to Old

England as a mother, yet she is only our second mother, for Canada is the first." In conclusion I say, let the Canadian people give the Liberal party a lease of power, and before the space of two years has elapsed you will see existing between Canada and the United States the most friendly feeling and the best commercial relations which can possibly exist for the promotion of the interests, the prosperity and the welfare of both countries.

Mr. GIGAULT. In the course of his speech, the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) has been praising the great progress made by the United States. I admire, with him, the great wealth of our neighbors; with him I admire their extensive home markets and their populous and prosperous cities, but what I admire most, is the cause of that prosperity; and that cause, Mr. Speaker, is chiefly the protective tariff. That cause I wish should continue to exist in Canada, and continue to produce here the same magnificent results which the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), so much admires in the American Union. We must be convinced that our neighbors seek commercial union with Canada because it is in their own interest. They do so, because they know that our industries in Canada are nascent, and could be easily destroyed by the competition which would come from the American manufacturers. Do they seek free trade with England? Do they seek free trade with countries where the industries are on solid basis? No, they do not. They know that free trade with England would be a national suicide for them, and the American people, being alive to their interests, wishing to preserve their industries, wishing to maintain their country as prosperous as it is now, do not wish free trade with a country which could crush out their industries. We should imitate the American people; like them, we should be alive to our interests, and we should be convinced that we cannot compete with the American manufacturers who have been protected for so many years by a high protective tariff. The Opposition, from 1874 to 1878, always said that a tariff of 17½ per cent. was sufficient to protect our manufacturers; and to-day they want to do away even with such a revenue tariff, that is to say, to have no tariff at all to protect our industries. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) has spoken a great deal of the advantages which would result to the farmers from unrestricted reciprocity. He quoted some figures as to our exports of agricultural products to the United States and to England; but what do those figures prove? They prove that England is our chief and natural market for the sale of our agricultural products. Last year we exported, of animals and agricultural products, to Great Britain, more than \$20,000,000, while we exported to the United States only \$17,000,000. We must look for a market in countries where we can find consumers of the articles we produce, and not producers of similar articles. The price of every article is determined by the law of supply and demand, and consequently we cannot expect to sell agricultural products at a high price in the United States, where the supply of agricultural products is greater than the demand. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States of last year, the total exports of the agricultural products of the United States were \$500,000,000. Of barley, corn, oats, wheat, and wheat flour, they exported \$127,000,000. How, then, can we contend that the United States is the natural market for our agricultural products? Of dairy products, the United States exported \$10,000,000, of living animals, \$12,090,000, and of apples, more than \$2,000,000. Our manufacturers, also, would find in the United States, not consumers of their products, but some strong and powerful competitors. The American manufacturers exported, of cotton goods, more than \$13,000,000, of leather and manufactures of leather, more than \$9,000,000, and the total exports of the domestic manufactures of the United States exceeded \$130,000,000. We

are, of course, and the Conservative party has always been, in favor of reciprocity limited to agricultural products; but what would be the consequence of unrestricted reciprocity? I remember that, last year, the hon. member for Iberville said that he would never accept unrestricted reciprocity if it were going to bring direct taxation. This year, he could not have listened with pleasure to the speeches made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), because both of those hon. members spoke in favor of an income tax, and so of direct taxation. There are a great many disagreeable things to which the hon. member for Iberville will have to submit if he favors unrestricted reciprocity. He will have, certainly, to submit to direct taxation, or to the income tax, as the hon. member from North Norfolk and the hon. member for South Oxford said.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say so.

Mr. GIGAULT. Did the hon. gentleman not speak in favor of an income tax? He spoke in a way to make that tax as popular as possible, arguing that it was not an objectionable tax. But there is another thing to which the hon. member for Iberville could not have listened with pleasure, that is, the doing away of provincial subsidies, which was advocated by the hon. member for South Oxford. The Liberals met in Quebec and had a conference, which we call the Quebec Conference, and what did they ask? They asked for an increase of provincial subsidies; and here, what is said by one of the chief men of the Liberal party? It is that we should do away with provincial subsidies. That hon. member is logical to a certain extent, because with unrestricted reciprocity we should have to curtail expenses; we would have also to resort to direct taxation, to support not only the Federal Government, but also the Provincial Governments. That would be the inevitable consequence, and the hon. member for South Oxford wants that.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. GIGAULT. Before recess I was stating that the Liberals did not agree on the question of provincial subsidies. At the Quebec Conference they claimed increased provincial subsidies, while here one of them argues that we should do away with such subsidies. If we are to be friends of provincial rights, we must give to the Provincial Legislatures the means of self-support, and if we compel the people of Canada to resort to direct taxation, to support not only the Federal but also the Provincial Governments, we will certainly make the Provincial Legislatures very unpopular. When the people are heavily burdened with taxation, they may seek for diminution of the expense; they may seek for legislative union, and in my mind legislative union is very far from being recommendable. If there is a Province which should be opposed to it, it is certainly the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) contended that the National Policy has not benefitted Canada. In my opinion, quite the contrary is the case. Every class has been benefitted by the National Policy: the farmer, the mechanic, the manufacturer, and the capitalist. The producers of wheat, oats and coarse grains have been protected, and the manufacturers have been largely protected by the National Policy. But not only have those classes of people benefitted, but the whole community as well has benefitted. It is that policy which has replenished the public Treasury; it is that policy which has increased considerably our revenue; it is that policy which has enabled the Federal Government to make the most useful public improvements which have given a great impulse to our trade and our agriculture. It is the revenue

created by that policy which has enabled the Federal Government to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the admiration of the whole world, and which gives so much importance to our country. In presence of these results, how can we say that the National Policy has not benefitted Canada? We must not speak only of the advantages which would result from unrestricted reciprocity, we must speak also of the disadvantages which would follow its adoption, and the disadvantages, in my opinion, greatly outweigh the advantages. We have collected since 1879 over \$3,434,000 upon animals and meats imported from the United States. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, we would have to lose that revenue; and not only that, but the American producers would become stronger competitors of the Canadian farmers, and oblige them to sell their meats at much lower prices than they do now. The duty collected on grain of all kinds since 1879 has been more than \$3,000,000, and all these sums of money would not have been collected. Not only has the National Policy created a larger revenue for the Canadian Government, but it has also greatly improved the Canadian market for Canadian farmers. In 1878 we imported barley, oats, Indian corn and wheat to the extent of more than 15,000,000 bushels of which we re-exported 8,469,475 bushels, so that we imported for home consumption in 1878 more than 7,000,000 bushels of those kinds of grain. And what was the amount of those imports last year? We imported last year for home consumption wheat, barley, oats and Indian corn to the extent only of 2,348,000 bushels, so that the supply of American grain in the Canadian market, compared to that of 1878, has been less by more than 4,000,000 bushels, and the supply of American grain having been less, the demand for Canadian grain must have been greater. If we believe in the principle that the price of agricultural products is governed by the law of supply and demand, the prices of Canadian products must also have been improved. That policy, in increasing the number of our manufactures, has not only rendered our home market much better, but it has also exempted the Canadian people from most obnoxious taxes—from taxes which would not benefit anybody, neither the producer nor the consumer. We have been enabled to remove the stamp duty on promissory notes, the duty on teas and coffees, the duties upon articles we do not produce, and the production of which, consequently, does not benefit anybody in Canada; and what would we have to do if we abolished our National Policy? If we destroy we must build in the place of what we destroy; and what would be the consequence of free trade? It would be most certainly direct taxation and the imposition of most obnoxious taxes. In my opinion the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) has not answered many of the objections which have been raised against the scheme proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). One of these objections is that unrestricted reciprocity cannot be carried out. The free traders contend that with unrestricted reciprocity the Canadians would continue to maintain control of their own fiscal policy. How can that be? How can we adopt a policy by which the Canadians will be able to have a lower tariff than the Americans? If we adopted a lower tariff all the goods imported from Great Britain would come through Canadian ports, and certainly the Americans would not submit to that. On the other hand, if the Americans had a lower tariff, all the goods imported from Great Britain would come through New York and Boston, and thus the cities of Montreal and Quebec and all our large cities would lose all the foreign trade which would come through the American channels. Shall we submit to that? The free traders themselves say they do not wish to see such a result. Then, how can they say that unrestricted reciprocity is practicable? In my mind, we are wasting time in discussing such a scheme, because it is a scheme

which certainly cannot be carried out. If there is to be a scheme to alter trade relations with the United States, it must be commercial union or reciprocity limited to agricultural products. The Opposition say they will not adopt commercial union. Then, if unrestricted reciprocity cannot be realised and commercial union cannot be accepted by this country, why should they speak of schemes which can never be accepted either by the Canadian people or the American people? The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) has not stated what source of revenue he will create to make up the loss we would suffer by the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. Last year, we collected more than \$7,000,000 on goods imported from the United States. By unrestricted reciprocity, if it be practicable, we will lose that amount of revenue, and we must, therefore, have some other source to make up for that loss. If we go before the people and tell them that it is true that we will lose \$7,000,000 by free trade with the United States, we must at the same time state to them how we will replace that source of revenue. The hon. member for Iberville did not say what he would propose, and the Liberals generally do not say what they would do, except the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who spoke of the income tax, of direct taxation, and of doing away with provincial subsidies in order to enable the Government of the country to submit to the diminution of revenue which would result. The member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) says he would not submit to direct taxation. Then, to what conclusion can we come? What can be done with these schemes? I do not see how the Liberals or the friends of unrestricted reciprocity can answer the objections which have been made against their scheme. The member for Iberville has spoken of emigration. He said: Look at the numbers who are leaving Canada; and he added: Where are they going? Are they going to England? No; but they are going to the United States. What does that prove? It is the most conclusive proof that a protective tariff is a good thing, since our emigrants do not go to a free trade country like England, but to a country like the United States, where they have had a high protective tariff for many years.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Why do they not go to France?

Mr. GIGAUT. How is it, then, that the protective tariff is so bad when it makes the United States so prosperous that Canadians are going there in order to earn their living? I am not going to speak for a long time. The objections which have been raised against the scheme of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have been argued much more ably by other members than I can argue them; but, before I close, I must allude to another remark made by the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). He says that the opponents of unrestricted reciprocity speak too often of loyalty to England. It is a duty to be loyal to our country and to legitimately constituted authority, and, as long as we are treated fairly and justly, as we are by England, we should be loyal to England, not only through a sense of duty, but also through a sense of gratitude, because we are enjoying under our present Constitution the greatest civil and religious liberty. We have the freest institutions of which any country can boast. Another hon. member of this House made an allusion to the Canadians of French descent, and said that they should desire closer relations with the United States because they have a large number of their countrymen in the American Union. The French Canadians should not envy the position of their countrymen in the United States. They do not enjoy the same liberties there that we do here. They have no separate schools, while we have our separate schools and educate our children as we wish. Here the liberties and the rights which are dearest to the Canadians of French descent

have been secured to us by treaties and by the Constitution. We can speak our own language and exercise our own religion with the greatest liberty. What is the political condition of the Frenchmen in the United States? In Louisiana, which was mentioned by an hon. member, they cannot speak their own language in their Local Legislature. As to education, the American authorities do not hesitate to interfere with the management of the independent schools established by the French Canadians, as we have recently seen at Haverhill, in the State of Connecticut. For the sake of the small advantages which would result from unrestricted reciprocity, we will not submit to the much greater disadvantages which would result from such a scheme, and I believe the majority of the people will continue to favor a policy which has replenished our Treasury and has enabled the Government to make most useful public improvements. I hope we shall be able to make this a prosperous country, and that we will do that by ourselves and without the aid of our neighbors.

Mr. AMYOT. I must congratulate my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) on the tone of his remarks, in which he has shown his sound way of judging events, though I cannot approve of everything he has said. I will not begin by answering his remarks. I suppose, at this stage of the discussion, there is very little new to be said. In fact, the question has been treated from many points of view. A great deal has been said affirming and denying the prosperity of the country, its present development, its future expansion. Comparisons have been drawn between Canada and the other colonies, between Canada and the States, and other countries. We might go on in that strain for months and months, and I do not see that we would be much better off, because it is impossible to compare one country with another without taking into consideration the surroundings, the population, the resources, the special aptitudes of the population, the facilities for living, and other matters. In one place free trade will suit; in another protection will be required. A high tariff will enhance the interests of one country, while a low tariff will enrich another. Everything has to be judged from surrounding circumstances. For my part I do not deny, I even freely admit, that we have progressed considerably in Canada. We have immensely extended the limits of our territory, we have built railways, telegraphs and canals, and bridged rivers, and increased our inland communication by water and by land. Our manufactures have sprung up in great numbers, and are daily increasing. But the question is: Can we do better, can we go faster in the way of progress and development of all kinds? Could we better utilise our great resources and the vigor of our hardy population? To say, Mr. Speaker, that "everything is for the best, in the best of worlds," in this country, is to contradict facts of daily occurrence. Let us, for example, consider the numerous petitions and depositions sent to this Parliament, asking for changes in the tariff. The difficulty is to find out who, among our producers and manufacturers, does not complain. Changes in the tariff have been asked for the following items, among others:—

"Pork, woollen goods, pig iron, scrap iron, steel and iron entering into the construction of ships, rope for ships, steel used in the manufacture of shovels, tinware, white lead, cloth used in window blinds, rennet extract, jute yarns, twine, non-elastic web, glazed glass, cotton and woollen plushes, whips, thread used in manufacturing whips, trimmings used in the manufacture of pocket-books, boots and shoemaking, Smyrna rugs, collie dogs, rubber clothing, haircloth, black-strap, blacking, saws, mining machinery, copper industry, logs, pianos, stereotype plates, clock movements, straw and felt hats, fertilisers, flour, fruit, seeds and nursery stock, vegetables, lard, foreign magazines, prayer book, &c."

I might go on with that list for a long time. So there must be something wrong somewhere, and we must ask ourselves: Where is the wrong, and what is the remedy? Why do the manufacturers require increased protection on the articles they produce? For the simple reason that the market at

their disposal is too limited. After a few years, even a few months, of existence, the market of Canada is filled up with their manufactured goods; the market is inundated and virtually sales have ceased. Consequently the manufacturers require a larger profit on each article so as to compensate for the small amount of sales. Give them a larger market, and then large sales will make up for small profits. I admit that we should protect ourselves, we should protect the manufacturers, but protection becomes abnormal, unfair and unjust when it is carried to prohibition. It is unfair to force the consumer to buy from Canadian manufacturers and to pay double for the same articles than he would have to pay if he bought them from another country. Let the manufacturers be protected so as to enjoy the Canadian market in preference to the manufacturers from abroad, well and good. The whole country is interested in that, so that the workman may be well employed, well paid and be a good customer for the articles of the farm. But if you grant an exaggerated protection you become unjust towards the consumer at large, and you bring about a state of things which must issue in sufferings and disturbances. Our population is not sufficiently numerous to maintain and support the many manufactures of all kinds that we have. Taking into account our producing power, that fact seems to be undeniable. The remedy lies in finding a new and more extended market. The Toronto Board of Trade, a body composed of eminent merchants from many parts of the country, has lately memorialised this House in that sense. As this petition is concise and to the point, I may be permitted to read an extract from it:

"Your memorialists are most deeply concerned in the import and export trade of the Dominion of Canada and the development thereof, and believe that very promising openings exist in Barbadoes, Jamaica, British Guiana, Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Ayres.

"The cardinal points being the dissimilarity of productions, and that each requires the surplus of the other, suggests at once a probable trade of equal bulk both ways.

"For imports, there may be named rice, cocoa, coffee, hides, wool, sugar, molasses, rum, coconuts, oranges, bananas, and other tropical fruits and vegetables, spices, medical barks, roots, and seeds, lime juice, with cabinet and dyewoods.

"As exports, we have agricultural implements, biscuits, boots and shoes, butter, carriages, cottons, fish, dried, smoked and pickled, fish oil and seal oil, flour, grain, lard, plaster of Paris, staves, hoops, lumber, laths, shingles, doors, window frames, box shooks, square timber, machinery, musical instruments, sewing machines, tweeds and knitted woollen goods.

"To gather all information, statistics, and a more or less complete directory of importers and exporters, appears the first step, and it is respectfully submitted that this work, being directly in the public advantage, should be taken up by the Commissioners appointed by the Government.

"All modern experience teaching that trade follows the routes that offer regular and speedy postal and freight facilities, it is respectfully suggested that a subvention be granted to a line of steamers, sufficient as to time and amount to bridge over the period required to build up a self-sustaining service between Canadian ports and those herein named, or such of them as may seem to the Government most desirable."

Mr. Speaker, this memorial has been sent in by so important a body as the Toronto Board of Trade. Why, if we are so prosperous here, if the manufacturers are so prosperous, if the farmers are so rich, if everything pays so well in this country, why do they come to this Government and ask us to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, even millions, to find a new market. We will see later on that this is not the only body asking for some changes in our system. For my part I admit the soundness of that document, and I would be glad to see the Government doing its best to comply with the wishes of the Toronto Board of Trade. I believe that every step taken to open new markets for Canada should be approved, no matter with what country, even including France with those countries named. But, Mr. Speaker, where is our natural market if not with our neighbors, numbering 60,000,000, and who will soon be 100,000,000—our neighbors immediately adjoining us for an extent of 2,000 miles, with whom we daily communicate by rail, steamer and telegraph, from whom we are only separated

Mr. GIGAULT.

ated by an imaginary line, and who have just declared that they desire to trade with us? I am not going into the details of the mutual advantages that would flow from such commercial intercourse, nor try to show how our agricultural interests, our mines, our fisheries, our forests, our manufactures of all kinds, our shipbuilding, and commerce at large, would be benefited by it. Each hon. member is convinced on that point. The Government themselves have declared that they would favor a good treaty; such also seems to be the opinion throughout the country. The same influential body I have mentioned, adopted the following resolution on the 17th of June, 1887:—

"Resolved, that this Board desires to place on record its conviction that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse between our country and the United States, compatible with our relations to Great Britain, is desirable."

I am afraid I will scandalise the hon. member for Rouville, (Mr. Gigault) by stating that the Board of Trade of Toronto has adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, that this Board desires to place on record its conviction that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse between our own country and the United States, compatible with our relations to Great Britain, is desirable; that this board will gladly do everything in its power to bring about the consummation of such a result; that in its estimation no treaty which ignored any of the interests of our country, or which gave undue prominence to any one to the neglect or to injury of any other, is one that could be entertained.

"That in our agricultural, our mineral, our manufacturing and our diversified mercantile interests, in our fisheries, our forests and other products, we possess in a rare and in an extraordinary degree all the elements which go to make people great, prosperous and self-reliant.

"That these are fitting inducements to any nation to render reciprocity with Canada a thing to be desired, and such as should secure for us a reciprocal treaty with the United States of the broadest and most generous character, which, while fully recognising these conditions, would contain guarantees which would prove of mutual and abiding advantage to both nations, but that this Board cannot entertain any proposal which would place Great Britain at any disadvantage as compared with the United States, or which would tend in any measure, however small, to weaken the bonds which bind Canada to the Empire."

The Central Farmers' Institute on 28th April, 1887, passed a resolution in the following terms:—

"That in the opinion of this Institute the removal of all restrictions of trade between the United States and Canada is desirable, either by reciprocity or otherwise, as may be agreed upon by the Governments of the respective countries, and that the officers of the Executive Committee are hereby authorised to take such action as they may think proper to urge this resolution upon the Government.

"That in the event of a fair measure of reciprocity being unattainable, this Institute memorialise the Dominion Government to suggest to the Government of Great Britain the expediency of entering into commercial union with her colonies in regard to food supply, and impose a protective tariff against all foreign countries."

I might quote similar resolutions adopted by the Boards of Trade of Montreal and St. John and many organisations in the different commercial centres. But, as I have said, I do not want to enter into the details of the question; all I want to say for my part is that I have adopted these views. I sincerely believe that reciprocity with the United States would materially advance the interests of both countries. The increase of our trade with the United States, in spite of the tariff, is a very forcible argument on this point. Hon. members have been speaking on a vast variety of topics in regard to matters of commerce, and some of them seem to have forgotten a little the question before the House. Now, what does the motion ask? It asks simply this: that we should ascertain on what terms the United States are ready to trade with us. Annexation, loss of our identity as a people, have nothing to do with the question. We have had a Reciprocity Treaty already. Have we been less loyal to England and to ourselves in consequence? Is it being loyal to England to seek to make of us commercial slaves, to prevent our commercial development, even to annex us politically to England? Those who thus act will be the first traitors to England. They will bring into this country wild excitement, and will introduce a state of things for which they alone will be

responsible. They may cause, perhaps, political annexation to the United States, if ever it should come—I say it may be brought about by those who abuse our loyalty to England. Let us remain a colony, as we are, loyal and true to England, but loyal and true to ourselves first. It was said: Canada for the Canadians. Well, let it be so, but let it be really so. Let us encourage and develop all our natural resources, our farming, manufacturing, fishing and all our industries; but the best way we can adopt to develop them is by procuring extensive markets for the sale of their products so as to compensate for the weakness of our consuming power. Our producing power is immense, but our consuming power is very limited. There is the discrepancy. We must endeavor to equalise both. We must find markets sufficient for our immense natural resources. Sir, I regret that the motion assumes the character of one of want of confidence, because I know it will prevent many hon. members from supporting it. For my part, the meaning I desire to attach to my vote is this: First, I believe we are acting rightly in protecting ourselves as the United States are protecting themselves against us; second, we must continue to protect ourselves so long as the United States continue to protect themselves against us; third, free trade or reciprocity with the United States will be a better state of things for us and we should do our best to attain it. Free trade with the United States does not mean free trade with the world; it means a kind of partnership with the United States containing 60,000,000 of people to protect the whole of us against the rest of the world. That is what is meant by free trade with the United States; it is protection enlarged in fact. I believe Canada should emphatically declare that we are ready to respond to the invitation of the United States, and ascertain, if we may, the terms that would be acceptable to both countries for free and mutual intercourse. The United States are our natural markets by their situation, by their easy access, by the number of our relatives and friends in that country. Our trade with them is increasing in spite of the protective tariff; it is a natural one, not a precarious one as is the case with trade with Europe. In case England became involved in war with some European country, would not our commerce with Europe be terminated? We would then be happy to be able to trade with the United States and the rest of this continent. Again, a commercial treaty would bring smuggling to an end. We have in fact all to gain by it, and we may honorably declare ourselves ready to make a treaty, as the United States, by inviting us as they have done, have made our dignity safe. Such a treaty would not diminish our commercial intercourse with the rest of the world, for by increasing the prosperity of this country, it would certainly increase our purchasing power. I have said the United States have invited us to negotiate with them, and it is desirable to know on what terms they have done so. The resolution adopted has been quoted, but I do not believe the report of the committee has been quoted, and it is important that it should be laid before this honorable House:

“Our commercial relations with Canada have recently awakened a deeper interest and received a more thorough discussion than ever before, on both sides of the border. The tendency of public opinion is plainly towards the enlargement of trade between the two countries. In Canada the movement has advanced from what was a few years ago an effort for partial reciprocity to a wide expression in favor of unrestricted intercourse and commercial union. The evidence of this fact is abundant.

“The Right Honorable Joseph Chamberlain, High Commissioner from Her Majesty's Government, is reported to have recently stated in a speech:

“The arrangement between the colonies and Great Britain is essentially a temporary one. It cannot remain as it is. \* \* \* Already you have in Canada, the greatest of all the colonies, an agitation for what is called commercial union with the United States. Commercial union with the United States means unrestricted trade between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, and a protective tariff against the mother country. If Canada desires that, Canada can have it.”

“And speaking of the relation of Canada to the United States and Great Britain on a subsequent occasion, the right honorable gentleman further said that:

“Commercial union with the United States meant that Canada was to give preference to every article of manufacture from the United States over manufactures from Great Britain. If the people of Canada desired an arrangement of that kind he did not doubt that they would be able to secure it.”

“Within a few weeks a conference was held at Quebec of the Prime Ministers of all the Provinces constituting the Dominion of Canada, and after a very full exchange of views these representatives of the Executive powers of all portions of the Dominion unanimously adopted the following declaration:—

“This conference, comprising all political parties, is of the opinion that a fair measure, provided under proper conditions, for unrestricted trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, would be of advantage to all the Provinces of the Dominion, and would in connection with an adjustment of the fishery dispute, tend to happily settle the grave difficulties which have from time to time arisen between Great Britain and the United States.”

Can it be said that Mr. Chamberlain is a traitor to England, that he is not faithful and loyal to the British flag? He says if Canada desires free trade with the United States it can have it. The report goes on to say:

“The chambers of commerce and boards of trade of the leading cities of Canada, and more than fifty farmers' institutes and conventions, have adopted resolutions declaring in favor of commercial union or unrestricted trade between the two countries.

“The answer made by their opponents and those most closely attached to English trade and English rule has been that the United States has given no indication that it would receive or even consider any proposal, however friendly in spirit or however favorable to us in its terms it might be.

“The joint resolution now submitted does not contemplate any action on our part at present; but whenever the Dominion of Canada shall have declared a desire for commercial union, with a common tariff, like internal revenue taxes, like duties on articles imported into either country from abroad, and no duties on trade between the United States and Canada, then the President is authorized to appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be designated to represent Canada, in order to prepare a plan for commercial union, by assimilating the tariffs and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, now not very widely different, and an equitable method of dividing the receipts, which they shall report to the President, who shall lay it before Congress. The whole subject of our relations with Canada is kept under the control of Congress.

“It is not deemed necessary to here discuss the great merits of commercial union or the details of arrangement that will be necessary. Your committee believe that the power herein conferred upon the President can do no harm, that it will be wisely used, and will lead to beneficial results, promoting the independence, prosperity and peace of two great peoples.

“The committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the joint resolution.”

He says that the answer to this was that the States would not hear such a proposition in any way, and they want to prove now that the States are ready to communicate with us in the matter. Some speakers have said that there are no petitions before this House asking for unrestricted reciprocity, but we must remember that petitions are usually sent here in favor of particular and special interests and never in favor of a general policy. In such a case no one has charge of going around to obtain signatures. When the principle of protection was discussed in this House before, 1878 I do not believe that there were any petitions sent to this House from any part of Canada in favor of protection. In favor of unrestricted reciprocity we have the expression of opinion of the boards of trade I spoke of a while ago, the resolutions passed by the societies I have mentioned, articles in the public press every day, and more than that we have the expression of opinion of members of this House representing about one-half of the country. If we had the expression of the opinion of Canada, taken as a whole and by plebiscite, and not taken by counties as subdivided or manipulated by the Government, I think that I would not be far from the mark in saying that at least half of the population of the country would be found in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said to us that some newspapers in the States have stated that reciprocity would lead to annexation, or the loss of our independence, and they argue from this that we are traitors to England. Every one knows that we have no control over the writers

in these papers and that there are cranks and visionary men to be found everywhere. At all events, by adopting this resolution and meeting the States in a friendly spirit the negotiations would not tie our hands and would not prevent us from refusing to accept any proposal that would be derogatory to our honor, our independence, or our interests at large. It is all very well to say we would lose the right of managing our own business. Will you tell me how many in this country manage "our own business." Is the farmer working from morning to night on his farm managing "our own business;" is the man in the woods cutting timber to enrich the merchant managing the business of the country? Is the poor merchant in the city managing the business of this country? How many are there managing the business of this country. I understand that the Government does, and that it is supported by a very honorable majority no doubt, but among that majority do we not find some who have a special interest in supporting those who manage the affairs of the country? I do not care who manages the affairs of the country, but I want to have the affairs of the country managed so that the farmer who has something to sell, and the manufacturer and the merchant who have goods to sell, will have some one to sell them to who will pay for them. I want the affairs of the country managed in such a way so that the people will be rich and prosperous, and be it Peter, Paul or James, or any one else who is at the head of the Government, what I want is a good and wise policy which will make our people prosperous and contented. According to some of our members the mere fact of saying that we are not prepared for a war with the States, and that we need some change of policy in this country, is to become a traitor to the British and to the Dominion flags. They think that we should always cry out and represent ourselves as strong, rich and independent. That may take with enthusiastic or blind people, but it will not take with practical and experienced men. We all know how many soldiers there are in Canada, for it is published every year in that blue-book called the Return of the Minister of Militia; we know the amount of rifles and guns, and even the number of cartridges in this country, and we know that we have a frontier of three thousand miles to protect. We know the amount of iron-clads in this country, too, and, without being traitors to the flag, I think we may say that those announcements will not induce the United States to undertake a war against us. I venture to say, at the risk of being accused of depreciating my country, that our military force has never been looked upon as sufficient by itself to prevent or carry on a war abroad. If we do not have a war with the States it is because the States do not want to war with us. They are too sensible a people for that, they are attending to the development and advancement of their own country, and they would find no interest in making war on Canada. I admit that their frontiers would be as much exposed as ours in the case of war, and that if we are unjustly attacked every Canadian able to carry a rifle would be ready to man our borders to protect his home and defend his country. Where the States would suffer most in case of war with England, and what is the best argument against a war, is that their cities and towns on the Atlantic seaboard are exposed and would be ruined by the British ships. But with the States it is not a question of war, for their common sense tells them that they would have no interest in fighting Canada. When I hear hon. members say that we are traitors, because we state that there are only 36,000 soldiers here, I think these gentlemen must not understand what is the position of men who have been elected by a majority of their constituency. My hon. friend for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) says that the States are prosperous because they are protected. I do not deny that, but under unrestricted reciprocity we would remain protected as we are now, and we would associate with

Mr. AMYOT.

the States to protect ourselves against the rest of the world. It would be protection enlarged. The same principle that made them rich would make us rich, and instead of having five millions of people as consumers, we would at once have sixty millions, and in a very short time, a population of one hundred millions to buy our products. My hon. friend says, that in the States the supply is greater than the demand. Well, I wish he would come to some of the counties between Montreal and Quebec; he would see large quantities of hay, potatoes, eggs, poultry, and various other farm products sent to the States continually; and if he went to the north shore of the St. Lawrence, he would see the same thing. But the hon. gentleman says that he would favor reciprocity limited to agricultural products. Why? Is it because that would be a benefit to the farmers? I presume so. I suppose he favors it, not for the benefit of the manufacturers or the merchants; it must be for the benefit of the farmers. Well, does he know that free trade or general reciprocity with the States, would include reciprocity in farm products; and if reciprocity in farm products would be good for the farmers, the hon. gentleman would, to-day, declare by his vote, that he would sacrifice the farmers for the manufacturers; he would sacrifice the many for the few; he would sacrifice all the farmers of this country for a few thousands—no, a few hundreds—of manufacturers; because, do not count as manufacturers, or as deriving any benefit from the tariff, the poor men who work from six o'clock in the morning till six o'clock in the evening, to enrich the manufacturer who employs them. And by sacrificing the farmers, what does he do? He chases them from the farm, and sends them to work for the manufacturers, either in Canada or in the States, to lose their health, their patriotism, and that honor which characterises those who live on the farm. That is what the hon. gentleman does; he cannot get out of that; and those who will oppose, perhaps successfully, free trade with the States, will have to answer for it. They sacrifice all the working classes of this country to enrich a few. My hon. friend is too respected, too intelligent, too good a speaker, too honorable to want subscriptions at election times; but there are some who will vote against reciprocity in order to obtain those subscriptions at election times. My hon. friend is not the only one who has declared that he would favor reciprocity for the farmers. In 1879, when protection was proposed in this country, it was declared that we were aiming at reciprocity; later on an offer from us was laid down in the law, and has remained in our statutes since. It is the expressed and avowed opinion of our honorable opponents. They admitted then, and they still admit, that reciprocity would benefit the farmers of Canada; and to-day they say, in spite of that, we will not have it—why? The only possible reason to my mind is that some of the manufacturers would suffer. Well, that reason even is not a good one. My hon. friend from the County of Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) the other day stated that some Americans had erected in Canada a manufactory of fertilisers, and they could now compete in the States. I asked some manufacturers of shoes in Quebec what they would think of reciprocity with the States, and they told me they were perfectly able to compete with any manufacturer in the States. I have seen in the press reports from hundreds of manufacturers who said they were ready to compete with the States, and I believe that this country is in a fit state to compete not only in the States, but in any other country, with all the manufacturers who use the raw material which we produce. Perhaps some manufacturers upheld by artificial means would suffer, like three that fell in the county of my hon. friend, because there was no market for them; but for one hundred that fell there would be one thousand started up. Now, free trade with the United States is admitted by the Government to be a good thing so

far as the farmers are concerned; and yet to-day they refuse to accept the offer of the States. They cannot refuse to comply with the motion before the House without laying down this broad and false principle: that we must protect a hundred manufacturers at the expense of millions of farmers, and millions of people composing the working classes of Canada. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we, in Canada, must find markets of some kind. We have natural resources in unlimited quantities, but we have no market. We are right to turn towards the other colonies, towards South America, towards Spain; we are wrong to exclude France; we are right to try to find markets everywhere; but we should, at the same time, try to have opened to us the most natural market possible, a market near us, with which we have so many ties, with which we daily communicate; and if we refuse that, we shall be responsible, perhaps, for a state of things which may prove disastrous in many respects for this country. But the motion says only this: that we should endeavor to ascertain on what terms the States are ready to trade with us. My hon. friend says we should not comply with the offer of the States, because we have been so well treated by our mother country—England. I wonder where! Is it when England has taken away from us by the Ashburton Treaty that territory which to-day we miss so much, that territory which, perhaps, makes it necessary for us to-day to search for new markets? Is it when England excludes us from her treaties with other countries? Let the hon. gentleman quote to me one single treaty by which England has taken the least care of Canada. He will not find one. It is all very well to say that we enjoy our laws and our liberties, that we speak French when we want to. Well, let us go to the States. I have seen thousands and thousands of my fellow-countrymen there. They had, last summer, a splendid demonstration, with an immense procession, in a Protestant city, and what did I see? On the day of their celebration all the factories and shops were closed. It was a day of general rejoicing. The great mass of the American people lined the streets and saluted with acclamations the procession wherever it passed; and there I saw a population of French Canadians satisfied with their position. They had gathered from every part of the States, and many of them told me they were happy, that they were making money, that they were respected. True it is they know how to make themselves respected. They work and are honest, and God has given them as much intelligence at least as the rest of the people of this world. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if Canada was not under the British flag we would not be free, but would be slaves? Does he mean to say that the people of Canada are so bad that without the protection of the British flag, the French Canadians would have no status on this continent? Does he think that the hatred which is being engendered concerning the Jesuit question, and the French schools in Ontario, represents really the sentiment of the people? Is he prepared to state that this country is not peopled by a population who are all on a footing of equality before the law, and that French Canadians are more exposed to be oppressed in this country than they would be elsewhere? I deny that. On the contrary I have confidence in the people of Canada, and we are ready as the French element of the Canadian nation, to march shoulder to shoulder with the other elements and to give equal justice to everybody. I do not believe that we owe everything to England. I admit that England has done good towards us. That is put down in the treaty, but were the conditions of the treaty inserted solely for the benefit of the 60,000 Canadians of French descent, who were then in Canada? I do not think so. It was a long treaty, and many things were written and signed in it, but it was not the love of England for us that caused to be inserted in that treaty the condition that we would enjoy

equal liberties with other nationalities. No; that condition was inserted in the interests both of England and France. It was those interests that dictated it, and we have to thank God for having prepared events in such a way that the treaty was drawn up as it was. Some fanatics may be ready now to do away with that treaty, but their efforts will be futile, and will only result in their being laughed at by the people at large.

Mr. HESSON. You will soon lose that privilege if you get commercial union or reciprocity.

Mr. AMYOT. I am happy to see an hon. gentleman here so ready to defend our interests, and I will tell the people in my county that we have in this House a gentleman who has our interests so much at heart that he wants to prevent our farmers selling our products to the Americans. I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House, but simply to lay before the House in a few words the position I take on this resolution. I have followed with interest and admiration this discussion; I have come to the conclusion that this motion is an expression of a principle which must be sanctioned by everyone who has at heart the interests of the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. In rising to continue the debate upon this most important subject, I do not propose to weary the House with any lengthened statistics or collations of figures, because I think we have been treated to such *ad libitum*. I think that the facts have been established, and that information has been produced to prove the happy and prosperous condition of Canada and the advantage of our condition compared with that of other countries. I believe that has been shown in a way that defies successful contradiction. At the outset, I must congratulate the hon. the Minister of Finance upon the able, clear, concise, and logical statement he has been enabled to give to this House and the country. I must congratulate the Government for having so conducted our affairs that the Minister of Finance was in a position to present the statement he did only a few days ago. It was his duty; and it will be my duty, for a short time, to call the attention of the House to the condition of this country. If we consider its condition compared with that of other countries, if we consider the condition of our people in the various lines of life in which they are engaged with that of the populations of other countries, taking into account the expenditure of Canada since Confederation, and the rapidity with which we have built our railways since Confederation, the number of our canals which we have completed, the importance of the public works which we have erected, the increase in our number of post offices, the increase in the large, extensive and important products of the farm, the increase in the amount of goods that are manufactured for the consumption of people at home and abroad, and in the products of the forests and the mines, and in all the various lines that represent the industrial wealth of our country, we can come to but one conclusion, and that is that Canada has been a great success during the last twenty years. If we view our country from its financial standpoint, if we consider the amount of money deposited in its banks since Confederation, we must admit that Confederation has been a great success. If we look at that barometer, which is above all others, the best by which to estimate the condition of the people and their trade, the circulation of money, and take into account the extension of that, we can come to but one conclusion, and that is that Confederation has been a great success. In 1878, only 10 years ago, we had bank notes circulating in Canada to the extent of \$21,466,641, Dominion notes \$3,235,000, in all \$24,692,173. How is it to-day? Instead of \$24,000,000 we have a circulation of \$41,763,000. Now, every hon. gentleman possessing the intelligence which members of Parliament must possess, will understand that the trade of a country requires a



certain amount of money to carry it on, and in proportion as that trade expands so does its currency. The amount of money that is necessary to carry on the trade of a country is just in proportion to its wealth and trade. Viewing it from that standpoint, we must candidly confess that Canada has been a very great success. If we look at the condition of our people, not only in the large cities and towns, but in the agricultural portions as well, if we go into their palatial residences, in our cities, and into their magnificently adorned churches, their extensive and magnificent hotels, and if we enter into the private relations of life, we will find there the evidences of comfort, peace, enjoyment and intelligence. Have we the indications of want here that are to be found in other countries? Have we here millions crying for bread to allay the hunger of the starving, as they have in European countries? Have we petitions from our cities and other parts of the country asking the Government to come to the aid of those poor and destitute people who are unable to provide for themselves the necessaries and comforts of life? It is not now as it was in 1878, when we had the House of Commons almost besieged by those unfortunate and destitute people in such large numbers, but we have not the evidences of want to-day nor the appeals to the Government for redress that we had then. Have we petitions from the people showing that any important change is necessary either in our fiscal policy, our commercial policy, or any other policy, which is under the control of the Government, and which is essentially necessary in the interests of the country? I say we have not; but I consider, in going over these lines, that no unprejudiced man can avoid candidly admitting, as the Rev. Principal Grant said, when he came back from his trip almost round the world, that, comparing Canada and the wealth, and intelligence, and industrial pursuits of our people with those of any other country, everything that went to make peace, prosperity and plenty would compare very favorably in Canada with any other country in the world. That gentleman said he had passed over five oceans and touched at seven continents, and yet he found that Canada was the flower of all the countries he had seen. He said it would be a fortunate thing for Canada if a few first class funerals were to take out the croakers from amongst us. What are we promised by this resolution if it should be passed? We are promised by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that we shall have the good times which Canada enjoyed during the existence of the old Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. He did not tell us the reasons for those good times which the people of Canada then enjoyed. He says, speaking of those days:

"These are the days the farmers look back to as the bright days in the history of their country, these are the days they desire to see come again, and these are the days they are going to vote to have come again. These are the days that my hon. friend's resolution promises shall come to them again, and they will try that resolution, at all events, before they are convinced that they cannot have them again."

I need not ask the attention of hon. gentlemen in this House, many of whom are older than I am, to the condition of Canada at the time of that Reciprocity Treaty. I need not ask them what produced the condition of affairs which we enjoyed in this country at that time. It was not the Reciprocity Treaty alone, though, no doubt, it was an element, to a limited extent, in producing that prosperity, but it was more largely due to circumstances which were outside the control of our country. It was due to the Russian War, and afterwards to the American War, which lasted from 1862 to April, 1865. It was due to the fact that hundreds of thousands of the agriculturists and manufacturers of the United States were taken away from their legitimate pursuits to defend the Union, and the farmers of Canada were called upon to supply the wants of that people which could not be supplied by their own farmers. Thus,

Mr. SPOULE.

we had high prices, prices which ruled far above the normal prices. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to a comparison between the prices which existed then and those which exist now, in order to show the utter impossibility, if this resolution passed ten times over, and the result was to bring about free trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States to-morrow, to bring back that state of things. At that time, wheat was worth \$1.66 a bushel, or, taking the average price of wheat for the twelve years during which that treaty was in force, it was \$1.36 per bushel. Corn averaged 77 cents a bushel, wheat flour \$7.12 a barrel. During the four years from 1884 to 1887, the average price of wheat was only 92 cents a bushel, instead of \$1.36, which is a great difference. Corn, which brought 77 cents a bushel during the twelve years from 1854 to 1866, was only worth 53 cents a bushel during the four years from 1884 to 1887. Flour, which was worth an average of \$7.12 a barrel in the twelve years, only brought an average of \$4.92 in the last four years—very little over half the amount. If our condition was measured by the trade carried on with that country, and it was all done by means of these commodities, the House will see the fallacy of the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that this resolution, if carried, would bring back those days. It could not do so, because the prices have been going down steadily for years past. During the twelve years to which I have referred, bacon and hams were worth 11 cents a pound, and during the last four years only 8 cents. Lard was worth in the first period 12 cents a pound, and only 7 cents in the last. Pork, salted, was worth 9 cents, and now only 6 cents. Beef, salted, was worth 8 cents then and only 6 cents now. Butter brought a price during the twelve years of 21 cents a pound on the average, and during the last four years an average of only 16 cents. Cheese which was worth 11 cents during the first period was only worth 9 cents during the second period. I give these figures to show the fallacy of the arguments brought forward by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he endeavors to convince the House that, if unrestricted reciprocity were brought about by the adoption of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it would bring back the prosperous days of the Reciprocity Treaty. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman's statement, because, if there is any hon. gentleman in this country who is to be stamped with inconsistency, it is that hon. gentleman. In 1876, he is a protectionist, and says that every young country needs protection for its manufactures as a child needs the protection of its parents until it can protect itself. He says that the history of every country shows the necessity of protecting the manufacturing interests, where the wealth of the country is not sufficient to enable those engaged in manufactures to compete with old countries who possess both unlimited wealth and skilled labor. But, in 1879, he turns round and says that the great panacea for all these evils is free trade throughout the world. There is no one in this House who is so stamped with inconsistency as the hon. gentleman. It cannot be that the additional light which he has got on the subject since has changed his mind. We would be glad to suppose that he changed it from honest convictions. If he was consistently carrying out the new convictions, the new ideas which he had imbibed since then, and we find him proclaiming, as he did only the other day: "The proper principle is the greatest good to the greatest number;" and saying, "when I compare the agriculturists and laborers of this country with the manufacturers, I find that the latter are few in number, and I am justified even in the destruction of their lines, provided I do good to the larger number." But when the same hon. member comes to reciprocity in wrecking, he tells the House that an investment in that line should be recognised by this House, that vested rights ought to be protected, and that we should not allow

them to come in direct competition with the United States wreckers, who can overpower us by virtue of more extensive plant, by virtue of greater means. Now, it is very strange that one principle is propounded to suit one case, and not in the other. The hon. gentleman has staked his reputation upon the very point he has proposed on these trade questions, for every time he is endeavoring to convince the House that the ground he occupied at various times was the only correct ground in all these principles; yet, before two years have passed he has convicted himself by moving on to some other point. Now I can only say that in my opinion his arguments, although they were very clearly presented, although they were apparently logical, possessed, as he is, of a great and cultivated mind, and an extensive experience—he always presents arguments to the House and to the country that may be acceptable—nevertheless, I say, that the force of those arguments is very materially destroyed by reason of the inconsistency displayed by the hon. gentleman during the last few years. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was talking about the exodus from the country and an objection was made to his statement, he replied by asking: "What has the National Policy done for the people of this country? Are the people not destitute, are they not in want? If not, why do they leave the country?" The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) answered across the floor of the House that the farmers were doing well in this country. The retort came back from the hon. member for South Oxford: "In your little village of Brussels I can point out to you no less than 70 men that have left the country and I can give you their names and addresses in the United States. I happen to know something about that neighborhood, because I represented it once, and had some relations with the people." Well, I can only say that I do not wonder they left, because I suppose they were susceptible to the influence of great teachers like the hon. member for South Oxford, and the hon. member for North Norfolk, who for years have been dinging into their ears stories about the elysian fields that lie beyond the border, the great, wide and enterprising country, with boundless fields for enterprise, far in advance of what we have in Canada. I say I do not wonder that many of these men left home for the United States, if they placed any credence in the statements that were made to them, or if they had any respect for the intelligence of the hon. member for South Oxford, who has been dinging these things into their ears for the last ten years, and the only wonder is that more of them did not leave. Now, I may ask, if this resolution is carried, what would it do for the country? How would it affect us? In the first place, it would compel us to abandon our rights and hand them over to foreigners. Why, do I say that it would compel us to abandon our rights? Because, every public man of any standing, either in the United States or Canada, who has spoken upon this subject, has almost invariably admitted that it was utterly impossible to negotiate these trade relations with the United States without Canada abandoning her rights. Here is what the *Philadelphia Record* says on that point:

"No scheme which would give to Canada an equal voice in the determination of federal taxation could be considered. She would have to accept the position of a State in the Union, with only such power in the determination of the tax rate as her comparative population would entitle her to. How this could be effected without representation in Congress is a matter hard to determine."

Or, in other words, that whereas the United States are composed of sixty millions and Canada is composed of five millions, we would have one representative for every twelve of theirs. Would that not be abandoning our rights? The Reform party have always been noted in Canada for fighting against the control of Downing Street over our affairs here; they have always held that the influence that Eng-

land exerted over us, even down to the present day, has been prejudicial, and now they demand the right to make our own treaties. They say that England has no right to have any control over us whatever, and yet, Sir, it is strange to find that these same gentlemen are willing not only to delegate the right to make our own treaties, but the right to control our own trade affairs to the United States, a country that has no direct interest in us whatever, as England has, because we are part and parcel of England; but the only interest that the United States can have in us must be antagonistic to our own interests. Sir, we are a young country, and we shall necessarily be compelled to go on, year after year, increasing our expenses for the purpose of developing this country. The United States are an old country; they have accomplished that long ago, for they have built their railways, their canals, their telegraph lines and their public buildings, and to-day the problem they have is to know how to spend the surplus money they have collected. Now, if we entered into this arrangement we should find, inside of a year or two, that we wanted more money, and to get more money we would be compelled to levy a higher rate of taxation upon the goods coming into the country. But the Americans do not want any more protection; they would not consent to it. Where, then, could we get the money? There is only one source from which we could obtain it, and that is by direct taxation upon the people of this country. The hon. member for South Oxford falls in with that view; it is the darling theory of his life. He is a free trader; he admires the principle upon which money is raised from the poor people of England, as superior to the principle upon which we raise money from the people here. He would welcome that system of direct taxation, because it is in harmony with his free trade views, and because it would be carrying out what he has always said was the correct principle. But would the people of Canada think so? I can assure the hon. gentleman and I can assure this country that whenever the time comes that the Government is compelled to raise money from direct taxation, then, if not before, the people would realise the great evil that had been brought upon them by Reform legislators in this country. They would feel it then, from the poorest man who works in a ditch to the most bloated millionaire that we hear so much about, who has been made rich by the tariff; then they would understand the force of the shock with direct taxation staring them in the face, if ever this policy was brought about. In the natural course of our development we shall require more money, but we would not be allowed to increase the tariff. If there was any conflict between the interests of Canada and those of the United States, if we required to change our tariff, and the United States found the tariff high enough, then 12 against one would always control the tariff and we would be practically helpless and would be obliged to submit to them. Then there is another point. Suppose we entered into this arrangement, it would be for a definite period, and afterwards found that it did not work to our satisfaction, and we desired to drop out of it, then, I say, a financial crisis would come upon this country; we would be almost ruined, and we would have to organise our country anew; we would have to start where we started 20 years ago; we would have to travel over the history of the past and plant ourselves back in the scale of progression, not only 20 years, but, I believe, 40 years. I believe that if this scheme was carried out it would prove an element destructive to the interests of the agriculturists. Why? Because the United States are competitors with us in every line. Their country lies alongside of ours for a distance of three or four thousand miles; their country is, much of it, warmer than ours, and their grain comes in earlier, their roots and their vegetables are ready for the market before ours, and they are thrown into our market at the very time when they bring the highest price, and would

therefore compete the most successfully with the produce of the farmers of this country, and in this way our agriculturist would suffer. And in every line in which they are engaged they must suffer if this resolution passes, and if the Dominion Government enters into such negotiations as the hon. mover of this resolution proposes. But in what other way would it affect the farmers? It would destroy our cattle trade, because the United States stands to-day as a scheduled country in Europe, and American cattle are slaughtered at the point of landing, while such is not the case with our cattle; and our farmers know well that this is a very important privilege, of which they are at present receiving the benefit. Shippers of cattle know well that this is very important in the interests of our stock raisers, and they are satisfied that if we had free trade with the United States we would be deprived of this privilege, and a severe loss would accrue to our agriculturists. What more? It would destroy our butter trade and our trade in cheese. The United States to-day are making a spurious article of cheese which the manufacturers can sell at 5 cents per pound with a profit, while our farmers say they cannot make cheese profitably at less than 9 cents per pound. If we had free trade with the United States, what might we expect in this regard? The reputation of our cheese would decline in the European market, until it would only bring the same price as the American cheese brings to the American manufacturers. Not only so, but American cheese would be sent across here by millions of pounds to compete with our cheese and to the destruction of our trade. In every one of these lines our farmers would be great losers by unrestricted reciprocity. Again, unrestricted reciprocity would destroy the manufactures of this country. Some hon. gentlemen have said that all our manufacturers want is a wider market. All manufacturers who have given any attention to this question express but one opinion on the subject, and that is, that the manufacturers of the United States in a few months would be found in Canada from Montreal to Sarnia provided we had unrestricted reciprocity. The *Cleveland Leader*, a very well informed paper, says:

"We would swamp their (Canadian) markets with manufactured goods, and wipe out their manufactures in many branches at one stroke. To save these industries they have adopted a protective tariff against even the mother country, Great Britain, which is their greatest source of revenue. The idea that they will give us better than they do Great Britain would be foolish to entertain. Great Britain would not tolerate any such invidious distinction."

There is but one desire expressed by the manufacturers of the Western States and that is to get into our country to compete with our manufacturers, for they are satisfied that in a very short time they would have full control of the Canadian market and their goods would be sold in every retail store between Montreal and Victoria within a few months if there was unrestricted reciprocity in operation. But hon. gentlemen opposite could not object to that, because they hold that manufacturers are of no benefit to the people, that the principle of protection is a wrong one, that the protected interests of the country have never been recognised by the great mass of the people. I will call the attention of the House to one fact connected with the principle of protection, which will no doubt satisfy hon. members that the people generally consider there is some virtue in protection. Why do we find villages and towns offering bonuses to manufactures, provided they will establish a factory which will employ a certain number of men? This has been carried on to such an extent as to have compelled the Provincial Legislature to pass a law to prohibit it. If no virtue accrued, if there was no benefit obtained from the increased consumption of goods from a larger number of hands being employed and an increased consumption of farm products, why should they make those offers? To my mind it is only protection in another form, in the form of a bonus, which Reformers and Conservatives join in advocating, recognising thereby the importance and

Mr. SPOULE.

correctness of the protective principle. But if you say anything about this matter politically, the Reformer stops at once and says he is a free trader. The truth is he is a free trader when you say anything about the protective tariff, but not when you ask him to assist in giving a bonus. Then he is as anxious as is his political opponent to assist in carrying a bonus, for he recognises the value of obtaining an increased number of inhabitants in a manufacturing town, knowing that they will prove consumers of farm produce as well as of general goods. I, therefore, ask what advantage would unrestricted reciprocity accomplish for us if we obtained it? I have endeavored to show that it would give foreigners control of our own affairs; and next I proceeded to show that it would virtually accomplish the separation of Canada from the mother country. Why do I make that statement? I say so because in watching the press of the country, I have failed to find a single announcement from any person of note in England or Europe, or the announcement of the opinion of any public man of importance, who has not stated unmistakably that if Canada inaugurated such a policy and discriminated, as this resolution proposes, against the mother country, it would thereby break the last tie that binds it to the mother land. Mr. Hitt, in moving the resolution in Congress, did not make that statement to the people of the United States. One point which strongly attracted my attention in connection with this discussion, was the similarity in the language and even the words used by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and Mr. Hitt when he presented the resolution before the House of Representatives. No one can place those statements side by side without coming to the conclusion that Mr. Hitt got his information from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That would not in itself be objectionable, if the information was correct and honestly given, because the hon. gentleman would simply have been enlightening a foreigner. But when you conceal a part of the truth it is equivalent to telling a falsehood. When you keep back an important part of the truth that should be given to those people to enable them intelligently to understand the question, it is not only doing an injustice to individuals, but it is deceiving those who may listen to and be impressed by the arguments. I will read to the House the statements made to the House by Mr. Hitt when he presented his resolution, and the statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in bringing this resolution before the House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

"Then we are told that England would not sanction such an arrangement. I do not know about that. England did sanction the treaty called the Brown-Thornton Treaty which amounted almost to unrestricted free trade, which put a very large number of articles on the free list."

Mr. Hitt said:

"Will it be said that England will not consent to any arrangement which would give a preference in one of her colonies to American goods over British goods? Her Government in a noted instance did this very thing not many years ago. In 1874, when the Reciprocity Treaty was being negotiated by Minister Thornton, the English Government instructed him to modify it at the suggestion of the Canadian Ministry and make such additions to the list of American goods to be admitted free into Canada as the Canadians desired. He did so, and made out a long list of American articles to be admitted free of duty, so long that it was almost free trade."

That is the statement of Mr. Hitt. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

"The treaty amounted almost to unrestricted free trade."

He then quoted an extract, as follows:—

"In 1874 when the Reciprocity Treaty was being negotiated by Minister Thornton, the English Government instructed him to modify it at the suggestion of the Canadian Ministry, and make such additions to the list of American goods to be admitted free into Canada as the Canadians desire."

Both gentlemen used almost the same language and the same words. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded to say:

"He did so, and made out a long list of articles to be admitted free of duty, so long that it was almost free trade."

Mr. Hitt used the same words and they are both crediting this as being their own language and originating out of their own heads:

"Not one of these articles coming from England was to be admitted free of duty—"

Says the member for North Norfolk; and—

"Not one of these articles coming from England was to be admitted free of duty—"

Also says Mr. Hitt in his speech. I say that it would be praiseworthy in the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to endeavor to enlighten a foreigner regarding our country, if he did not conceal from him a part of the truth which would have enabled him to correctly and intelligently understand our position. The hon. member for North Norfolk goes on to say:

"This draft of a treaty was sent to Lord Derby, who answered that the whole proceeding was approved, and the English Government assented to the arrangement admitting American goods free to a British colony, where a tariff of 20 or 40 per cent. was to be laid upon the same kind of goods coming from England or any other country than the United States."

And the Hon. Mr. Hitt uses exactly the same words. Who taught the Hon. Mr. Hitt; who instructed him if it was not the member for North Norfolk? I say that the discreditable part of it is that the hon. member for North Norfolk, who got that information from the Debates of the Senate on that treaty, read part of that debate and read it correctly, but he left out that portion of it which gives a flat contradiction to the words that he and Mr. Hitt used. Why did he not quote what the Hon. George Brown said in defending that treaty that he proposed to the United States? The Hon. George Brown is the man who conducted negotiations on behalf of Canada; he was the person who was sent by the Mackenzie Government to look after the interests of Canada in that, and he says:

"I come now, hon. gentlemen, to the objections which have been urged against the treaty from such quarters as entitle them to a formal answer. The first of these is the allegation that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain in favor of the United States. Nothing could be more unfounded than this. It was perfectly understood from the opening of the negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States that was not also free with regard to Great Britain and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment."

That is from the mouth of the very man who is sent there by the Canadian Government to negotiate that treaty, but the hon. member for North Norfolk concealed that information from his friend Mr. Hitt, and they both fell into the same error and conveniently kept the truth from the people of the country, so as to lead them to believe that England would have no objection to Canada negotiating such a treaty, if she thought fit herself. Is that fair; is it honorable; is it consistent? It is on a par with the consistency of the hon. gentleman in many of the courses he has taken in this House. In an article on this question the *Mail* newspaper appealed to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and asked him to say whether or not it was intended that that treaty should discriminate against England, and that paper was authorized to say that not a single article in that treaty was contemplated to be brought into this country under more favorable circumstances from the United States than from England, that the same duty on the goods coming from the United States was to be imposed on those coming from England, and every article that came from the United States which was on the free list should also be put on the free list if imported from England. It is a pity that Mr. Hitt should fall into such a mistake when he endeavors to enlighten the House of Representatives, and it is a pity he got his information from a source so unreliable and so dishonest as to

betray him into an error which I think he would not make if he knew better. Such a thing is disgraceful to Canadians. Let every man lay the truth and the whole truth before the public, and enable them to judge for themselves, and no man should conceal part of the facts and then endeavor, from part of the truth and from false premises, to reason that England would have no objection to such a treaty. The Hon. Mr. Hitt goes on to say that Mr. Chamberlain had said that if Canada wanted such a treaty she could have it, but he stops there, and I am inclined to think that Mr. Hitt got that information from the same source. The speech which Mr. Chamberlain made before leaving the old country was construed by the *Mail* newspaper as an insult to Canada, that he should have made the statement that Canada could separate from England if she wanted to. The Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, in explaining this matter to the electors of Islington, said:

"What I said was, that there was a party in Canada which is seeking at the present time for commercial union with the United States. Commercial union with the United States, as I understood it, means free trade between Canada and the United States. While at the same time Canada is to continue to impose protective duties on imports from the mother country, that is to say, that she is to give a preference in every article of manufacture of the United States over Great Britain. Well, I say that if Canada—if a great majority of the people of Canada—desired any arrangement of that kind I have no doubt they would be able to secure it."

But here is where they stop the quotation, and they do not give the remainder of Mr. Chamberlain's speech, which says:

"I did not think that there was anybody in this country who would attempt to prevent it by force; but I regretted that in that case all that continued of this slender tie which still binds Canada to this country, so far as we are concerned, would disappear, and that it was not likely that the people of Great Britain would continue much longer to sustain the obligations and responsibilities of the relationships after the reciprocal benefit had been withdrawn, and so I said that if a union of this kind ever came about it would be the first step and the signal for political separation."

Now, the latter part of this speech of Mr. Chamberlain is left out by Mr. Hitt, and it is this part of the speech which is hidden from the American people when an unfair inference is intended to be conveyed that the people of England would have no objection to unrestricted reciprocity. If it is not out of place I would give the member from North Norfolk this advice, that in future when he endeavors to instruct the American people or the Canadian people either, let him take some solid grounds from which he can argue and give them the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. When the facts are laid before them in this way, then and only then can they fairly judge of the situation. The announcement by the Hon. George Brown in reference to this matter is unmistakable and it is backed up by the assertion of the late Premier, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I very much mistake the feelings of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie to-day if he is in harmony with, or supporting those hon. gentlemen in what they are endeavoring to bring about in Canada. I said that I believed it means separation for Canada as soon as we enter into those free trade relations with the United States, and at the same time exclude the mother country from the same advantages, and if the announcement of the press of the United States, and the sentiments expressed in Congress and in the Senate, is any indication of the feelings of that country, there is but one conclusion to come to, and that is that free trade with the United States means separation from England. I say most unmistakably that it means annexation with the United States. I have here before me a number of extracts taken from American papers and from the speeches of prominent politicians of that country, who, like ourselves, are shaping the affairs of the nation, and I take their expositions on the public platform and in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of that country as an index of the sentiments of the people of the States. I take John Sherman, the Republican leader of the Senate,

and what does he say? He says: "I say therefore that anything that would tend to produce the union of Canada with the United States of America will meet with my hearty approbation." That is what Mr. Sherman said in the Senate when he spoke on this very question of commercial union, and he continues:

"Yes, Sir, I want Canada to be part of the United States. Within ten years from this time, in my judgment the Dominion of Canada will be represented in the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain or in the Congress of the United States, and I say to senators on both sides that I hope that that representation will be in the Congress of the United States, and those countries up there, so interesting to us, and bound to us by so many ties, may be part of the great English speaking Republic of America. I do not vote against this treaty because it may possibly bring about this state of affairs, but I shall vote against it because I believe it tends to erect a barrier, and to prevent the very objects that are sought to be accomplished."

Now, I have given you Mr. Sherman's views. What does Mr. Blaine say? In speaking to the people he said:

"But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes and the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come with us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, and who have no part nor lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for a Democratic congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have."

Now, these are the sentiments of two of the most prominent men in the United States to-day; and if I look at the press of the country I find the same views expressed. The *Oswego Times* says:

"He would make our neighbors across the lake a Canada with American institutions—in short we would annex them (virtually) if not in name, and that he thinks a political union would follow a commercial union is pretty clear from the fact that he said the flag of the union would follow the trade."

The *New York Mail and Express* says:

"If Canada agrees by statute to a general union, she must face probable abandonment by Great Britain, and then annexation with the United States, so that it is really annexation which is involved in this commercial union discussion; and, while there is a strong party in Canada favoring annexation, we fancy that the majority outside of the Maritime Provinces are not yet converted to the plan."

If he knew the sentiments of the Canadian people, he might well add that a large majority amongst the people of the Maritime Provinces are against this proposition. The *Buffalo News* says:

"The Tories are in control of the Government of Canada, and the keeping up of a close British connection is one of the prime articles of their faith. Between that and their dread of political annexation which in the opinion of many commercial union would lead up to, to the United States they will find it very hard to adopt Mr. Wiman's views."

The *Syracuse Standard* says:

"Mr. Butterworth scorns the idea that commercial union means political union. It means nothing else. We want no commercial union without political union."

There are a large number of similar expressions from the press of the United States, which I might give, but I do not propose to waste the time of the House by giving them. But I take a letter of Mr. Sherman's, written to a friend in Woodstock, who had eulogised a speech made by that gentleman in the west last summer. He says:

"I intend to follow up the speech, to which you kindly refer, by a more extended one on the Retaliation Bill, so suddenly sent to Congress, the chief object being to show the importance of our commercial and personal relations with Canada, the ties which bind our people together, and the benefits to both countries of a policy of free commercial intercourse and ultimate union."

They all speak of this movement as "ultimate union." Mr. Hitt himself, speaking of it to the manufacturers of the west, said:

"We in the west would like you manufacturers of New England, to have access to that great market of Canada, with a Reciprocity Treaty, or better still commercial union. You will have the preference over English, French or German goods, and in two years time after it is  
Mr. SPOULE.

adopted, goods from Yankee manufacturers will be in every retail store from Montreal to Victoria."

I think there is not an hon. gentleman in this House, or in this country who will not agree with that. Now, I give these extracts as evidences of the sentiments of public men in the United States to the relationship that would be brought about in the event of any such policy being entered into by the people of this country, and I can only come to the conclusion that if it were carried out, it would mean annexation, and thereby the extinction of our national existence. It would destroy our commercial relations with the old country; it would destroy our Canadian nationality and our national sentiment; it would subjugate our people to foreigners who have no interests in common with us, but interests contrary to ours in almost every particular; it would delegate to them the control of our finances to the detriment of the country; it would lead to direct taxation, because when the control of our finances would be taken out of our hands, we should have nothing to fall back upon to raise money but direct taxation. We have been told by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, that his only excuse for troubling the House with it was that he considered it of great importance. In view of the condition of the country, in view of the state of the people, in view of the dissatisfaction that exists among our people, in view of the arrested development which as he is pleased to say is to be found in every part of this country, he propounds this policy as the great panacea for all our evils—in view of the exodus, and in view of the fact, he says, that Confederation has proved a failure. Now, I would like to ask the people of this country: Has Confederation proved a failure? After the statement we had from the hon. Minister of Finance of the development of our country by railways, by canals, by commerce, by money put into the savings banks and the various banks of the country, by the circulation of money in our country, which represents its developed trade, by the rapid progress we have made during the last twenty years in every particular, by the extension of our boundaries since 1868, by the development of the resources of our country, by the large educational institutions that have been built up, by the imposing and ornamental churches which we find throughout our country, by the rapid growth of our cities, and by the increasing wealth and prosperity of our citizens—after all of these things are considered, I would ask: Has Confederation been a failure? On the contrary, has not its success been far beyond even the most sanguine expectations of the fathers of Confederation when they entered into it? What was Confederation intended for? It was intended to allay the unfortunate clashing of feeling among the discordant elements that were found among the different nationalities and religions comprising our people of that time; it was for the purpose of bringing us together for a common defense and for an inter-provincial trade which has been rapidly developing since; it was for the purpose of building up a national sentiment which would make the people of Canada feel that they had a common heritage and a common interest, and should live together in unity and harmony. It was for the purpose of allaying the discordant strife that has from time to time arisen between the French and the English elements in this country—between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and between the different nationalities; it was for the purpose of increasing that provincial trade; it was for the purpose of cementing and reconciling those various elements. And how far to-day has that been accomplished? Is not the evidence that we have before us of intelligent men from every part of this country extending from Prince Edward Island in the east away to Victoria in the west, who represent the various discordant elements which were found on this American continent before Confederation—is not the fact that these men are here working harmoniously together to-day to be accepted by us as an evidence that

the great end of Confederation has been amply accomplished. I say we are building up a national sentiment; I say we are cultivating a spirit of amity among the various classes, nationalities and religions of our people; I say we are going to understand each other better by being brought here together in the same chamber, working out the same end, discussing together the various measures which affect our progress, working out the destinies of life as best we can, according to our individual and collective intelligence, and in this way building up a great nation. I ask, then, has Confederation been a failure? If we look at the advancement the country has made in its industrial pursuits. I ask has Confederation proved a failure? If we look at the provincial trade that has been established and carried on since 1878, I ask again has Confederation been a failure? If we look at the various teaching institutions and the enhanced intelligence of our people, as evidenced by the various lines of literature and of taste and arts that are rapidly being developed in the various sections of the country, we may well ask has Confederation been a failure? If we go into the homes of our people in the rural districts and find them provided with all that they require to supply their wants, find them amply provided with food and the ordinary necessaries of life and with the clothes to protect them from the inclemency of the weather—I say if we find these and if we find no inconsiderable portion of our people unemployed in our large cities, if we find commercial trade being rapidly developed, and if we find the evidences of peace and prosperity in all the ranks of life, we cannot fairly assume that Confederation has been a failure. Has any country in the world accomplished more under similar circumstances? Could any system accomplish more in Canada? Could the destinies of Canada have been guided better than they have been by the various Governments of Canada since Confederation? Could any country in the world point to a more rapid development? Could any country have been settled more rapidly? Could you have given a larger amount of peace and prosperity to the people by any other system than is found to-day in the Dominion of Canada under Confederation? If all these advantages have been brought about by Confederation, we must pronounce unmistakably that it has been a great success, and that the fathers of Confederation are entitled to the eternal thanks of the people for having in their wisdom seen fit to devise this scheme of bringing together the various elements of Canada and cementing them in one grand whole as they have been cemented within the last 20 years. Then, if Confederation has not been a failure, and if we find these evidences of satisfaction in the country, I may ask, who are the people who ask for this great change to-day? It has not been asked by petitions extensively signed by the people throughout the country who want something they have not got. It has not been called for by virtue of any information which has been given to us from the large centres of commerce. It has not been asked for by the agriculturists. It has not been asked for by the manufacturers nor by the fishermen. From whom then does this demand come? I say it comes but from one source. It comes from a few discontented politicians on whose brows disappointment has left its imprint, and whose highest aim in life appears to be to be transferred across the floor of this House to the Treasury benches. They, and they only, are the educators of the people in this discontent. Leave the people alone, and they are contented and happy; but it is an easy matter to make some people think that far away fields are green and that in a distant country there are opportunities for promotion and advancement which they cannot find at home, because the people are always shown the glittering side of the picture and never the dark side. Our people are shown the silver side of other countries, but only the dark side of their own by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, when speaking

in other countries, take care to show the silver side, but in speaking at home they show the dark side. Is it to be wondered at that a few of our people, when they are subjected to this agitation from a source that they respect, by men whom they believe to be men of honesty and intelligence, should transfer themselves from Canada to these elysian fields which have been painted in such glowing colors by hon. gentlemen opposite? We do not need this resolution. The people of Canada do not require any great change. The country does not require unrestricted reciprocity to give it prosperity; the country only requires to be left alone under the care and management of the same men who have brought it to the pitch of prosperity that it has attained to-day. These men have succeeded admirably in their mission, and the people of Canada have shown their gratitude by electing them time and time again by increased majorities on each occasion. I ask them why should we entertain the demand for the change that they wish to impose upon us? That demand comes from no other class of people save those men in this House and their supporters who are anxious to be transferred from the cold shades of Opposition to the Treasury benches. In my opinion, as an observer of Canada and its affairs and destiny, I say if we can judge of the sentiment of the Canadian people to-day, by the evidences on every side, they only wish to be left alone to work out their own destiny intelligently as they are doing. We want neither annexation to the United States nor separation from the mother country. We want neither Imperial federation or commercial union. We want only to be left alone and then the people of Canada will prove, as they have proved in the past most unmistakably, that Confederation has been a great success, that Canada is a prosperous country and a country which any man ought to be satisfied to live in. Our people are keeping pace with the onward march of progress and prosperity equally with the people of every other country under the sun, and can do for themselves what the most intelligent and advanced people are doing in other countries. They can educate themselves, they can clothe and feed themselves, they can make for themselves comfortable homes if they are only left alone. If we can only keep these mischievous agitators quiet who are preaching everywhere discontent, those men who are impracticable in their views, and who are endeavoring every hour of the day to convince our people that there is something they should have which they have not and which they could get across the southern border. I say that Canada does not want their teaching to-day. Our people are satisfied that they have a good country with all the facilities for promotion and development that may be found in the most advanced and civilised country to-day, and all they ask is to be allowed to go on and develop their resources as they have been doing in the past. All they ask is not to be interfered with in this march of progress, and in addition to that they ask that those who have controlled the destinies of the country so well in the past, should be retained in their places in this House, in order that they may continue to administer the affairs of this country, until such time as the people will call for a change themselves, and I am sure the time will never come when they will ask for either unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union or annexation to the United States.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I do not rise for the purpose of going into this question at any great length at this late hour. The question has been discussed so fully by members on both sides of the House, and especially on this side of the House, that hon. gentlemen on the other side have received, I think, a complete reply to their arguments. However, there are some matters affecting the Province I come from and the county I have the honor to re-

present, with which I desire to deal very briefly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and, if I mistake not, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) made reference to the protective policy, as it affected the coal industry of Nova Scotia; and they made statements to the House which would lead the country to believe that the National Policy, which imposed a duty of 60 cents a ton on foreign coal, did not benefit the coal industry in Nova Scotia to any extent. In fact some of them made the statement that it did not benefit anyone except the men who had their money invested in that industry. These are the points to which I desire to refer for a few moments. The total production of coal in the Dominion of Canada is about 2,400,000 tons, two-thirds of which is produced in the Province of Nova Scotia. In 1868 the total production of coal in Nova Scotia was 453,624 tons. That is twenty years ago. In the year 1878 the total production only reached 693,511 tons, or a rate of 5 per cent. of an increase per annum on the production of the ten previous years. During that time we had no protection on our coal, and our chief market was the United States, to which we sent about three-fourths of the total production of the Province. In 1879 this Parliament imposed a duty of 50 cents a ton on American coal, and subsequently raised it to 60 cents a ton, which is still the duty on coal. I wish to show the House the effect of that protection on the coal industry of Nova Scotia. The total production in 1888, the year just closed, was 1,156,500 tons, or an annual increase of 18 per cent. for each of the ten years from the time the duty was imposed on coal to the present day. We may put this in another light, and possibly hon. gentlemen may then see it in a little clearer way. The value of the labor, or the cash paid for labor in connection with the development of this industry, is a matter of very great consideration to our laboring classes. Looking at the total production in 1868, and basing the cost per ton on the rate of wages paid at that time, we find the cost of labor in producing the coal to have been \$1.52 per ton, and the total amount paid for labor in the development of that industry twenty years ago was \$598,783. Ten years after, in the year 1878, the year before the imposition of the duty on coal, basing the calculation upon a higher rate of wages, in order to give every advantage to hon. gentlemen opposite, at the rate of \$1.65 per ton, we find that the amount of \$915,434 was paid in cash for labor in connection with that industry; or, using another calculation, \$2.28 per head of the population of the Province. In 1888, after ten years' experience of the National Policy, basing the wages paid at the same rate—and I believe I might be justified in putting them at a higher figure, because last year I believe wages were considerably higher than they were ten years ago—we find that no less than \$2,616,725 was disbursed in cash for labor in connection with the development of that industry, or about \$5.81 per head of the population as compared with \$2.28 before the imposition of the duty. To my mind, this ought to be a very satisfactory answer to those hon. gentlemen who contend that the protection to coal has not been a benefit to the people of Nova Scotia generally. It is a very great benefit, as will be seen by the statement I have made. Another feature of the case is the amount which the Provincial Government have derived from this industry; because for every ton of coal which is raised in the Province, a royalty is paid into the Provincial Treasury of a little less than ten cents per ton. In 1878, \$53,697 were paid on the total production, while in 1888, ten years after the adoption of the National Policy, \$151,388 were paid in as royalty, or 33½ cents per head of the population as compared with 12½ cents per head before the adoption of the National Policy. That is another answer to hon. gentlemen opposite which ought to

Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton),

be satisfactory. That is a benefit to the Province as a whole, it is a benefit to every man, woman and child in the Province, because it enables the people to get the benefit of the production through the payments which are made to the Provincial Legislature. It is also a benefit to the Dominion, because, previous to the imposition of duty on the importation of coal, we were obliged to come here year after year seeking subsidies and concessions to enable our Provincial Legislature to meet the expenses of the Province. Now that is not the case. We have a revenue of a very large amount from that particular industry. To-day we have \$150,000 yielded by this industry, of which we get the benefit. The total annual revenue of our Province is about \$650,000, and of this the coal industry pays \$150,000, so that hon. gentlemen will see the benefit derived from this industry in that particular line, aside from the benefit derived by our laboring classes generally. Then we have to add to this the benefit derived from the employment of this labor in the mines, the employment of a large number of horses which consume large quantities of hay and grain, which are furnished by the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, so that not only does the protection of coal benefit Nova Scotia, but also Prince Edward Island. In addition, our miners are large consumers of flour, and, as hon. gentlemen know, flour is not manufactured in Nova Scotia nor in Cape Breton, where a large portion of these mining operations is carried on. They get the flour from the Province of Ontario, nearly all of it. In previous years they imported it largely from the United States, but to-day that is not the case. I am happy to bear testimony to the fact that to-day the flour that is supplied from Ontario to the people of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton is an article that gives satisfaction, both as to price and as to quality. I was astonished, the other evening to hear the statement by the hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell), who is a large manufacturer of the flour which is consumed to a large extent in Nova Scotia; the productions of that hon. gentleman's manufacture, I may say, enter more largely into the consumption of the people of the Island of Cape Breton to-day, than the production of any other miller in any other part of the Dominion. Yet we heard that hon. gentleman make the bold statement on the floor of this House that this duty was a tax on the people of Canada, and he ventured to say that the coal duty should be removed, because it is a tax on the people. Well, the money derived from the development of that industry goes more of it into his pocket, I may say, than into the pocket of any other man in the upper Provinces. I am sorry to find that the hon. gentleman has been so blind to his own interests and to the interests of his own Province, and of the people who want to get a market for their flour. I am sorry to find that a gentleman so prominent in the manufacture of flour should make such a statement. He seems to me to be cutting off his nose to spite his face. I would advise my hon. friend to leave the nose where it is, and the face as well. Leave the coal duty where it is, and it will benefit not only the people of the neighborhood of the mines, but it will also benefit the people of Ontario. Well, in addition to the people who are engaged in this coal industry being consumers of flour and other articles, they are large consumers of clothing, boots, shoes, cottons and wares of all kinds that are manufactured in Ontario and in Quebec. Our people buy largely from the Province of Ontario in those lines, notably from Montreal and Toronto and other large centres; so that the money which is earned by these people by reason of the development of the mines, is distributed not only to the people of the Province where the work is performed, but all over the upper Provinces as well. What the people engaged in this industry and interested in its development require now, is not only the maintenance of the existing duty on coal, but an increase of that duty. It would be

only fair on the part of the hon. gentlemen representing Provinces which produce those articles which are consumed so largely in the neighborhood of these mines—it would only be fair that they should willingly concede to the people interested in the further development of those mines, a further increase of duty. In doing so they would benefit both themselves and the people engaged in the coal industry. This would not increase the price of coal. An hon. gentleman stated on the floor of this House in a previous discussion that the imposition of this duty upon coal had the effect of increasing the price. That has not been the case. There is no increase in the price of coal in any part of the Dominion to-day, as the effect of the duty which was imposed 9 or 10 years ago. Why, Sir, a year ago the duty was removed on anthracite coal, and what has been the effect? To-day the price of anthracite coal is much higher than it was ten years ago. In Halifax last November the price was \$6 per ton, whereas ten years ago at the same date it was \$5 a ton. The price of some kinds of coal, of some particular mines, is even lower than it was ten years ago, so that the duty that was imposed on American coal has not had the effect of raising the price, as hon. gentlemen opposite contend. There is another reason why hon. gentlemen ought to agree to this increase of duty that is asked for by the people interested in the development of that industry. In the year 1866, if I am not mistaken, the United States imposed a duty of \$1.25 per ton on Nova Scotia coal. We continued to pay that duty for a period of five or six years. The result was that, whereas previous to the imposition of that duty, we sent in the neighborhood of 460,000 tons of coal to the American market; at the end of six or seven years, after that duty was taken off, our sales in that market were reduced to something like 160,000 tons, and for the last thirteen years they have not averaged more than 90,000 to 100,000 tons a year, which is chiefly culm coal, valued at 40 cents per ton. The duty was reduced to 75 cents per ton some thirteen years ago; yet we do not find that it increased our sales in that country. Now, a gentleman who is directly interested in, and connected with, this coal industry in Nova Scotia, published a letter upon the subject a few days ago, from which I will take the liberty to read an extract:

“And now a word about the coal duty: The first National Policy coal duty was only 50 cents per ton of 2,000 lbs. That was too low to shut out foreign coal, and as the National Policy tariff raised the duties on mining plant, the coal trade was not benefited. Subsequently 10 cents per ton additional duty was imposed, which in connection with low seaborne freights enabled Pictou and Cape Breton collieries to successfully compete in the Province of Quebec with coals from Britain and the United States; and as the National Policy started a number of coal consuming industries in that Province, the result is, Nova Scotia shipped in 1887 to the Province of Quebec 650,358 tons, against only 83,710 tons in 1878. The fact is our shipments to Quebec in 1887 were only 37,768 tons less than the total sales of all the collieries in Nova Scotia in 1879, the first year of the coal duty. That the National Policy saved a number of valuable collieries from going down into Hades every one connected with them knows.”

“But, as every one connected with the St. Lawrence coal trade also knows, low freights had much to do with the increased business. In '87, steam colliers carried coals to Montreal so low that Cape Breton screened coals were delivered there at \$2.90 per gross ton. True, this did not net the collieries a paying price, but a low price with a large output may leave some profit. In '88 freights were a little higher and so was the price of coal delivered, and on the whole a little better net price was obtained than in the previous year. But this year freights are up; steam colliers are costing equal to 30 cents per ton on coal more than last year and there is reason to fear that Cape Breton and Pictou cannot pay that increased freight and compete with coals from the United States. My conviction is if the duty on coal be not increased our shipments up the St. Lawrence will be much less than of late years and if so it will be bad all round; less work at the mines, less royalty to the Province, and an unprofitable year's coal trade for Cape Breton at least. The United States protected and developed their coal trade in 1866 by means of \$1.25 per ton duty, which they kept on for several years, subsequently reducing it to 75 cents, which it now is. Our coal trade needs somewhat similar encouragement to enable Nova Scotia to compete successfully with foreign coals in the Upper Provinces, and Ontario for her own sake should see to it and devise ways and means of becoming as independent as possible of the United States for an article so essential to her homes and factories, railways and steamers.”

“That United States capitalists desire to control the coal trade of this Province I have no doubt. That an effort was made to buy the Cape Breton collieries is well known, as also that it failed for the time being. That their policy may now be to cut us out of our upper Province market so as to make the working of our collieries unprofitable and induce their proprietors to sell out is quite probable. That a United States coal syndicate controlling the collieries of this country might be a very serious business for the whole Dominion of Canada, any thinking man may see; hence the need of such a coal duty as will prevent American bituminous coals supplanting those from Nova Scotia in the upper Province markets we now have.”

This letter was written by Mr. Lithgow, acting treasurer of one of the most important coal mines in Cape Breton. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) threw a challenge across the floor the other night to the effect that no coal mine had been opened in Cape Breton since this protection was given.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is misstating me. I said that no new coal mine had been opened that I knew of.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). That is the point I am taking. But it must be remembered that we had coal mines at that time which were just being opened, and work upon which had just been commenced, but the condition of the industry was such that it was impossible for the people who had invested in those properties to make any pretence of developing them. They continued to produce year after year only a few tons up to the time of the imposition of the duty on American coal. What has been the result of the imposition of the duty? I will name to the hon. gentleman some of the mines that have been developed. The Reserve mine is one of the largest and most profitable mines in Nova Scotia. Its total production in 1878, the year previous to the imposition of the duty, was only 9,280 tons, or about four ship-loads. In 1888 it was 111,900 tons. The Caledonia mine, which is operated by my hon. colleague from the same county, produced in 1878 only 17,348 tons, whereas the total production last year was 102,927 tons. Victoria mine, another most valuable property, had a total production in 1878—and I venture to say that it had been open for nearly 15 years before the imposition of the duty—was only 12,191 tons; while the total production last year was 76,656 tons. I might go on and enumerate every one of the mines in Cape Breton with like result; but I suppose those facts are sufficient to answer the hon. gentleman's challenge. Another point raised last evening by an hon. gentleman opposite was with respect to the effect that protection on coal produced in the Province of British Columbia. That is the only Province which produces coal at the present time, except Nova Scotia, in the whole Dominion. The production of that Province is something in the neighborhood of half a million tons.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about the Galt mines in the North-West?

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I do not think the production of those mines has been very much yet.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes, it has.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Allusion was made last night to the mines of British Columbia. The products of those mines find their market in California, where there is no competition of any consequence from American coal, and thereby the people who send coal into the California market do not pay the duty. The customer pays the duty because the producers of the coal control the price. If there is any competition it is among themselves; there is no competition in the market except as between the products of the different mines of British Columbia. So the American duty does not injure the people of British Columbia as it does the people of Nova Scotia. That will be sufficient answer, in my judgment, to those hon. gentlemen who have chosen to take up the coal question in the course



of this discussion, and I will not trouble the House at greater length on this question, presuming that what I have already said is a sufficient answer to the arguments of the hon. gentleman. There is another point to which I desire to refer, and it is contained in a statement made by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry), last night. During his address he made particular reference to the articles which entered into the consumption of fishermen, and he enumerated fish hooks, twine entering into nets and seines, as articles that were taxed by this tariff and on which the people engaged in the fisheries had to pay duty. The hon. gentleman was mistaken. If he had only consulted the proper authority he would have seen that those articles are exempt from duty, and that nearly every article that enters into the business of the fisherman is free from duty. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman should have made such a statement on the floor of this House, when speaking for the fishermen whom he is representing here. I am surprised that my hon. friend should make such a reckless statement on the floor of this House. Among the articles which enter into the consumption and requirements of the fishermen are hooks, nets, seines, lines, twines, and salt for fish, and my hon. friend tried to make a point that they had to pay duty on these as well as on the nails they used in building their boats. The facts are that a drawback is given equal to the amount paid in duty on material used in building all vessels including fishing vessels as well." In the face of these facts, facts which are under his hands, facts I venture to say which are in his desk if he chooses to examine them, the hon. gentleman makes this statement for the purpose of having it go back to what he considers an unintelligent class of the people who can be led away by any erroneous statement he may make on the floor of the House. If I mistake not, the fishermen of Prince Edward Island like all other fishermen are too intelligent to be stuffed with statements of that kind. I might also refer to the increase in our shipping to show the progress which we have made in this direction. The extent of the shipping is an index of the trade of our country or of any country and particularly of our maritime shores. Of course, a large amount of the shipping is in connection with our coal industry, and the amount of money earned by the people in connection with this shipping is very considerable. I venture to say that including this with the amount of money I have named to the House as being paid out in connection with our coal industry, that not less than \$3,000,000 is paid annually in the Province from which I come. Let me give the House a few figures to show our progress in this direction. In 1878, the year previous to the adoption of the National Policy, we had in our Nova Scotia ports a total of 7,803 vessels of all kinds, including British and foreign; in the year 1888 which has just closed, I find that instead of having 7,803 vessels entering and clearing our ports we had 12,554, or 60 per cent. increase in ten years. In 1873 the tonnage was 1,855,831, and in 1888, 2,931,738, or more than 60 per cent. than what it was 10 years ago. The tons of freight carried in 1888 were 1,094,950 as against 657,233 in 1878. The crews carried by those vessels in 1878 were 81,035 while in the year 1888 the number manning those vessels was 133,617. If that is not an evidence of prosperity by reason of the protective policy which this House in its wisdom gave to the different industries in which the people of this Dominion are interested, I do not know what is. I am obliged to hon. gentlemen who have listened so patiently to my remarks.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on this very important subject I may say that I consider it is one of the most important questions which have before the Parliament of Canada for many years, and especially is it important from the farmers' point  
Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton).

of view. It is from the farmers' standpoint that I shall endeavor to treat the question; but I may be permitted before so doing to offer a little criticism on certain misstatements which have been made by gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that we had not the stirring times in 1883 that we had in 1878. Now, Sir, I shall contradict that statement by the words of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches to-day, and by no less an authority than the Prime Minister of Canada himself. The right hon. the Prime Minister in a speech delivered in 1878 describing the condition of the country says:

"Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry, but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufactories of the United States. Was it not a crying shame that in this country with a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people, that 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in these years and taken up their abode in the United States, because they could not find employment for their skill and energy and enterprise in consequence of the false policy of our leaders."

I leave the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the Premier of the Dominion of Canada to settle between themselves as to which spoke the truth in regard to the condition of affairs in 1878, and as to whether we had the spirited times described by the member for East Grey, or the depression described by the Prime Minister of Canada. The member for East Grey also told us that it was not the Reciprocity Treaty that was responsible for the measure of prosperity that we enjoyed in Canada between 1854 and 1866. In this connection I would read another little extract from a document that was issued by the Coalition Government of Canada in 1865. It says:

"Under the beneficent operations of the system of self-government which the altered policy of the mother country has granted to Canada in common with the other colonies, in giving us our representative institutions; combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty and the unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, the agitation for organic change has ceased and dissatisfaction with the political rulers of the Province has wholly disappeared."

Let that be an answer to the member for East Grey when he states that if we had unrestricted trade with the United States it would end in annexation to that country. History is continually repeating itself, and we know, Sir, that gentlemen perhaps spoke from experience when they spoke with respect to the feeling existing in this country at the present time, that we wished to be annexed to the States. I believe that there are a few people in Canada that wish annexation, as well as a few in the United States, but the great majority of the people of Canada are perfectly satisfied with their condition, if you give us that free trade that nature has placed us in a position to receive a benefit from if it were not for the barriers imposed by the Government of the day. The Premier of Canada told us in 1878:

"That the blessed policy they were about to inaugurate would restore prosperity to our struggling industries which were sadly depressed. It will prevent Canada from being a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade and moving as it ought to do in the direction of reciprocal tariff with our neighbors as far as the varied interests of Canada may demand will greatly tend to secure with that country eventually reciprocal trade."

Now, Sir, that is the platform that was laid down by the Conservative Party in 1877, and yet, that is the very policy that they are contending against to-day. And yet, Sir, these gentlemen have the unblushing audacity to stand up and tell us that we on this side of the House are annexationists and traitors. The hon. Premier in 1878, said of his policy:

"By having all kinds of industries we would have a great country; the industries would be twice blessed, our sons would be prevented from going to a foreign country to add to its wealth and strength and skill. The fruits of their labor would be exchanged for the fruits of the soil, cities would multiply, and not only would there be a demand for the larger products, such as wheat, flour, cattle and everything we could raise, but for cheese, butter, eggs, roots and other kinds of small produce."

Now, Sir, I will not go further in that direction at present. The hon. gentleman for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) laid down a maxim, which if he himself had followed, his utterances would not have been what they were to-night. He stated that he who told a part of the truth and withheld a part, was guilty of base misrepresentation. Now, I hold that that gentleman was guilty of the very crime he charged against members on this side. He started to show what was the value of wheat during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, and how it had been increased in price after that treaty was abrogated. He showed us that it was worth \$1.35 after the treaty was abrogated; but he should have told us that one cause which assimilated the price of wheat in this country to the price in England was that in 1871, we paid nine pence a bushel to have it carried from New York to Liverpool, while in 1886 we only paid one penny. Then, we know that in 1866, when the Reciprocity Treaty came to an end, the trade between the United States and Canada had assumed vast proportions in comparison with what it was at the commencement of the Treaty in 1854. It had gone up until there was a trade between the two countries amounting to \$186,000,000; and yet when we come to 1887 we find that the trade between the two countries in that year not only did not exceed that amount, but did not reach it by \$400,000, showing how greatly the country was benefited by the Reciprocity Treaty. Then we have been told time and again that it is the speeches of hon. members on this side of the House which have caused the great exodus of population that has taken place from Canada, but I think I shall be able to show that that is not the case. Now, we find that every Province in the Dominion receives a certain subsidy from the Dominion in lieu of what the Dominion gets from taxes on trade and commerce, to assist in carrying on the government of the Province. Now, we find that the subsidies to Manitoba and British Columbia amount to \$647,746 a year, but we find that these two Provinces pay duties amounting to \$660,012 or \$12,166 more than the whole subsidy they receive from the Dominion. Now, some hon. gentleman may ask me what has this to do with population? I will endeavor to show. A great many people from the older Provinces have gone up to the North-West to settle and when they went there and found that such large amounts of taxation had to be paid in that country to support the trade policy of the Government, when they found that it was the policy of the Government to give large tracts of land in alternate sections to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and further when they found that the policy of the Government was only to grant settlers 80 acres for a homestead, with 80 acres of a pre-emption right, while across the line the conditions were much more favorable, they found that all they had to do to get rid of this large amount of taxation and those other hardships was to step across the line, although the soil they found there was not equal to the soil of Manitoba. With regard to this population question, I have been very much amused at some of the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially those made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson). That hon. gentleman has made statements to show that the progress of Canada has been much more rapid than that of the United States. In comparing the population of Canada and the United States, instead of taking different States and comparing them with different Provinces, I would take the whole population of the United States, and compare its increase with the increase of the population of Canada according to the last census returns. The total increase of population in Canada from 1871 to 1881 was 19.80 per cent., while the total increase of population in the United States from 1870 to 1880 was 29.53 per cent., showing that the population of the United States has increased much more rapidly. Now, we have been asked to compare the population of some of the Provinces with the population of some of the States or Territories ad-

joining. The hon. member for Welland states that the largest increase of population was found in the Province of Manitoba, amounting to 247 per cent. from 1871 to 1881; and he goes on to state that this is a greater increase than could be found in any of the States or Territories to the south. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman might have just recalled to his memory the statement which he made in 1884, I admit under different circumstances; and I was just reminded of it to-night, when an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House stated that circumstances were a considerable element to be taken into account in regard to the view any gentleman took of a question. In 1884 the hon. member for Welland addressed this House upon the loan made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and, in endeavoring to show the great advantages to be derived from railways going into a country, he referred to the State of Kansas in this language:

"Without a solitary bit of material for the construction of buildings. Where the people live in dug-outs, in Kansas, the population has increased from 417,659 in 1870, to 1,080,090 in 1880, an increase of 158 per cent."

With all the fine climate that Manitoba has, with all its fine land, with all its superior advantages that he describes so well, he has only been able to show that that Province increased 247 per cent., but when we come to Dakota he made a comparison with that, and I hold that a comparison between Dakota and Manitoba is perhaps the best that can be made. He said:

"Take also the Territory of Dakota with a much inferior climate to ours, all I need to show its inferiority in these respects is to point out the physical features of that country. The Territory of Dakota is the watershed of this continent, and he says, with all these disadvantages the population of Dakota has increased from 14,181 in 1870, to 135,137 in 1880. Why, it has almost multiplied its population by ten in the short period of ten years."

And yet he asks us to-day if the increase of population of 237 per cent. is exceeded by that of any State to the south. Now, with respect to population, let me make a comparison between the period in Canada from 1869 to 1878, before the introduction of the National Policy, and from 1879 to 1888 since the introduction of the National Policy. The ten years from 1869 to 1878 inclusive, show an increase of population of 19.48½ per cent., while in the ten years from 1879 to 1888, during which we were to have had, under the operation of the National Policy, such a large influx of population that would consume all our extra produce, we find that the population increased but 19.26½ per cent., so that there is  $\frac{22}{100}$  per cent. of an increase in the ten years before the National Policy came into existence greater than that in the ten years after the introduction of that policy. Then with respect to the progress that Canada has been making. Take the years 1881 to 1886: During those five years Ontario increased in population 7.39 per cent, while Michigan from 1880 to 1884 increased in four years 13.38 per cent. Dakota from 1880 to 1885 increased in population 237 per cent, while Manitoba from 1881 to 1886 increased but 74½ per cent. Now, I hold that it is not the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side which have caused this large amount of population to leave this country, but the policy of the Government in imposing heavy taxes on the people of that country. When a farmer goes to the North West he requires between \$700 and \$800 worth of agricultural implements within a very short period to successfully carry on operations; and taking a common binder as an example of the taxes he has to pay, I find that when that binder come to the frontier it is bought at \$100, but is valued by the Customs officer at \$130, and is sold to the settler of Manitoba and the North-West at \$180, as stated by one of the hon. members from that country, and that is a cash sale. When we consider that there is a tax of \$45 to \$50 placed upon that implement, and that all the settler has to do is to cross the line to the south to be free from the payment of this large amount of duty it is not to be wondered

at that so many should take their departure from our country. Our settlers have to pay probably \$200 in the shape of duty on agricultural implements. That is one great reason of the exodus. Another great reason is that we granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway twenty-four miles of land on each side of the railway in alternate sections, and that the company are free from taxation for twenty years. Any hon. gentleman who settled in Ontario when I did, and suffered as we did by the locking up of the land by the Canada Land Company, when the country was only partially settled, thus creating great difficulty in building roads, and school houses, and bridges, and carrying on the general improvements of the country, will know what this grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway involves. People are not inclined to settle in a country where they find half of the lands situated within twenty miles on each side of the line free from taxation, and know that every acre they turn up, every improvement they make has the effect of increasing the value of these lands without giving the settler any corresponding benefit. Let me give you a statement that a young man made to me two years ago, who had been in that North-West and had settled upon 160 acres and performed the settlement duties and got his patent. He came back and spent a night in my own residence. I asked him when he was going to return to the North-West and he said: I will never return there until such time as the Government adopt a different railway policy. He said that as long as the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway exists, it will drain the heart's blood out of every settler in that country, and put money into the pockets of the company, and we cannot expect to have those improvements we otherwise would have in lands close to the railway line. With respect to the exodus which has taken place, I would just say that the exodus is going on this spring as rapidly if not more so than ever. I am informed that a special train came down the London, Huron and Bruce Railway yesterday containing more than 30 people and their effects all coming from Wingham, Ontario, and bound for Louisiana, and this is the advance guard of others who expect to move this spring into the States. And on the 12th of this month, a similar number left the same locality for Dakota, and a large number left Clinton and Seaforth, also bound for the American side. The policy of the Government is therefore bearing fruit more rapidly than we in Canada desire, and I hope the Government will take warning and reverse a policy that is working so injuriously. I think I have shown clearly that the National Policy has not increased the population in our country in any degree, and this despite the fact that during the last seven years \$2,851,000 have been expended in bringing settlers into our North-West. I say it is folly to spend such a large sum to bring settlers into our country when those settlers will not remain there. Let me read what one of the Government agents in the North-West says. It is the statement of Mr. W. C. Grahame, the Government agent in Winnipeg:

"Many will be surprised to learn that the number of actual settlers in our Province and Territories, has not been as large as expected, neither has the amount of wealth brought in by those who have come, been as considerable as that of former years. This may appear strange, when we consider the many efforts that were put forth by the many different organisations, to induce immigration to the Province and neighboring Territories, but it is nevertheless a fact, that out of the many thousands who left the mother country, ostensibly for the North-West, a large number of them found occupation and homes on the Pacific coast, and I regret to say, a large majority of these are on the American side.

He continues:

"I took a keen interest in this matter and interviewed the pursers of the local steamboats from whom I gathered information that would lead me to believe that the steamboats plying between Vancouver, Victoria, San Francisco and the American ports at the head of Puget Sound, carried very little less than 10,000 immigrants, most of whom left Europe with the intention of remaining in British possessions."

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

There is positive evidence that it is not the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House which caused this, but the misrepresentations made to immigrants before they went to that country with respect to the condition of things, and they found them very different when they got there, and left the country accordingly. I will not say any more with respect to the question of population. I think I have shown clearly that the National Policy has been a failure in that respect, and has not increased the population of the Dominion of Canada. Now, take the question of expenditure: We were told, when the National Policy was inaugurated, that it was not to increase the taxation, but was to cause a redistribution of the taxation, and that the policy would not only benefit the manufacturing population but also the agricultural population of the country. Let us see how far the promises of the Government have been kept in reference to the increase in taxation. In 1868 we had an annual expenditure of \$13,483,000. In 1873 we had an expenditure of \$23,316,000, or an increase of \$9,830,000, or \$1,966,000 annually, or 73 per cent. of increase during the first five years after Confederation. There was a change of the Government, and the Conservative Government had to give way and allow the Reform Government to assume the reins of power. In 1873, the annual expense was \$23,316,000, and in 1878 it was \$23,503,000, or an increase in five years of \$187,000, or an annual increase of \$37,200, or four-fifths of one per cent. of an increase annually during the five years that the Reform Government held the reins of power. In 1878, the Conservative Government came into power again, and, with an expense in that year of \$23,503,000, they increased it in 1887-88 to \$35,653,000, an increase of \$12,150,000, or an increase of \$1,350,000 a year in nine years, or an increase of 52 per cent., or in five years an increase of 27 per cent. Taking the expense upon the basis of the population, which is perhaps the most correct system of estimating the expense of the country, we find that, in 1868, the annual expense was \$4 per head; in 1874, it amounted to \$6 per head, an increase of 30 per cent.; in 1878, it amounted to \$5.75 per head, or a reduction of 7 per cent.; in 1885, we find it was \$7 per head, or an increase of 30 per cent.; in 1888, we find it was \$7.40 per head, or an increase of 35 per cent. That is the position in which the finances of the country stand to-day. We find that in five years Sir John A. Macdonald increased the expense \$2.10 per head; that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, during the time his Government held the reins of power, reduced the expense by 34 cents per head; and that, from 1878 to the present time, the expense has been increased by \$1.64 per head. What has been the effect upon the taxpayers of this Dominion on account of this large increase? Take the amount of annual expense and base it on the ground of population, and allow the same amount which the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie collected from the people, \$5.76 per head, and you will find that this Government have taken no less than \$15,000,000 out of the pockets of the taxpayers and put into the Treasury. But this does not tell half the tale. Because I contend that, while the Government have taken \$15,000,000 out of the pockets of the people to put into the Treasury, over \$65,000,000 have been taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers which have gone into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country. I do not want it to be understood that I believe that the manufacturers have been making large profits during all this time. I believe there was a time after the National Policy came into force when the manufacturers did make a large amount of money, but that time has passed. Too much money was invested in the different manufactures of the country, and the time came when the production was greater than the country could consume. Take the cotton manufacturers for instance. We know that some of

the cotton mills have had to stop. We know that for their own protection they have formed a combination and then they had to settle the amount of output, and after that they not only settled the number of yards which were to be put out in proportion to the number of spindles, but they settled the price which was to be put on the goods by means of that combination. This reminds me of a statement which was made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech, that the cotton manufacturers of this country were in a thriving and prosperous condition, and he told us that they were sending their surplus products to China and Japan; but he did not tell us that, a short time ago, the cotton manufacturers of Canada held a meeting and decided to raise the price of cotton goods 15 per cent. to the consumers of Canada; so it is evident that we have to pay dearly in this country for the goods which go to China and Japan. And that is the result of the National Policy. Now, I must go on and criticise a little further the statements which were made by the Minister of Finance. If it had not been for some statements which he made, I do not believe that I would have taken the platform at this time, but the National Policy has proved to be a strange production, it has been an ever changing policy, but every change has borne more hardly upon the workingmen and farmers of Canada. I find that, in 1877, cotton clothing was admitted at 17½ per cent. In 1880, it rose to 30 per cent., and in 1889 it is up to 35 per cent. Printed cottons were at 17½ per cent. in 1877, they were 28 per cent. in 1880, and 32½ per cent. in 1889. Those are the cheap goods which the wives and daughters of the farmers and artisans of the country are to get, and the Finance Minister told us that the taxation laid lightly on those who were least able to bear it; but my lady can go and buy a silk gown and only pay 30 per cent., while the wives and daughters of the artisans and farmers have to pay 32½ per cent. on printed cotton. Then, earthenware and stoneware was admitted at 17½ per cent. in 1877, in 1888 it was 30 per cent., and in 1889 it is 35 per cent. Then we come to agricultural implements, and I make the statement again in regard to which I was contradicted before, that agricultural implements came into the country free in 1877-78. There was a clause in the tariff at that time which stated that agricultural implements which came in through agricultural societies, or for the encouragement of agriculture in Canada, came in free. Then it was the farmers' own fault if they did not get all the implements that came into the country free of duty. We had all the implements we needed down to the time that the National Policy was imposed duty free. In 1880, 25 per cent. was put upon implements; but that was not sufficient and they ran it up to 35 per cent. A waggon that paid 17½ per cent. in 1877 was put up to 30 per cent. in 1880, and now it pays 35 per cent. Then, in reference to pig iron, we find that in 1888 it paid 38 per cent. Now, just let me go on a little further. We were told that the farmers of this country pay very little taxation, that this was a policy that bore very heavily upon the wealthy classes, but that the farmer and the artisan did not require to pay any taxes, that they could live in the country without paying almost any taxes. Now, we find that earthen and stoneware pays 35 per cent., and chinaware 30 per cent. The Finance Minister also told us that the wealthy citizen could go to the States and buy a large amount of plate, and that in purchasing \$500 worth, he would pay \$150 in duty; but plate only pays 20 per cent. and that would make only \$100 duty. He then goes to a farmer's house and examines his table, and asks what taxes he pays on his food? He says all the food placed upon his table was raised upon his own farm, and that it was free from taxation. I would ask the Finance Minister if all the food of a similar description that is placed upon the table of the farmer, is not free to the wealthy citizen as well as to the farmer. Have the rich not flour at the same rate? Have they not potatoes

without duty? Butter and cheese, fowls, fruit and vegetables all free, just as well as the farmer? But what about sugar? Is the farmer not to have any sugar to sweeten his fruit or his vegetables? Does the Minister of Finance propose that the farmer shall live without sugar? And then how nicely he turned the question aside. He said there are two sorts of taxation, voluntary and involuntary. Now, Sir, it is not a voluntary taxation if the farmer purchases sugar. I was reading a work to-day in which it was stated that there is not a country in the world in which a large amount of sugar is not used; it is considered at the present time to be one of the necessities of life. I consider that in Canada to-day sugar is one of the necessities of life, and that a farmer has just as good a right to use sugar, or spices, or the other necessities of the table, as any other class of the community. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that I do not advocate for the farmer any special advantages. I do not consider that he is better than any other class. All other classes of the community are just as necessary to the welfare of the country as farmers; but being the largest class in numbers, the largest producers and the greatest consumers, and the greatest employers of labor, I hold that particular attention ought to be paid to that particular industry. Now, Sir, if the Minister had gone just a little further in trying to find something that was taxable on the farmer's table, he would have found that the table itself pays 35 per cent. duty. But he says the furniture is made out of our own lumber, it is grown in our own country and pays no duty. I tell him that furniture to-day is sold in Canada within one per cent. of the cost with the duty added, and we have got to pay that. I asked one of the largest furniture manufacturers in the western part of Ontario within the last few months, what effect unrestricted reciprocity would have upon his industry? He had a paper in his hand and he turned round, "there is a paper," he says, "I have just paid \$250 duty upon furnishings that I cannot get in this country. Relieve me of that amount of duty, give me my furnishings free, and I will enter into competition with any firm in the United States, or any other country." I chanced to be in Belleville this fall, and I saw the owner of a large furniture manufacturing company. I put the same question to him, and received the same answer. I say, Sir, that a great many of our manufacturers are perfectly willing to enter into competition with the people of the United States, or with the people of any other country. Now, let us see what the manufacturers themselves said in 1878, and what some of them say to-day. I think there was a report presented to this House in 1878, of the condition of a good many of the manufacturers of the Province of Ontario. The first I will mention is a founder with a capital of \$180,000. He says:

"No profit on fixed capital last year owing to bad debts and keen competition; the measure of protection they had enjoyed had unduly stimulated the industry, and the business was overdone."

That was before the National Policy was imposed, and if the protection that they enjoyed then had stimulated industry, what must it be to-day?

"Hosiery establishment in the west: too much home competition and business overdone; profits last year 6 per cent."

"Another hosiery establishment: trade fairly good; profits on capital last year 8 per cent."

"Extensive sewing-machine maker: not running on full time; satisfied last year with interest on investment."

"Agricultural implements maker in the west: making reaper harvesters and various machines; past ten months the busiest ever known; exporting largely to Great Britain, Australia and South Africa; export trade rapidly increasing."

I am only sorry that the high duties placed upon iron has put it out of the power of our agricultural implement manufacturers to pay the duty upon iron and to manufacture and export their goods successfully to other markets, as they could before the iron duties were imposed. When Mr. Massey was examined before the Combines Committee

last year, what was his statement with respect to the effect that the increased duty upon iron had had upon his industry? His statement was that the increased duty upon iron in one year had caused his firm to pay the extra sum of \$30,000. When the Bill was before the House, proposing to increase the duty upon iron, I wrote to one of Mr. Massey's agents and received from him a letter in which he stated at that time that it would be impossible for them to manufacture unless they increased the price of implements at least 10 per cent. This is the effect the increased duty upon iron has had, obliging every farmer in Canada to pay a price increased by 10 per cent. upon the implements he uses upon his farm. Here is another statement. James Nixon, of Ingersoll, says:

"The profits of this company last year, after making ample provision for bad and doubtful debts, were twenty-eight per cent. on the paid-up capital stock. Our usual profits were over thirty per cent. \* \* \* There never was a more absurd cry than that manufacturers are languishing for want of protection, while the fact is the manufacturing industries, not including lumber, are to-day more prosperous than any other of the great industries of the country, with the possible exception of agriculture. It may safely be said, generally, that the manufacturers of Canada are as prosperous as are the manufacturers of any country in the world at the present time."

That is the statement of a manufacturer with respect to his industry in 1878. Now, let me read an extract or two from another class. I find that Mr. T. G. Haskett, of Peterboro', lumberman, miller and builder, was interviewed by a reporter of the *Mail*, and this is what he says:

"Our interests are very wide and extend to many lines of business. We are interested in wood working, flour milling, wool manufacturing, real estate, lumber, &c. An extended market, such as we should gain by commercial union, would benefit every line. I could manufacture to better purpose for 60,000,000 of people than I could for 5,000,000."

That is the opinion of one of the largest manufacturers of that part of Ontario. I will next read the opinion of a carriage manufacturer:

"The iron duties have greatly increased the price of iron, and consequently have reduced our profits, there being no corresponding increase in the retail price of the manufactured article. Some of our manufacturers here are not doing well under the protective tariff; in fact some of them have failed. Our market is too small and overstocked. We could produce a great deal more than we do without much extra expense or trouble if we get larger sales for our goods. I think I can face any competition, I do not know why I should not. If I am not as good a business man as my competitors why should the public suffer for my benefit."

Let me give the view held by the farmers in the County of Bruce. At a meeting of the Farmers' Institute, held a year ago in the Village of Teeswater, the following resolution was adopted unanimously at a largely attended meeting:—

"That in the opinion of this meeting unrestricted trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States would be advantageous to both countries, and we desire that the same may be entered into."

That is the opinion of the farmers as well as of the manufacturers, and any hon. gentleman representing a constituency in western Ontario, who will rise in this House and state that the opinion of the majority to-day is not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, is not stating the facts as they exist. Let me now state what two respectable and educated Conservatives told me before I left home. They said: During the discussion of the trade question in 1878 we believed the Reformers of this country were fools for talking as they did; in 1883 we were not very certain about it, yet we voted for the Conservative party; but when it came to 1887, it had been proved to us beyond a doubt that the National Policy was a complete failure, so far as the farmers were concerned, and we will never cast another vote for any Government which will impose such a policy on the farmers and workmen of this country. That is not the opinion of an odd individual or two, but it is the opinion of hundreds of people throughout the western part of Ontario. I desire now to refer to a few articles adverted to by the Minister of Finance and I must say I expected that he would make a very dif-

**Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).**

ferent statement from that contained in his Budget speech, especially as at the outset he stated that his Budget speech would be characterised by candor and frankness of statement, but I was very much disappointed and thoroughly deceived in the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman told the House that the farmers' houses were all built of their own timber, that their implements were made of timber grown in this country, and they had not to pay any duty on their implements. Does the hon. gentleman understand anything about farming or farm implements in Ontario? I was amazed that the Minister of Marine should have afterwards risen, when this point was replied to, and make the statement that the Minister of Finance did not mention implements; I was amazed to hear anyone make such a barefaced statement before this House. What did the Minister of Finance say:

"Nearly all the foods that are used by the farmer are raised upon his own farm and pay no duty; the wheat he raises he has ground at the neighboring mill, it is brought into his home and he pays no duty upon it. The home itself, the outhouses, the barns, all that is necessary in the way of housing for the work of the farm is built out of woods which grow in this country, of which we have a surplus and upon which he pays no duty."

He further said:

"The clothing for himself and his family is in many cases made from the wool which is raised by the farmer himself, or, if not raised by the farmer himself, he clothes himself and his family with the products of our mills, the raw material of which is admitted free. His lumber of all kinds, his furniture of all staple and solid kinds, his farming machinery, is made, and made to the best advantage, out of the woods of his own country."

I am astonished that any hon. gentleman occupying the prominent position of Minister of Finance of Canada should have made such a statement to go before intelligent farmers, viz.: that all their implements are made of their own timber. There is not \$5 worth of timber entering into the construction of any implement except waggons, sleighs, cutters and buggies. A self-binder did not contain more than \$5 worth of wood. In a mower there is only the tongue made of timber; in a pair of harrows there is no timber. Yet, the hon. gentleman tried to make us believe that all the farmer's implements were made out of his own lumber and paid no duty. I would advise the hon. gentleman to visit some of the Ontario farms and see the implements required, and before I take my seat I will state to him of what a set of implements consists, and the duties the farmer is called upon to pay. Then we have been told in regard to the ware he uses. The farmer has to pay 35 per cent. on his stoneware, the man in middle rank pays 30 per cent., but as regards the wealthy individual who can go to the United States and buy his gold or his silver plate he only pays 20 per cent. That is a specimen of the taxation at present imposed on the people of this Dominion. With respect to clothing the hon. gentleman said:

"So that, taking it in the gross, in the rough, the special articles of consumption, and of housing, and of fuel for the farmer are those of which this country produces a surplus, which are free within the borders of this country and upon which not one cent of tax is paid."

As to clothing let me say this: I am perfectly well acquainted with the laws of trade and with the condition of our farmers. It may be that years ago a farmer made his own homespun or he could take his wool to the mill and get it spun there, but that day has gone by. The farmer now takes his wool to a woollen mill and the manufacturer takes it at market price, and the farmer obtains his clothing at market prices—that is, within 2 per cent. of the cost of similar goods coming from Britain into this country, and that covers insurance and freight. So he has to pay the whole duty, and when he has paid the whole duty he has to pay 25 per cent. additional on the 35 or 40 per cent. of duty on woollen goods. Thus it is, I say, that the burdens of taxation bear very heavily on the farmers. I do not say that the farmers are begging from door to door; but the farmer's income is very much

reduced by the heavy taxes he is called upon to pay. I am now going to give a list of implements used by every ordinary farmer in the Province of Ontario, and excluding a few implements that every well-to-do farmer has. I find that a binder costs \$135, a mower \$70, a hay rake \$22, two waggons \$120. In this connection just allow me to say that I have put the values on the implements at the same rate that the Experimental Farm here at Ottawa paid. I went to the Auditor General's Report and got the prices there, so that they must be the correct prices. There are also the following articles at the prices I name: 2 ploughs, \$32; 2 harrows, \$14; cultivator, \$36; gang plough, \$10; bob-sleigh, \$24; drill, \$75; scuffer, \$16; roller, \$20; fanning mill, \$28; straw cutter, \$45; horse power, \$75; turnip drill, \$15; knife grinder, \$8; 2 sets double harness, \$60; one set single, \$64; surcingles, \$4; horse covers, \$4; ropes, pulleys and horse fork, \$30; cutter, \$10; buggy, \$20; 2 stoves, \$38; sewing machine, \$40; clothes wringer, \$6; washing machine, \$16; kit of tools, \$0. This amounts to \$1,040. Now, what is the amount of duty that a farmer pays on all these? The duty on implements amounts to \$270, and the total duty, including household implements, is \$295.37, so that a farmer pays upon those articles \$295.37. Now I hold that this whole set of implements that I have gone over including stoves, washing machines, and clothes wringer, will not last more than ten years on an average. If they have to be renewed every ten years, for implements of this kind the annual duty that the ordinary farmer in the Province of Ontario pays is \$32.50. I put \$3 duty upon twine with the \$29.50 on farming implements, because I find that the duty on twine amounts to about that much. The furniture for a farmer's house costs \$200, duty, \$52; carpets in three rooms, \$70, duty \$20; clothes for family of five persons, \$150, duty, \$39; a barrel of sugar at 7 cents a pound, \$21, duty, \$8.50; coal oil, 10 gallons, at 30 cents, \$3, duty, \$1.24; rice, corn starch, spice, soda and raisins, duty, \$2. So that \$50.84 upon clothing and groceries for the house, and \$32.50 on implements, amounts to \$83.34 during the year. Then, we are told that a farmer can put up his dwelling house and that he has to pay no duty on the timber. I went to a hardware merchant who, every summer, supplies materials for farmers' houses and barns, and I found that for a kitchen, small parlor, two bedrooms and a little room upstairs, the hardware cost \$52, and the duty amounts to \$10. A common barn cost \$81; duty, \$16.33. Carpets, \$70; duty, \$20. Furniture, \$200; duty, \$52. Knives, forks and spoons, \$10; duty, \$2.50. Dinner and tea set, \$30; duty, \$8. Total, \$443; duty, \$108.83. We find that in incidental articles required, the duty on clocks is 35 per cent.; bed clothes, 43 per cent.; towels, 25 per cent.; drain tiles, 28 per cent.; fertilisers, 20 per cent.; and grain bags, 27½ per cent. I wrote to a firm that imports wire largely and I was told that the price of barbed wire wholesale in Canada was 5½ cents a pound, while in Chicago the price of the same wire is \$3.85 per 100 lbs. wholesale. Wire is sold retail in Canada 6½ cents per lb., and in Chicago retail at 4½ per lb. A farmer in putting forty rods of a wire fence has to pay \$5.36 more than he would if wire were allowed to come into the country duty free, and for the putting up of a quarter of a mile of wire fencing he has to pay \$10.72. Now, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked if the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) meant to state that the price of land had been reduced on account of the policy of the Government. Every gentleman who understands anything about political economy, or anything about the farmers' position to-day, knows that land is only worth the amount of profit that can be made out of it after all the burdens on it have been paid. Whether it be direct taxation or indirect taxation, or any other burden, the farm is compelled to pay. It has to come out of the land and it reduces the price of the land by just the amount he has to pay. The annual duty on implements is \$32.50 as I have shown,

and this, on a farm of 90 acres, with 60 acres of crop, amounts to 53 cents per acre, increasing the cost of raising an acre of wheat by 53 cents or a fraction over 2½ cents per bushel. That is the increased cost on account of implements alone of raising a bushel of wheat in the Province of Ontario. Now, if a farmer pays \$32.50 annually for implements, capitalise that at 6 per cent. and you will find that for implements alone the price of a farm is reduced by the amount of \$540, because 6 per cent. on \$42 comes to that amount; thus a firm is reduced by \$540 on account of the annual tax that is placed on it by reason of the duty on implements. Now, take the total duty of \$33 that a farmer is compelled to pay, and capitalise it at 6 per cent. and you will find that it reduces the value of a good 160 acres of land in the Province of Ontario by \$1,333; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the farmers pay no duty, and that it does not injure them. Why, Mr. Speaker, I can remember twelve months ago that it was stated in this House that the revenue derived from a hundred acre farm in Ontario in one year amounted to only \$790, and that the expenditure amounted to \$720, leaving only \$70 of profit to the farmer after all his year's hard labor. Now, Sir, just consider for a moment the effect of the duty on the farmer. The amount he has to pay eats up the whole of the profit he makes on his farm because in the calculation made, the duty was not included. Now, I find that the Postmaster General told us last year, in a speech he made, that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada could not be benefited by unrestricted trade with the United States, that the only article in which they would be benefited would be horses, barley, and a few chickens. That was the amount of the hon. gentleman's information. Now, let me go over a few articles that we have exported. In 1888 our total exports to all countries were \$78,000,000, of which the products of the farm amounted to \$40,155,656. To the United States we exported \$37,300,000, and to Great Britain, \$33,600,000, or \$3,700,000 more to the United States than to Great Britain. In 1878, we exported to the United States, \$25,245,000; and in 1888, \$42,572,000, an increase of \$17,327,000, or 75 per cent. To Great Britain we sent in 1878, \$46,000,000, and in 1888, \$40,000,000, a reduction of \$6,000,000, or 15 per cent., showing conclusively that the United States is our natural market, and that our trade with that country is increasing. Now, take the amount of goods imported into Canada, and from Great Britain we find they amounted to \$39,298,000, upon which we paid a duty of \$8,972,739, while from the United States we imported \$48,481,000, on which we paid a duty of \$7,109,233; in other words, we imported \$9,000,000 more goods from the United States than from Great Britain, upon which we paid \$1,863,000 less duty; and yet hon. gentlemen on the Government benches call aloud about discrimination against Great Britain. Is this not discrimination? Is this not letting goods in from the United States on more favorable terms than from Great Britain? Now, take the annual average of our trade in two periods of five years each. With Great Britain, from 1873 to 1877, it was \$95,665,000, and from 1884 to 1888 it was \$84,300,000, a reduction of \$11,365,000, or 12 per cent. The annual average trade with the United States, from 1873 to 1877, was \$83,223,000, and from 1884 to 1888 it was \$86,299,000, or an annual average increase of \$3,076,775. Now, we have been told that the United States cannot be a market for the products of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada because they raise such large quantities of agricultural produce themselves. I was a little astonished at the hon. member for West Huron, who last year stated that the United States returns showed that the exports of agricultural produce in 1887 amounted to \$485,500,000, of which the exports of beef amounted to \$92,000,000. Then he said:

"I ask you, is it possible that a country that exports these quantities of agricultural produce requires the products of Canada?"

But he seems to have got a little light when he comes to the present year, for he says :

"Do they come and give us \$200 or \$250 for a horse just because they have an affection for us? No, Sir, it is because they want the horses, and if they did not want them they would not buy them."

He finds, Sir, that they want them this year, although there was not a market for them in the United States in 1887. Now, Sir, I just want to say that the United States, in 1888, took from the Dominion of Canada \$10,406,278 worth of agricultural products, while Great Britain only took \$4,292,640, leaving \$6,103,638 in favor of the United States. Then, we sent to Great Britain 54,58 head of cattle and to the United States 40,047. Then, I find that in wheat, in 1888, 36½ per cent. of all we exported went to the United States and 63½ per cent. to Great Britain. The people of the United States actually come into our market to compete with other buyers for the purchase of our wheat, upon which they pay 20 cents a bushel of duty to take it into their own country. Will any hon. gentleman opposite tell me that if that duty were removed, instead of taking 777,000 bushels of wheat in 1888, they would not have taken three times that quantity. I maintain that if the duty were taken away they would have taken a much larger quantity, because they require our wheat for seed, and are willing to pay a good price for it, and everybody knows that seed from a northern country should be taken to a southern country. Now, these two articles show very clearly what benefit the farmers would derive from unrestricted reciprocity. Take eggs: We find, in 1870, during the last six months of the year, that \$5,403 was the total amount paid for eggs going from Canada to the United States. Then, in 1871, when the duty was removed from eggs, and during the first six months of that year the amount had increased from \$5,403 to \$290,000, and it had increased in 1888 to \$2,119,000, or an increase of 39,000 per cent. Take apples: We find that, in 1883, at the time the American Government removed the duty, we sent 33,700 barrels to the United States, while in 1887 we sent 103,000 barrels, and in 1888, 170,840 barrels, or an increase in that short period of 500 per cent., showing clearly that although the United States raises large quantities of eggs and apples, it would be a great benefit to us to have their market for our products. This is an example of what unrestricted reciprocity would do for Canada in the matter of agricultural products, and I believe the United States, if we had unrestricted reciprocity, would be our principal market. The duty paid to get our wheat into the American market in 1888 was \$155,000, and on our barley \$936,000. On horses, cattle, sheep, poultry, potatoes, hay, barley, wool and wheat, there was a duty of \$2,565,000 paid to get these articles into the United States. But hon. gentlemen opposite may tell me that we would not be benefited by that, yet we remember that, in 1873, the hon. the First Minister said that when the Canadian farmer took barley over to the American side he got \$900 for a thousand bushels where the American farmer got \$1,000; and Senator Macpherson told us that the Canadian farmer, who took five horses worth \$100 each into the Buffalo market, got only \$400, while the American, who took the same quantity of horses and sold them at the same price, got the whole \$500. Our farmers had to pay 20 per cent. to sell their horses in the American market. That is authority hon. gentlemen can have nothing to say against, since it comes from their own side of the House, and I hold that if these statements hold good with regard to barley and horses, they would likewise hold good in all other lines of agricultural products, because the quantities that we could send to the United States market are so small compared with the quantities they produce, that they would not have any effect in reducing the price. I hold that our farmers do not receive fair play under the present tariff. We were told

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

by the Minister of Finances that raw material for the Canadian manufacturer, such as wool, hides and skins, and certain kinds of timber used in the making of furniture, came in free of duty, but where is there anything admitted free for the farmers? We find he has to pay duties upon tiles; we find that he has to pay duty upon fertilisers, and that in the matter of corn he is discriminated against as compared with the distiller. I hold that free corn would be a great benefit to our agriculturists. We send over 40,000 head of cattle to the United States annually to be fattened, over 30,000 of which come from Ontario, and these could be profitably fattened in our own country if we had the duty removed from corn. Our farmers to-day have to pay a heavy tax of seven and a half cents on corn. To-day, barley is selling for 54 cents a bushel and corn at 39 cents delivered in bond, and if the corn were admitted free of duty it would be a great benefit to the farmer, because it would be cheaper to feed his cattle with the corn at that price, especially as it gives 56 lbs. to the bushel whereas the barley gives only 48 lbs. to the bushel. We have heard a discussion about fertilisers, but there is no system that could give a cheaper fertiliser to the farmer than to allow him to purchase his corn free of duty with which to feed his cattle and save the manure to put on his land. The manure from a ton of corn is worth £1 11s. or \$7.44 a ton, and if hon. gentlemen opposite love the farmer very much, why do they not place him on a level with the distiller and allow him a rebate upon corn, on his certifying that he has fattened with it cattle which he sent out of the country. But is any favor to be given the farmer? The time, however, is rapidly approaching when those gentlemen will feel the weight of the burdens they have placed on the farmers of Ontario; and if I do not mistake the signs of the times, the farmers of Western Canada are fully alive to their own interests. Having been deceived by the National Policy, and having found the promises made with regard to that policy have not been carried out, they are convinced the statements of the Government are not to be relied on. Take, for instance, the statement of the Minister of Finance, that all their agricultural implements are made of timber grown in the country. That was a childish statement for any hon. gentleman to put before the intelligent farmers of this Dominion, and there is not the least doubt but that they will remember this statement when they have an opportunity of going to the polls, and recording their votes. I am as well convinced as I can be of anything in the future, that just as soon as the Government of the day will give the farmers an opportunity, they will teach hon. gentlemen opposite the lesson they deserve to be taught. I was much amused to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Tupper) declare that the result of the elections of 1882 and 1887 were a complete answer to the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I was very much astonished to hear the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) argue that the Gerrymander Act was based upon population. I was inclined to believe at first that he was uttering a falsehood, but I have come to the conclusion that his statement was perfectly correct, and that the Gerrymander Act was based on population—not, however on the numerical population but upon the political population. Take West Bruce and North Bruce. For instance, two adjoining counties. The Government found it was necessary to put a population of 25,418 into West Bruce in order to give the Grits there, but what did they do when they came to North Bruce? There they only put a population of 17,625. In East Middlesex they put a population of 24,542, and in South Middlesex 18,880; and when I come to South Huron, the constituency I have the honor to represent, I must say that I was made a member of Parliament by that Gerrymander Act. But what are the facts with respect to South Huron and the rest of the Hurons? South Huron

has a population of 23,042, and there is only a population in Cardwell of 16,770. With respect to the County of Huron, I heard a respectable Conservative state that it was not Sir John Macdonald or his Government who were responsible for the gerrymander in that county, though it was true that it was gerrymandered, but he said the question was sent up there to him, and he gerrymandered it, and his gerrymander was accepted; but there is no doubt that it was only on party grounds and not, as the hon. gentleman from Renfrew would have us believe, in the interest of the country. If there is any Act of which the Government should be ashamed, it is the Gerrymander Act; and another Act of which they should be ashamed is the Franchise Act. I was surprised the other evening to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state in his place that he was astonished at the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) make the statement he did in 1876 or 1877 that all the money borrowed or spent in this country was spent in paying investments. My mind took me back to the year 1885, when, on account of the mismanagement of the Government in the North-West, after warning following warning, after they had received all the information, according to their own statements, which it was possible for them to receive, after they had goaded a certain class of the people there by withholding the rights and privileges to which they were entitled, they had to expend over \$7,000,000 of the money of the people of this country in suppressing the rebellion which took place. I should like to ask if that is a paying investment? Perhaps in one sense it was, because it may let the Government know that there is a limit to the endurance of a people in a free country, but certainly that is the only way in which they can show that it is a paying investment. I should like to ask if it was a paying investment to spend between \$400,000 and \$500,000 in carrying out the Franchise Act, which is such an iniquitous measure that they have not been able to have the lists revised since 1885, and in the elections which have recently taken place a great number of voters are disfranchised. Is that a paying investment? That Bill will be repudiated by the people of this country when they get the opportunity. My mind also takes me back to the License Act. I had the honor of a seat in this House when the Premier of the Dominion was warned by the leader of the Opposition not to pass that Act, until he had taken a test case and submitted it to the courts, because he would find that the Act was *ultra vires* of this Parliament. But the leader of the Government would not be warned, he would go on, and, after spending a large amount of money he had to go back to the position which existed before the McCarthy Act, as it was called, came into force. There is yet another question upon which a large amount of money has been spent, and yet who can tell but that was money well spent? We know that, on account of the aggression of the Federal Government, territorially and otherwise, on the rights of the Province of Ontario, a large amount has been spent in litigation; but whenever the Province of Ontario has appealed to the court of last resort, it has been proved to be right. There may be something in that in the nature of a paying investment, because it may warn the hon. gentleman that he may go too far in interfering with Provincial rights, and that there is a limit to the endurance of the people.

Mr. COCKBURN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. What is to be taken up to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has made an arrangement with my hon. friend opposite, as he knows, that this debate will be resumed and finished on Tuesday. To-morrow, the Government will go on with the

measures on the paper, taking up those first to which it is likely there will be the least opposition.

Mr. LAURIER. Bills?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Bills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this debate to be resumed to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On Tuesday.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:25 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That, for the remainder of the Session, Government measures shall have precedence on Wednesdays, after Questions put by Members, and that the order of business for Mondays, hereafter be the order of business for Wednesdays, under Rule 19.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that it is altogether premature for the Government to bring forward this motion at such an early stage of the Session. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Order Paper he will see that there are four or five pages of notices and almost two pages of Public Bills and Orders, and if the Government take Wednesdays it is tantamount to saying that those are to remain untouched for the present Session. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion to take next Wednesday, but that he will wait for a week, or two weeks, before adopting this course. I offer these remarks in no other spirit than that of a wish to expedite the business of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and during former Sessions I objected to the Government prematurely taking away the private days from the members of this House. I do not think there is any such pressure of public business as would warrant my hon. friend pressing this motion for next week. I think the hon. gentleman would do well to consider the interests of the private members who have matters to bring to the notice of the House affecting their constituencies, and I think that the motion should be let stand for at least a week more so that the Order Paper might be lessened.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wish of the Government is not to curtail the time at the disposal of hon. members. The measures that the Government have on the Notice Paper are perhaps as important as those of private members, and if we want to have the Session closed not too late in the season, so that members may not be inconvenienced, we have to take a day more in order to finish the Session at the proper time. Hon. members have themselves spoken of Easter as the period at which they would like the Session to end, and by taking the Orders of the Day of Wednesday, on Monday, hon. members will see that they have the double advantage of having their motions during the first three hours of the sitting, and then in the evening there will be Private Bills. I think in this way the work of the Session would go on without inconvenience to hon. gentlemen. I have no doubt that the First Minister will do as he has done once or twice already.

Mr. MITCHELL. Concede to the wishes of the Opposition.



Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For example, we can take unopposed notices on Monday. That was done before, but some hon. gentlemen were not ready to go on. I am sure that will give all the facilities that are possible to hon. gentlemen to bring forward their motions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that the occasion has ever occurred before, where the Government demanded four days of the week in the sixth or seventh week of the Session. This is practically equivalent to making it impossible for any member to bring a Bill of public importance to a second reading. I may remark that I do not think the hon. gentleman will facilitate matters very much by this motion, because, as he knows, a great many more discussions are likely to take place on going into Supply than are likely if private members have time to bring forward their motions. I do not think the Prime Minister, whose memory stretches over a longer period than mine, will recall an instance in which at so early a period as the 15th of March, after the House opened on the last day of January, the Government proposed to take four whole days in the week:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A motion similar to this was made last Session and adopted, but I must say not at such an early period of the Session. I have had some conversation with members of both sides of the House, and there seems to be a universal desire that Parliament should prorogue before Easter. Good Friday is on the 19th of April, and we would have to rise on Thursday, the 18th, or adjourn over Easter. It is because I believed that we were meeting the general interest of the House, that I proposed this resolution. In order to adjourn before Easter we must carry out three rules: first, we must have short speeches; second, we must sit very late; and, third, we must all be animated with a sincere desire to return to the bosom of our families. However, the Ministers are servants of the House, and as we all have our residences in Ottawa, it does not put us to so much inconvenience to adjourn over Easter as it would hon. gentlemen who live at a distance, and especially those gentlemen who are in business, and wish to be at the seat of their business at the opening of the season. We have gone over those notices of motions twice, and hon. gentlemen were not ready, but I suppose it often happens that at the first few weeks of the Session hon. gentlemen have not got well into harness. The motions, however, with two or three exceptions, are merely for papers, but some of them no doubt are designed as a peg to hang a speech on. If hon. gentlemen agree that I shall be allowed to move this motion on Monday next, I will let it stand in the meantime.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman will let this motion stand for the present. With every desire to facilitate business, and with every desire to prorogue, if possible, at Easter, I do not think that it would be at all conducive to the public interests to have this motion carried. In addition to the three things mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, there is another also which we must not forget: we must do the business of the country, and there is a good deal of the public business of the country included in these motions. We have gone twice over the motions, it is true, and if so many are left on the paper, I do not think it is because those gentlemen were not ready, as the First Minister says, but because they desire to speak upon their own motions. There are some 30 or 40 motions relating to public matters which hon. gentlemen desire to debate before the House, and it is only fair that we should give them an opportunity to do so. I assure the hon. gentleman that it would be more conducive to the expedition of the business to let this matter stand for the present and take it later on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So be it.  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not want to allow the statement to go uncontradicted which has been made by the hon. Minister of Public Works and by the right hon. leader of the Government, that the reason these notices of motion have been gone over twice has been that hon. gentlemen were not ready to go on with their motions. They have been ready with them, but they did not want them passed in silence. Those notices have been put on the paper by hon. members for the purpose of getting the documents and papers to which they relate before the House, so as to enable them to deal with the matters to which they refer. As I understand, the practice of going over the paper twice was for the purpose of passing the unopposed motions, so that the papers to which they related might be copied and sent to the House, but the motions remaining were those upon which hon. gentlemen desired to make some observations. Therefore both hon. Ministers are in error in stating that because any hon. gentleman's motion remained on the paper he was not ready to go on and discuss it. Now, we are very early in the Session yet, and while I agree that it is desirable that we should bring the Session to a close as soon as possible, there is a still higher duty we have to perform, in attending to the matters for which we have been sent here, in criticising the accounts of the Government, and in seeing that the interests of the people we represent are brought before the House. What opportunity have we had to do that? There are five pages of notices of motion alone on the paper, many of which have been there since the beginning of the Session, and it is impossible that hon. members can perform their duties to their constituents if they are foreclosed to one single day in the week, and to only a part of that day. Now, I do think the right hon. gentleman is not doing right in taking Wednesday, at all events the first Wednesday. If he would leave us next Wednesday, and take the succeeding one, I do not suppose there would be so much objection.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think it would be quite right to bring this matter up on Monday or Tuesday again, because that would have the effect of taking away from us Wednesday without substituting the orders for Monday next. If it is to be brought up on a subsequent day, the motion might be made to apply after next Wednesday, otherwise the matter ought to be gone on with now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I shall gracefully yield, and we shall only ask for the Wednesday after next.

#### FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. AMYOT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call attention to the delay in the printing of the French translation of the *Hansard*. We have received it only to page 144, while the daily version has reached page 640. I have enquired, and I am told that the fault lies with the printer. The translators had translated 448 pages on the 13th of March, and they had given the printer on that day 350 pages. How is it that the same quantity has not been printed and issued to the members. I do not complain with the translation itself; I remark that this year especially it is very well made; I have read a great many of the speeches which have been translated, and have ascertained that fact. Though the translators are few in number, only nine, one of them, Mr. Beaulieu, is sick, and another is engaged in correcting proofs; but they have been able to follow the daily issue of the *Hansard* very closely. But we should have the translated *Hansard* printed; we have our rights; we represent over a million people, and we are entitled to it. For my part, I insist on it, and I hope the House and the committee will see that there is a remedy.

Mr. DESJARDINS. In answer to the question put by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), I beg to

say that although the translators have been keeping up the translation, I understand that the printer has been delayed because some of the members have kept their proofs too long. He complained about that, and asked me to call the committee together, to see if some more stringent rules could not be adopted regarding members who delay delivering their speeches after correcting them, so that the printing of the translation could be kept up. Perhaps we can account for a little of the delay by the fact that the printing establishment has been newly organised, and that the printer has not all the hands that he ought to have in getting out the work. But I think there is something in his complaint that members have been keeping their proofs too long in their hands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the apology put forward by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) is not exactly such an apology as ought to be offered to this House for the delay in the publication of the French edition of *Hansard*. It is well known that when a member gets the proof-sheets of his speech, there is a notice attached that they must be returned within 24 hours.

Mr. DESJARDINS. That is not done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is the rule, and I fancy that most members comply with it; and if the proof-sheets are not returned within twenty-four hours, the printer is at liberty to go on and print without the corrections. The excuse offered by the hon. member for Hochelaga, that the printer is not able to keep up with his work is, to my mind, very absurd. The Government took over from MacLean, Roger & Co., the entire plant of the printing establishment which carried on the printing of this House, and of the departments, for years, and not only that, but they have at their command thousands and thousands of dollars worth of other material which has been bought since the Printing Bureau was established. They have greater facilities now for turning out the work than MacLean, Roger & Co. ever had, and I cannot see that we can excuse the Printing Bureau for inattention to its duties in this way. If any person is to blame, it must be the department which has control of that bureau.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not want to attach blame to the department or to anyone; I do not know enough of the details of the organisation for that. My hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) has made the case a little worse, because he has evidently been humbugged by the printers. I am quite aware that if the members delay returning the corrected sheets, there must be delay in getting out the revised *Hansard*. But this is not the question in this instance. Once the corrected sheets are printed they go out of the hands of this House entirely and into those of the translators, who translate them, and there are over 200 pages of corrected sheets translated in the hands of the printers which are not yet printed. I only wish to draw the attention of the committee to this delay so that the remedy should be applied at once. It is unfair to French members and those who like to send out copies of the translated *Hansard*.

Mr. DESJARDINS. In answer to what my hon. friend from North Brant has said, I must say that the printer complained to me that he was greatly delayed in his work by the fact that some of the members had kept their proofs too long. I told him that there was a stringent rule laid down by the Debates Committee on which he should act, and that if members kept back their speeches beyond a certain delay, he should go on with the printing without waiting for the return of the corrected proofs. I understand now that he is doing that. With reference to the delay to which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has referred, I will see that the printer is notified of the complaint.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it, the question of printing from corrected sheets has nothing to do with this matter. The complaint of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is that the French translators have delivered to the printer some 400 pages of manuscript, and of that only 150 pages are printed.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I will see that the printer's attention is drawn to this.

#### TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. BARRON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to know if the commissioners appointed in regard to the Trent Valley Canal have yet made a report to the Government? A large section of the community is deeply interested in the completion of this work, and are anxiously waiting to know what the report of the commissioners is, and whether the Government is going on with the work or not. I asked the Government in the beginning of the Session if the commissioners had reported, and I was told they had not. I understand now that one of them has gone away, and that their work is done, and there is no reason why they should not have made their report by this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to renew his question when the First Minister, who now administers that department, is in his place.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 17) to make further provision respecting the speedy trial of certain indictable offences.—(Sir John Thompson.)

#### MASTERS' AND MATES' CERTIFICATES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 26) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. I explained the other day the object of this amendment. It is to enable those vessels now managed by masters and mates holding port certificates to take their ships—which now they can only take to ports in Newfoundland and the United States, besides Canada—to any of the West India Islands; and I propose to add the amendment suggested by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), by inserting the following words: "and the east coast of South America." So that those vessels may go to the ports in South America as well as to the ports in the West India Islands.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why not say South America, and not simply the east coast?

Mr. TUPPER. If we do not draw the line somewhere, the extension will be, perhaps, hardly justifiable. In view of the fact that we restrict those vessels to the coasting trade, I think we should stop at the Horn, and I think that will be ample for all coasting purposes—certainly for those purposes which can be strictly called coasting. We are giving them quite a large district, the Gulf of Mexico, all the West India Islands, and the east coast of South America.

Gen. LAURIE. I presume the amendment of which I have given notice is covered by the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis)?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, the resolution of the hon. member for St. John included that of the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie).

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The effect of this is, they will have to take certificates?

Mr. TUPPER. Their coasting certificates will enable them to make these voyages, just as they enable them to make voyages now to the ports of Newfoundland and the United States.

Mr. ELLIS. Do you think that form of expression will also cover central American ports?

Mr. TUPPER. I think so. Central American ports would be included in the words "on the east coast."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And British Columbia?

Mr. TUPPER. That is now covered in the present Act as being ports in Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see much use in limitation at all. When a man can go round Cape Horn to British Columbia on one of these coasting licenses, you might as well let him go round the world.

Mr. TUPPER. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but that is the state of the law now and has been for years.

Mr. EDGAR. I would suggest that South America should be added.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not object to that.

Gen. LAURIE. I do not think the Gulf of Mexico should be included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the Minister made this extension of the existing laws under advice from any of the merchant shipowners? What is the real reason for this proposal? It appears to me that we are destroying any good which exists in the present law, requiring us to have as masters of ships men fitted for the position, and possessing a certain amount of knowledge of navigation. This amendment is going to take away very largely the effect of that provision. According to this, a man without any knowledge at all can sail a ship all round the coast of America, around Cape Horn, up to British Columbia.

Mr. TUPPER. Under the existing regulations as to the coasting trade, the master must have a coasting certificate, and pass an examination before he obtains it. In introducing the Bill, I explained that our restrictions in regard to the coasting trade were greater than those of almost any country in the world. These amendments have been introduced at the instance of those in the Maritime Provinces who are interested in the matter, and who represent that, unless our law is changed in this direction, the effect will be to transfer most of this coasting business to American bottoms. Captain Scott, the late examiner of masters and mates, agreed that the provisions here were too stringent for the trade, and I know that in Lunenburg and in Halifax County it was often found impossible to get a fit master for vessels engaged in the coasting trade, without a great and ruinous delay. Looking into the law, I found that in England they had no such stringent regulations, and in the United States none whatever, in regard to a master taking a vessel on such a voyage. It is, therefore, at the instance of these men who are interested in the trade, that I propose somewhat to slacken the regulations which now exist to some extent.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is some force in the objections of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), but he must remember that the persons who are engaged in the coasting trade have to pass an examination in order to qualify for the service. Besides, no one is going to place his property in the charge of a man unless he is satisfied that the man is able to command the ship, and to navigate her properly.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then you need have no law at all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That may be so, but perhaps a man would be more likely to take care of his own property than to do what simply the law required. I think this extension of the privileges of these people who are almost born at sea, these captains and mates of boats along the shore running to the West Indies and other places, will be recognised to be in the right direction, and I do not see that any harm can come from it.

Mr. LOVITT. Does the amendment give any more privileges than the Bill?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, the coast voyage will include South America and the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. LOVITT. I think there is a great deal of objection to that. There are difficulties in the navigation of the South American coast which do not exist further north. The Bill as it stands is quite enough, and I think the amendments will be unfair to the shipping industry, because men will be put on to navigate vessels without a chronometer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) cannot suppose that in this day a vessel will be sent to the West Indies without a chronometer. That is a thing of the past.

Mr. TUPPER. I should think that a vessel which can go through the West Indies could safely navigate the coast of South America.

Mr. LOVITT. They have a different system of navigation there. They have to go to the east in order to make allowance for the trade winds, or they would go ashore. The current there is all going one way.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that for years past, without any great loss of life having occurred on that account, vessels have been permitted, and are permitted under the existing law, whether this Bill passes or not, to go around the Horn, which is the most dangerous place to navigate, and then upwards to British Columbia. This last season one vessel did clear from Halifax to Victoria.

Mr. WELSH. I object to that clause. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Jones), and I think it is not fair for those masters who pass an examination. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine may be a very good lawyer, but I do not think that he is a very good navigator.

Mr. TUPPER. He does not pretend to be.

Mr. WELSH. I object to that. I think it is not treating past masters fairly to allow a man with a coasting license to go down to South America, where navigation is most difficult, to take a ship to England, or a ship to the West Indies? If my hon. friend will only take the trouble to ask any old sailor, he will tell him that the West Indian and South American navigation is much more difficult than taking a vessel across the Atlantic Ocean. It is not treating the past masters properly to allow any one who can obtain a license to go into the South American trade. I shall oppose this clause, decidedly. A sailing master with a fishing license and a coasting license can navigate these vessels to South America, or anywhere else.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I think this is a very useful Bill. I am not very anxious about the South American ports, but I think, so far as it applies to other ports, it is a very useful Bill and ought to pass.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Bill may be very useful, but the House must understand that by passing it they are practically repealing the law now on the Statute-book, which was passed after some consideration. That Bill declares that a

man shall not handle a sea-going ship, or take charge of the property in a sea-going ship, unless he qualifies himself by passing a certain examination. My hon. friend to my left, argues that the owner of the ship has so much at stake that he will not put any but a qualified man on board. Well, the Legislature did not believe that argument was sufficient, and that is the reason that they passed the Act declaring that before a man could be qualified to take charge of a sea-going ship, he should pass a certain examination in navigation. A large number of men have gone to the expense and trouble of qualifying themselves to obtain these certificates, and if you determine that it is desirable to throw open the whole coast of America to men who have not got these qualifications, it is better to repeal the Act on the Statute-book altogether. It is not fair to say that under the existing law a vessel can go from eastern Canada to British Columbia, and then, more by accident than anything else, trade there. It was not the intention of the law on the Statute-book to permit men to navigate Cape Horn unless they passed a master's examination and obtained a certificate. It is true that they could do it, but the trade between eastern Canada and the west coast of America has been very small. I think myself, basing my opinion to a large extent on the knowledge of my hon. friend behind me, that if you dispense with a master's certificate for navigating along the east and west coast of America, you had better dispense with them for crossing the Atlantic.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend did not take into consideration all the circumstances. Now, this Bill will apply to the most skilled class of people along our Atlantic coast, who have been at sea all their lives. They are thorough, practical seamen and cannot be taught anything more about handling a ship in bad weather, or the navigation of a ship, and have qualified themselves by taking out a master's or a mate's certificate. From my own knowledge, I would as soon have one of these men to take charge of a vessel as many men who pass a regular examination. My hon. friend is not aware, perhaps, that of late years a considerable number of small vessels have been taken around the Cape to British Columbia by this very class of persons, and they always arrive successfully. With regard to South America, so far as I can see, it is a matter of no great importance, because, practically, we have very little trade in that quarter except with British Guiana and Brazil. We have some, of course, with Buenos Ayres and those places, but the chief ports are in the West Indies, and I do not think there will be any difficulty or danger arising under the provisions of this Act.

Gen. LAURIE. I think the matter is, to some extent, misunderstood. It appears that, under the existing law, which this Bill is intended to amend, the master of a vessel holding a coast certificate can sail from Newfoundland to New Orleans, and in that course he goes past the West Indies. We have submitted a proposition in the first place, and the Minister of Marine has submitted it to the House that he may call at a port in the West Indies, stopping, so to speak, on the road in which he is sailing; and we ask further that he may be permitted to call at ports in the Gulf of Mexico or in British Guiana. We have then the endorsement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), who are largely engaged in that trade, and who, owning a large number of vessels, will not run any risk that they can avoid, and they do not desire to place their property in the hands of men who are incompetent. In addition to that, under the Act, such masters are already entitled to pass to San Francisco or to British Columbia, and surely it is not unreasonable to ask that they may be permitted to call at a port on the coast of South America. I do not press that matter, but the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) has proposed it. I simply propose to include the West Indies and Central

America, and I think it is very reasonable that they should be permitted to call at those ports.

Mr. LOVITT. I would ask if a man does not need as much qualification to go around Cape Horn as he does to cross the Atlantic?

Mr. SKINNER. I have information from vessel owners in St. John, who are thoroughly competent to give information in regard to this Bill, as follows:—When sailing from United States ports, masters and mates do not require to pass examinations or possess certificates. So long as we require in the Maritime Provinces larger evidence of efficiency than they do in the United States, the business is likely to pass to American ports, and I have information to the effect that, in very many instances, vessels owned in St. John would have taken on board cargoes from Canadian ports for South America, but could not obtain the required certificated masters and mates, and were compelled of necessity to have the vessel sail for an American port and take their cargoes from such port. We find, now that attention is being more directed to South American trade, than it was a few years ago, that a serious difficulty is looming up in connection with that trade in this respect. If we in Canada in regard to our coasting trade, however extensive the line of coast may be, place a heavier onus on masters and mates of vessels than they do in the United States, they will go to the United States and will ship their cargoes from New York or other ports in the States. It may be that the remarks of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) are to a large extent correct, that it almost requires as much knowledge to go to South America as it does to cross the Atlantic.

Mr. LOVITT. More.

Mr. TUPPER. That class of vessels never wants to cross the Atlantic.

Mr. SKINNER. If it requires more skill, and it will not do to allow our masters to go on vessels without examination, because that is the effect of the argument, and the United States' laws do not require that masters and mates should be subject to such examinations, but a master or mate simply makes a certain declaration that he intends to become a citizen of the United States, which he may carry out years hence, or may never carry out, and that is being done, the effect must be to drive trade to the United States. If it requires more knowledge on the part of masters and mates to take a vessel to South America than across the Atlantic, and certificates are not required by masters and mates sailing from American ports, then the effect of the present law is to send our trade over to American ports. I placed the notice on the paper in order to bring this matter forward, because we are feeling the difficulty now, and we shall continue to feel it, and our vessels will sail from United States ports if we continue the regulations with regard to examinations and certificates. The insurance companies understand this, too. They do not require any heavier premium upon the cargoes of vessels commanded by uncertificated masters and mates than if they were certificated officers, and, of course, the shipowners are careful that they obtain proper men for the positions. It is found, by experience, that these men born, as it were, on the sea, although they may not possess the knowledge in a scientific sense required, are, in a practical sense, just as efficient, and the vessel is just as safe in their hands as in the hands of certificated officers. It must be remembered that our coasting trade is in direct competition with that of the United States. We cannot take a cargo on board a vessel and call with it at different ports in the United States, and subsequently sail to South America, and, therefore, this Parliament must be very particular in seeing that we have no heavier liabilities placed upon our masters and mates, and our vessels loading for foreign ports, than are imposed

in the United States, or the Americans will beat us all the time.

**Mr. LOVITT.** There is a good deal of force in what has been stated by the hon. gentleman, that vessels are sometimes skilfully sailed by men who have not certificates. What I contend is that if we have an Act on the Statute-book declaring a master sailing across the Atlantic shall have a certificate, a master should also have a certificate if he is going to sail round Cape Horn. If you wipe the Act away altogether, it is all right. The contention that it takes more skill to sail a vessel to England than it does round Cape Horn, is absurd. In order to make this Act work, there must be some rule established, and if a man can take a vessel round Cape Horn, why cannot he take it round the Cape of Good Hope or to Australia?

**Mr. WELSH.** The Minister of Marine must be satisfied that an injustice will be done to those captains and mates who have passed examinations and obtained certificates, according to the law of this country. The hon. gentleman is now going to injure them by allowing any Tom, Dick and Harry to take command of vessels out of their hands.

**Mr. TUPPER.** You do not call men who command our coasting vessels in the Lower Provinces an inferior class of men?

**Mr. WELSH.** I know that masters and mates have to obtain certificates before vessels are allowed to sail. I have had many instances of hardship in that regard. I have had five or six vessels ready to go to England, and could not sail them until I produced certificates of certificated masters and mates. Here it is proposed that a vessel going to the West Indies, round Cape Horn, or to Brazil, shall be allowed to sail without certificated officers. That is not fair. I should prefer that the Government withdraw the Examination Act altogether than make this change. I repeat that it is not fair to those who have spent much time in studying in order to pass examinations and obtain certificates, that men should take their places who have not obtained those certificates. The examination of masters and mates, last year, cost \$5,000, and I fail to see any reason for expending this money if the proposed change is to be carried out. Most of our trade is now with the West Indies and South America, and it would be better if the Government were to repeal the whole Act and do away with certificates altogether.

**Mr. LOVITT.** Let the matter stand as it is. It seems perfectly absurd that a master should require a certificate to go to England, and should not require one to go round Cape Horn. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), with respect to masters, I can guarantee to supply him with all the masters he requires, and they will have certificates—in fact, I can supply two for every one that is wanted.

**Mr. BAIRD.** I fully concur in the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner). It must be borne in mind, that on the American coast, there is engaged over 6,000,000 of tonnage in their own home trade, and that the large coasting fleet is manned and commanded by a set of men who are under no such restrictions and regulations as are imposed on Canadian masters and mates. A large trade has lately opened up in the southern waters, particularly on the east coast of South America, and it is found that when Canadian vessels visit the port of St. John, although her master may be duly qualified to do a coasting business, and is every way fitted for his position, except that he does not hold a certificate, it is necessary that both he and the mate should obtain such certificate before they can have the privilege of sailing vessels from a Canadian port to South America. What is open to him? He visits, say the port of St. John, which is one of a great number of lumber

**Mr. SKINNER.**

shipping ports in the Maritime Provinces. He wants to load his vessel for the West Indies or South America. In order to do this without a certificated captain or mate, the vessel must be taken to an American port and sail therefrom, and vessels are now loaded at Calais, Boston or other ports, for South American ports. Our vessels are thus driven to this extremity of going abroad, and thus evading our law. We find, in some instances, that a vessel is loaded at St. John and is cleared coastwise for some American port, say Portland or Vineyard Haven, and when they reach there they have orders to sail for South America, and they thus get round the law. This requirement in regard to masters and mates passing examinations and obtaining certificates presses very severely on young men who have not received a liberal school education. Most of the masters of vessels in the coasting trade have not had the benefit of a liberal education. These young men, born on the sea, as it were, know no other business, and when they come to manhood it is found impossible for owners of vessels to employ them for lack of the certificate. It is true that a master of a vessel under a hundred tons is not subject to these regulations, and can sail anywhere he likes; but if the master is promoted to a 150-ton ship, or a 200-ton ship, then a certificate is required. At the same time he possesses most valuable practical experience. Such men will sail their vessels in the most dangerous waters from New York to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and pilot them among the currents with head winds and fair winds, and will strike their port of destination with remarkable precision. They often leave New York in a constant and overhanging fog, and land with with accuracy and certainty at the port of St. John, or any other port in the Maritime Provinces that they may be directed to go to. The science of navigation is very largely lost sight of in the coasting business. It is chiefly by soundings and charts that the navigation is done, and very few accidents happen. Our people find it a grievance that they cannot clear their vessels. They say that the Americans, who are in no way superior to them, take their cargoes and sail away, and as a last resort they are compelled to evade the law or to go out of an American port. They say: "We will have to change our colors, we will have to take the oath of allegiance, and then we can get to be masters of American schooners." The young man who works himself up to be a master wants to go further than a certificate enables him, and the American shipowners, knowing the worth of Canadian brain and the value of Canadian muscle, are willing to pay the price for it, and the inducement is held out to young men that if they cannot get a Canadian vessel to go abroad in they will have to get an American vessel. We ask that those restrictions should be removed, and that our young men should not be handicapped in the ocean race they have to run. Give them a fair chance and you will find that they will be all right. It may be said that we may have incompetent men under those rules, but it is not in the order of things that the owner of a vessel will send incompetent men abroad. Shipowners do not carry heavy insurance, and the merchant will not entrust his treasure on the sea if there is an incompetent man at the helm. While a man may not receive such an education as to enable him to pass this examination, yet he is perfectly well able to handle a vessel coastwise from our northern waters clear down to South America. I would urge on the Government to see that our men are not handicapped and that they have a fair chance in the race they have to run.

**Mr. WELSH.** I still maintain my objection to this amendment. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) has represented that the coasting masters of this Dominion are men of experience, thereby inferring that the certified masters are only masters in theory. He should know better than that, because every certified master in this

Dominion has to serve so many years on board ship as an apprentice before the mast. He has to produce a certificate of servitude for so many years before he can go before the board of examiners; then he has to pass his examination for mate, and, after serving so many years in that capacity, he comes up for an examination as master. I want to know if this is not better evidence of a man's experience, than by taking any man off the street who tells you a cock-and-bull story that he is able to navigate a ship. The law of the Dominion as it stands now was passed for the safety of life and property, and it costs \$5,000 a year to keep that Act on the Statute book.

Mr. TUPPER. Not the Coasting Act.

Mr. WELSH. I do not mean the Coasting Act, I mean the Examining Act. You can hardly call it coasting, if you make a voyage from here, around the Horn, to British Columbia. I think that is just as difficult navigation as any part of the world. I do not think it is just or fair that men who are obliged to have a good education, who have fought their way up and who have all the experience the hon. gentleman refers to, should be put on the same level as others who have not got this education and experience. A qualified master has to go through a technical course to qualify himself for that examination; he has got to go before the board, and perhaps he has to go up two or three times to answer those questions. I wonder if the Minister of Marine has ever seen those questions. Some very nice slips have been put in the papers for the examinations under the Civil Service Act, but you had better look into some of the questions to masters when they go before this board of examiners. If you adopt this amendment you are making fish of one and flesh of another, when you should treat everyone fairly. I am a certified master myself, and I object to any man coming to take my place who has not the same knowledge or experience.

Mr. LOVITT. People sailed ships before this Bill was passed, and they will continue to do so whether it is amended or not. I have no doubt that a great many sail ships, and sail them safely, who have no certificates, but I complain that I am not allowed to choose any master I like for a foreign voyage, but the member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) wants to choose any man he likes on a coasting voyage. I ask the House, is it fair to allow a vessel to go by Cape Horn to British Columbia without a certificate, when, if a man wants to go across the Atlantic, he has to show a certificate?

Mr. TUPPER. That question has been asked by the hon. gentleman before. It seems to me that if that privilege had borne so unfairly on shipping interests, that the hon. gentleman would have been asked years ago by some one interested in the trade, to repeal the present law. I do not think that it is advisable for us on this occasion to discuss the wisdom of an Act which has been on the Statute-book for some time. I am not proposing legislation in the direction that the hon. gentleman suggested. He has had opportunities for some years of testing the opinion of this House on the repeal of the Act. It is difficult to make uniform these coasting laws, but there has to be a line drawn somewhere. In the United States they believe that the captains engaged in the coasting trade are smart enough and intelligent enough, and that the owners of the vessels are smart enough and intelligent enough too, to judge and choose men worthy enough and competent enough to conduct their vessels from port to port in the coasting trade. That is so in every country, and Captain Scott, the head of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, and a man of great experience, has pointed out that our law was entirely too strict. I propose to amend that law, and in amending it I have been able to show the House that we have not as mild regulations in regard to our coasting trade as exist

even in Great Britain. The British Parliament which first discussed this subject were most careful about protecting the lives of passengers, and they defined their boats as home-trade passenger ships and foreign-going ships, but, to encourage the coasting trade, they did not interfere with that trade by the regulations which they made to this extent, nor to the extent which we did some years ago. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) knows the correctness of the assertion that I made in connection with the coasting business generally. Those men who are technically unable to pass a high class examination have that shrewdness and practical experience which makes them so valuable to the merchant who owns a coasting ship. The hon. gentleman knows that this has been done, and done even in Lunenburg; they have sent to Halifax, obtained a certificated master having a high class certificate, and have put on a man who has practical knowledge and experience of the coast, and the moment the ship is out of port, the practical man has taken charge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What conclusion do you draw from that?

Mr. TUPPER. I draw from that the conclusion that there is no danger in trusting the nautical ability and knowledge of our shrewd Maritime Province men to the same extent that Americans trust their shrewd maritime men, and I do not think any of the dangers the hon. gentleman has pointed out need be feared in this instance, especially as we are keeping within the mark of other countries which have legislated in regard to masters and mates.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine—although it is not in the Bill, it is germane to the subject—whether he has thought over the question spoken of the other night, of the shipping of American seamen?

Mr. TUPPER. That is rather foreign to the Bill; but I have no hesitation in saying that at present it is not in contemplation to amend the law relating to the shipping of seamen. The trouble that arose in regard to the shipping of seamen at St. John was in connection with a claim the American consul there made that American sailors should be shipped in his office, and by him, regardless of the provisions which require the shipping of seamen to be made by the master of the port. It was ascertained that the law requires a consent of the American consul at the port before there can be a prosecution, and the matter stands pretty much in that position. It has not yet been considered whether it is advisable to repeal the Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). May it not lead to some trouble in the United States in the shipping of our seamen?

Mr. TUPPER. We have heard of no trouble.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have heard that it would create great difficulty in the United States if the same rule were in force there with regard to seamen on British vessels.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the danger, of course.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. member think, in view of the conversation this afternoon, that it is desirable to amend the Bill and include South America in it?

Mr. TUPPER. I intend to press the Bill as it stands, and I am glad to find it approved of by hon. gentlemen of experience on the opposite side of the House.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THE WINDING-UP ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 98) to amend the Winding-up Act, chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. Minister explain the Bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Winding-up Act, of which this is an amendment, contains provisions for winding up a company which is insolvent, at the instance of the creditors, but there is no provision by which a company which is not insolvent can be wound up, although it may have lost a large portion of its capital and may desire to be wound up, and although for various reasons it may be desirable that its business should be closed. This Bill provides for the winding up of any company whose circumstances render it desirable that it should be wound up, by the same court which winds up insolvent companies.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. Minister of Justice, I think, will see that the existing Winding-up Act applies to companies which are incorporated by Acts of the Provinces since Confederation. There are certain new provisions which he includes in section 4 of this Act, and I do not see why he should not make those provisions apply to those companies which come under the Winding-up Act at present, as they certainly will not apply to those companies incorporated by the Provinces unless the language of this Act is changed. I do not know whether the Minister has any particular reason why the provisions of section 4 should not apply to the companies incorporated by the different Provinces which may be wound up under the present Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The theory is, we have no jurisdiction in regard to those companies unless they fall into a state of insolvency, and the provisions of the Winding-up Act for winding up such companies are insolvency provisions. If the companies are not insolvent, we have no jurisdiction.

Mr. EDGAR. Trading corporations are every day incorporated by letters patent in the Provinces, and they are very often wound up under the Dominion Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that Ontario, for example, has a Winding-up Act providing machinery for winding up companies incorporated by itself.

Mr. EDGAR. Ontario has, but Quebec has not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nova Scotia has, and Quebec can have one if she pleases. I do not see how we can pass an Act for the winding up of a company incorporated by Provincial Legislatures, unless we can get jurisdiction over it as an insolvent company.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that a corporation, the subject-matter of which we have jurisdiction over, may be, when its charter expires, wound up by order of the court at the instance of any of the shareholders?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Whether a majority or not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That would be very awkward. There are several banking corporations in Prince Edward Island which were incorporated by the Province. Their charters will expire in the years 1890 and 1891, and it is the intention of the incorporators to apply to this Parliament for a new charter under the Banking Act. It is, therefore, possible that a single shareholder might wind up the whole institution once the charter has expired.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A single shareholder could not prevent the application to Parliament to renew the charter, and the charter could be renewed easily before the time in which winding-up proceedings could be taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

On sub-section *b*,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do you require a simple majority of the shareholders, or a majority in value?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would let that stand over.

Mr. EDGAR. Sub-section *e* appears to be taken from the English Act, and that clause has been taken to mean that these cases are only those mentioned in the previous part of the section.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think sub-section *b* makes it safe enough, because the way in which the owners are to vote is prescribed by the charter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, it would be possible for a minority in number and in amount, constituting a majority at the meeting, to wind the company up?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Quite so.

On section 5,

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot see any reason why the application should not be made in some cases by creditors. Here it is limited to the company or a shareholder.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the company is insolvent, the creditor has the right under the present law. This Act is intended to provide that, when the company is solvent, that can be done by the company or by a shareholder. I do not see why we should give a creditor the right to wind up a solvent company.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. We have cases where the head office is not in Canada at all, and this section should be amended to provide for such a case.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to that.

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. That seems to be a very strong provision. I do not know whether there is any reason for it. It is giving very unusual power to the judges, who may not only act at discretion, but dispense with all notices.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Under the present Act a notice has to be given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At a very large expense.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that section is a great improvement on the present law, which had a notorious case of winding up under this Act, recently, in Toronto, in which the liquidators had to make special application to the court, and there were about fifty counsel, sometimes, who were moving without any responsibility.

On section 15,

Mr. EDGAR. That merely enables the liquidator of his own motion to make objection to a claim, whereas one of the creditors could do so before.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. At present the creditor, contributor, shareholder, or member, may object.

On section 16,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The section this is to amend, has given rise to a good deal of litigation.

On section 20,

Mr. EDGAR. I know that the Master in Ontario believes that he is exercising a purely voluntary part of his duty when he accepts anything under this Dominion Act. He thinks that his time and services are engaged by the Provincial Government, and as he is paid by the Provincial Government he assumes that he should give his whole time to the duties of the provincial court. I know that he has a strong conviction that having been, as he happened to be within the last year, engaged for the greater part of his

time in carrying out the provisions of the Dominion statutes, that he has been doing it merely as a matter of course to the Dominion Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would be sorry to remove that impression from his mind. As long as he has the idea that he is doing this as a matter of grace and a matter of patriotism, he can at least hope for his reward in the next world.

Mr. EDGAR. Probably something in this world might come too.

Committee rose and reported.

#### CULLERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Committee on Resolutions (p. 469) to assimilate and amend the laws in force in relation to the inspection, culling and measuring of timber.—(Mr. Costigan.)

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister has not, so far as I am aware, explained the objects of these resolutions.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object of this Bill is to meet what I believe to be the general feeling of the House, with regard to the great cost of administering the Cullers' Act passed many years ago. On every occasion when I have had the honor of discussing the Estimates, in regard to the culling of timber, the attention of the House has been called to the large deficits in the receipts as against the expenditure. Of course, those hon. gentlemen who have taken an interest in that Act, know that it was passed many years ago to deal with a condition of trade which does not at present exist. At that time the whole timber trade of this country, affected by the Act, consisted in getting out square timber and exporting it to the old country. Since that time the proportion of square timber to other lumber exported from the country has become very much reduced, and it has been felt that the Act required very important changes. At the very time I took charge of the department, my attention was called to the imperfections in the Act as it stood, and gentlemen interested in the lumber trade made representations, from time to time, as to the changes which ought to be made. Of course, this particular branch of the service differs from any other. It is under the control of the Dominion Government, so far as the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are concerned, for the reason, I presume, that at Confederation, this Act was found in operation, and it was simply continued in those Provinces, while the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had a system of culling and measurement which they have continued to enforce up to the present time. The first object in endeavoring to obtain a thorough change with regard to the inspection of lumber, was to try to get the consent and co-operation of those Provinces which did not come under the Cullers' Act. With that end in view, I got Mr. Patton, the chief supervisor at Quebec, to visit the Lower Provinces, in order to ascertain if an arrangement could be made for amending the law so as to make it uniform in all the Provinces, and thus reduce the expense. His report left upon me the impression that the gentlemen whom he met, and to whom he broached this subject, were afraid that the proposition would be an encroachment on provincial rights, and therefore did not entertain it favorably. The law continued to be administered as it always has been; but last Session I think it was expected by the House that some change should be made. During the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, a reduction was found necessary in the staff of officers, which had grown beyond the requirements of the service; and fur-

ther reductions were made a couple of years ago, yet the expenses continued to be out of all proportion to the receipts. Therefore, the commissioner has spent a great deal of time in preparing this Bill, with the aid of such advice as he could get from the Department of Justice, and after consulting with gentlemen of experience in the lumber trade. It is proposed that the Bill shall have the character of a general inspection Act, and the carrying of it into operation will be optional. That is, the Bill will provide a means for culling and measuring timber and lumber of all kinds throughout Canada, but it will only come in operation in any of the Provinces by proclamation. It is very likely that it will immediately go into operation in Quebec and Ontario, where there is no other law to replace it; but other Provinces will have to be consulted, with the view of making it acceptable, and arranging the details, before it can be brought into operation in them. With regard to the powers taken by the Government under this Bill, I thought it would be more acceptable, and more in the public interest, if such powers were those necessary for the administration of the law. This Bill proposes, for instance, that the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario will each form a district; and I think the Maritime Provinces together, are to form one district. In each district there will be a chief inspector, and what are termed inspectors will replace the officials we now call cullers and measurers. There will also be a board of examiners for each district. The salaries of the different chief inspectors and the boards of examiners are the only salaries to be provided for by Parliament. The payment of the inspectors will be by fees, provided for under regulations to be made. The board of examiners for each district are to frame the regulations with regard to measurements and with regard to fees, subject, of course, to the approval of the Governor in Council. That, I believe, will be an acceptable feature of the Bill, because the board of examiners, with the chief inspector, will have an opportunity of consulting the whole trade within the district, and getting such information as will enable them to frame regulations in accordance with the requirements of the service, as well as to recommend a scale of fees that will be just and fair.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you intend to abolish the office of supervisor of cullers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, the whole office and staff at Quebec is abolished. We abolish the whole system, and it will be replaced by the one proposed by this Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What additional expense will there be?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This will only be brought into operation in the two Provinces immediately. But supposing it were brought into operation at once all over the Dominion, the whole cost the Dominion Parliament would have to provide for would be \$11,600 against the fees to be paid, but supposing you got no fees, all you would have to pay would be \$11,600, which would be a great saving on the amount we now have to pay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much do we pay now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Last year the Estimates showed about \$40,000 of expenses, and the revenue does not exceed \$15,000.

Mr. LAURIER. The total expenditure was \$57,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, one portion will always remain a charge on the country, and that is the amount due to officers retired. But take the amount of pay of the cullers each year, it is over \$20,000. Then there are the salaries of the permanent officers in Quebec, Montreal and Three Rivers, which will amount to \$15,000 or \$16,000.



Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman expects to make a saving?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly. This is principally to meet the serious objection made by Parliament on the unsatisfactory condition of the Act. We were spending \$40,000, without speaking of the men whom we had retired.

Mr. EDGAR. Provision is made for retiring a lot more?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman knows that, in dealing with a question like this, some provision has to be made in order that, while looking after the public interest, we do not sacrifice the interests of men whose services, through no fault of theirs, are being dispensed with. Under the provisions of this Bill, the men who will do the work formerly done by cutlers will be the inspectors. I propose, as far as I can, to get the work done under the new Act by the old officers. All who can be utilised will be utilised to discharge the new duties under the new Act, and some provision will have to be made for the retirement of those who cannot be utilised.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to propose to deal with the inspection of timber in somewhat the same manner as the inspection of leather and flour is dealt with? Will there be a board of examiners whose duty it will be to appoint inspectors of timber, as at present there is in Montreal a board of examiners to appoint inspectors of flour and leather, and will the inspection of timber take place in the same manner?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the same principle.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand also that the hon. gentleman will dispense with the whole office in Quebec, which includes the supervisor of cutlers, the deputy supervisor, the cashier and several clerks.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. But that they will be retained under the new Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The whole office will be replaced by this law, and this law does not provide for the continuance of the supervisor of cutlers or of his office. It will have the effect of wiping out all the existing officers under the old Cutlers' Act. Provision is made to utilise the services of every man now in the service whose services may be required. If it be found that a certain number cannot be utilised, then the Bill provides that, so far as these officers are concerned, the fees collected in the districts of Quebec and Ontario will be kept separately in order that any portion of the moneys that may be taken out of the fees shall be taken from these two Provinces to meet the charges that properly belong to them—that is, the superannuation of these officers. They do not come under the Superannuation Act, but there is a special provision for their superannuation.

Mr. GILLMOR. I understand that this system at Confederation was taken under Dominion management rather than the local, and that changes are now necessary from the altered condition of the lumber business. Is it proposed to extend this system over New Brunswick? I would like to know if those engaged in the lumber business in New Brunswick, have expressed any wish to have the system extended to that Province? I have been surprised that the Dominion Government should manage this matter at all—these slides and dams, and the regulating of the surveys of lumber. There is a system established in New Brunswick which provides for the inspection of lumber, under which certain authorities appoint certain persons as surveyors, from year to year, to survey cargoes of lumber. It involves no expense to the Province at all, because the costs all come out

Mr. COSTIGAN.

of the parties selling and purchasing. Instead now of getting rid of this objectionable feature as regards the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, it is being extended to all the Provinces. It may be an improvement that these commissioners should come down to New Brunswick and look into this matter, but I think it is a matter that ought not to be taken cognisance of by this Parliament at all, so far as New Brunswick is concerned. If the Government can get rid of it in Quebec and Ontario, and throw it into the hands of the local authorities, who know more about it than anybody here, that would be an improvement, and that they should do instead of extending this objectionable arrangement over the whole Dominion. It is like creating another department in the Government. It is no small matter to regulate the appointment of surveyors and cutlers all over the Dominion, and commissioners to travel all over the Dominion. That can be better looked after by the local authorities.

Mr. SKINNER. If the law were extended to New Brunswick, what would be the taxation on our business there?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not understand that the inspection fees are to be compulsory. I understand that the Government propose to appoint inspectors, in addition to the chief inspectors, for whose services a tariff of fees will be fixed, but I do not understand that it will be compulsory on the trade to employ those inspectors unless they choose. If I am wrong, I hope the Minister will correct me. But if they are employed by any person engaged in the trade, a certain tariff of fees will be paid to them. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Inland Revenue whether the classification of different kinds of lumber is to be left to the board of examiners, or recommended by the board to the Government and authorised by them? I have not heard from the Minister that there was any provision to be made for that classification.

Mr. LAURIER. It is provided by statute.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It was provided by statute, but I understand that those Acts are to be repealed, and, if so, there must be a new classification made, and the mode in which that classification is to be made is of great interest to those who are engaged in that trade. I would also like to enquire whether I am right in supposing that the employment of the inspectors is not to be compulsory but optional?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is nothing compulsory about the Act. It provides the machinery for this service, but it is not intended to force it upon any one, even upon my own Province about which my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) seems to be so uneasy. The Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia already have laws for the inspection of timber, either manufactured or raw, but here this has been carried out for many years under an Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says it is easy to wipe that provision out, but something must remain in its stead. So far as the classification and the inspection are concerned, the whole Bill is framed in order to guard the interests of the producer, the manufacturer and the exporter of lumber.

Mr. LAURIER. What about the classification of timber?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The moment a district comes under this Act, a board of examiners and a chief inspector are appointed, and it is their duty to get the information required. The most difficult point in the past in regard to the classification has been to get that information, but that board will make the classification, which will simply be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not think any necessity has been shown for this Act, and we should have further

information upon it before it is passed. It is clearly intended, if it passes, to put a number of people on the permanent staff, and we know what that means when once they are there.

Committee rose.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No 66) to ratify an exchange of land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No 82) to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No 58) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No 75) respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

#### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No 99) to incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Riopel.)

Bill (No 107) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

#### CULLERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on resolution.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COOK. I did not hear the full explanation made by the Minister of Inland Revenue in regard to the resolutions which are now before the Committee, but I entered the House when his explanation was partially made, and I understood him to say that the resolutions were not compulsory, that they were so framed that any lumbermen who did not wish to avail himself of the opportunity of putting money into the pockets of the Government without obtaining any adequate return, would have the privilege of not doing so. I should like to ask the Minister how he proposes to pay the inspectors, for the inspectors will have to be paid pretty large salaries and their expenses in travelling from mill to mill, which is the most expensive way of travelling in those parts of the country where there is not railway facilities. They will have to make inspection of the lumber at the mills, and then they will have to leave their payment to the Minister's mercy. After reading the resolution, I entirely disagree with the proposition laid down by the Minister of Inland Revenue. The wording of the resolution is distinct. It says that every manufacturer of lumber "shall" pay—the word "may" is not used—to the Crown an annual registration fee of \$2, if his annual output is less than 1,000,000 feet, and \$10 when the output is greater than that quantity; and in addition one-fifth of one per cent. per thousand feet, board measure. That means one cent for every 5,000 manufactured, or \$2 for every million. If a man manufactured 20 millions at his mill, which many of the mills at Ottawa and other places do, he will be compelled to pay \$50. I do not believe there are many lumbermen that would pay that amount voluntarily. I think the Minister misconceives his own resolution. The result of this resolution, if carried out will be to repeal the old Act, to abolish the office at Quebec, and to superannuate every officer there; new officers will be appointed, or the same

officers, with a superannuation fee, as has been very frequently done by the present Government. I do not think there is any necessity for the Bill. I do not understand that the Minister proposes to introduce a Bill such as once prevailed in the State of Michigan, by which the Government regulated the grades of lumber so as to have an equal inspection throughout the whole of the State. If he had undertaken such a thing, there might be some reason for a proposition of this kind; but I can see no reason and no object why the hon. gentleman should wish to have the office at Quebec abolished and levy a tax on the lumbermen at large, a direct tax. It is only a short time ago when the charge was hurled across the floor, to hon. members on this side of the House, that we wanted to impose direct taxation on the people. Could you have more direct taxation than this? What do you call direct taxation? Hon. gentlemen opposite have hurled epithets at hon. members on this side of the House with this idea—it was all in their own imaginations—that we were adopting some means by which to place direct taxation on the people. Is this the thin edge of the wedge which hon. gentlemen opposite are contemplating with regard to the question of direct taxation? It looks very much like it. They have squandered the revenues of the country and are looking round to see where they can raise more money with which to carry on the Government, and they now swoop down on the poor lumberman. Lumbermen have as much as they can do to take care of themselves without paying tribute to the present Government. I hope the hon. gentleman will abandon the resolution, it is certainly not a popular measure, and I would not wish the hon. gentleman to pass a measure that would not meet with the approbation of the lumbermen at large. I am satisfied that the lumbermen at large do not favor it; I do not know what lumbermen or other gentlemen the hon. gentleman opposite consulted; but I asked some questions when entering upon my legislative duties at the commencement of the Session.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says "lumbermen or gentlemen." I believe the two terms are synonymous.

Mr. COOK. In conversation with some gentlemen engaged in the lumber trade at the commencement of the Session, I was about to state, when I was interrupted by that Shanghai from the North-West.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. COOK. In conversation with some lumbermen and other gentlemen who are members of this House, and supporters of the Government, I could get no information further than that the Bill was not to be compulsory, that the office at Quebec would be abolished, but they did not say that the Government proposed to appoint inspectors. I should like to know from the Minister of Inland Revenue how he now proposes the inspectors shall perform their duties? Are they to travel from mill to mill to obtain the desired information? Are the lumber merchants to make returns to the Government, and if they are, on what condition—is it to be voluntary on their part or compulsory? I should like to know from the hon. gentleman whether, if the returns be compulsory, they will be made under oath? and I should like to know, further, and above all, whether his measure is within the jurisdiction of this House? I would like to know if he does not consider that it is a question entirely for the Provinces? It is all very well for the Government of the Dominion to have their office at Quebec, because they were administering both the Quebec and the Ontario side. The institution there was established before Confederation, and even if it was a provincial institution no one objected to it. If we all this time have been doing an illegal act, it is no reason why we should

perpetuate that illegal act. We know that the Crown Timber Office in the city of Quebec, is somewhat under the control of the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, as well as under the Dominion of Canada, for they all share the responsibilities and pay their portion of the expenses. These are matters of very great concern, and matters which the Minister should very cautiously guard. I am afraid he has not consulted the lumbermen of this House, or of this district, because, if he did, I am sure that the lumbermen, as a rule, would not give their consent to have more taxes put on them at the present time. God knows they are taxed enough now. Everything used by the manufacturer of lumber is taxed, the saws are taxed, the axes are taxed, the flour is taxed, and the necessaries required from the grocery are taxed. I may state that Mr. A. H. Campbell, who is a very strong supporter of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they inaugurated the National Policy, stated that the lumbermen would be taxed to the extent of a dollar and a quarter a thousand by this policy, but the Government are not satisfied with that and they now want to put direct taxation on the lumber. It is a question, to my mind, if the matter will stop here. It is a question, to my mind, if the Government will not in a short time, probably after another election, tax wheat and the produce that the farmers grow. I would like to have an explanation from the hon. Minister in reference to the questions I have asked him.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will endeavor, as far as I can, to give answers to the questions of the hon. gentleman. In the first place I may say that he has covered a good deal of ground in his observations, and he has criticised my observations very extensively. He says that he differs entirely with me when I discuss the point as to whether the proposed Inspection Act, which is to follow this resolution, is compulsory in its character or not. I stated to the House that the inspection under the proposed Act would not be compulsory, and that is the principle that has been adopted in regard to other matters under the General Inspection Act. The saw mill men will be called upon to make a return of the season's produce.

Mr. COOK. Will that be under oath?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will be by declaration, and these returns will form very useful statistics for the country. As regards the constitutional question: Whether this House has a right to deal with the subject or not, I took the only means at my disposal to ascertain that fact, and it has been decided by the Minister of Justice, that it is entirely in our power to legislate on that matter; but I am not going to the full scope of the powers of this Parliament to introduce a measure to take effect at once, and to say to the people of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia: "We will pass this law, and we will force it on you whether you like it or not." The proposed law is entirely voluntary.

Mr. COOK. Is it voluntary for every individual lumberman?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; that is the principle we follow with regard to fish inspection and other matters, that no man should be compelled to pay the inspection fee, unless that fee produced an equivalent in value. If he thinks the inspection is good, and will enhance the value of his property, then it is to his interest to pay the fee, but he is not compelled to submit to it unless he believes it is to his interest to do so.

Mr. COOK. Do you intend to inspect in grades?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; but the grades will be fixed on representations made by the board of examiners, who will be selected from experienced men in the trade and whose ideas will be acted upon. We do not take power to fix

Mr. Cook.

those grades, but we want to leave it in the hands of men who have experience.

Mr. COOK. If they do not take advantage of it, how are you going to pay the inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not pay the inspectors at all; we do not pay the leather inspectors now or any other inspectors under the General Inspection Act. If they are not employed they get no fee, and it is not proposed that the country should provide a salary. In the old times, when the Bill was first introduced, those cullers were all paid fees, and, if my memory serves me aright, there were no salaries. After a while times got dull, and by-and-bye the timber was lessening, and those men said they could not continue on the fees. Some of them would not get any employment at all, some of them would get more work than they could attend to, and after a while they were put upon a salary. This Bill does not provide to pay any salary except for one inspector for each whole district, and the examiners are paid a sum not exceeding \$10 a day. The salaries to inspectors and to the board of examiners will be amply met by this inspection fee, and that is what this is for. The other fees that will be levied for the inspection, culling and measurement of timber, are to be fixed after consultation with the trade, with a view to make it just what will cover reasonable fees to the inspectors, which inspectors represent the present cullers.

Mr. COOK. I suppose the meaning of the \$2,000 a year is that if the inspector should make by his fees \$3,000 a year, the difference would go to the Government and he could only claim \$2,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am afraid I have not made myself clear to the hon. gentleman. That salary is for the inspector appointed for the whole district.

Mr. COOK. He gets that anyway.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, that is his salary; but he gets no fees at all.

Mr. COOK. How many districts will there be?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is proposed to make three of the Lower Provinces, if they should come under the operation of the Act, one district, and in the Province of Quebec and Ontario there will be an inspector for each.

Mr. COOK. Do I understand you to say that he will not be paid out of the consolidated fund?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The salaries will be paid, but they will be covered by fees which will meet that expense.

Mr. KIRK. It appears to me that in this matter the Government are taking powers that I think they should not ask the House to give them. I have no doubt so far as I am concerned that the Government or Parliament have the power to pass this law, because I am aware of the fact that the British North American Act gives this Parliament power to raise money by any mode or system of taxation. This is simply another mode of imposing taxes on the people. The hon. Minister says that it is not to be compulsory—that it is not to come into force until the Government declares it to be in force. I think we have too many laws of that kind on the Statute-book already. We have a law which regulates the keeping of sawdust out of the streams in this country, which is to come into force when the Government thinks proper. It has been decided by the Government, I understand, to bring that law into force, and it is understood in some parts of the country that it is in force, and again that it is not in force. It is held over the heads of the people, so that they are kept in terror, and very likely it will continue to be held over their heads for the purposes of the Government in election times, and very likely this law will be used in just the same way. I am

sorry I was not in my seat when the hon. Minister made his explanation of this resolution; but, if I understand it, it is to apply to all the Provinces. Now, this Government has never had control of the culling of timber or the surveying of lumber in the Maritime Provinces, especially in Nova Scotia. That has been a matter entirely in the hands of the local authorities, and, so far as I know, no complaint or inconvenience has resulted from that arrangement; and why the Minister thinks it necessary for this Government to take charge of that business now I do not know. I think he ought to be able to give good reasons why he asks this Parliament to give the Government that power. Now, if I understand this resolution, it means that every manufacturer of timber or lumber shall pay an annual registration fee of \$2, besides a certain fee for all the lumber and timber he manufactures. I understand that it will affect not only large lumber dealers, but small ones as well. In Nova Scotia, at least, there are a large number of farmers who go into the woods in the winter season to manufacture square timber for sale, and according to this Bill, before they manufacture 100 tons of timber, they must first pay a registration fee of \$2 to this Government, besides which they must pay one-tenth of one cent for every ton of timber they make. This is something new under the sun, so far as the people of Nova Scotia are concerned, and something which I believe they will resent. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), has spoken of the heavy taxes the lumbermen have to pay at present; he said what is quite true, that the National Policy has placed heavy duties on articles which they consume, and I think it is hardly proper for the Government to place more taxes upon them. I do not like the idea of putting a law on the Statute-book, and giving the Government power to bring it into force or not, as they please. If we are to have a law, let us have it; but do not leave it dangling before the eyes of the people. As I believe this law will be burdensome, I will oppose it.

Mr. IVES. I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue whether it is his intention to make this inspection apply to logs as well as to sawn lumber and hewn timber, and whether he proposes that these inspectors may be called upon, in case of any difference between the lumbermen and the party from whom he is purchasing logs, to survey or measure them—whether the inspectors are to act as a board of arbitration which either party may force the other to accept in case of difference as to the measurement of logs?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, the Act is compulsory on the officers if it is brought into operation. If the inspector is called upon, it will be his duty to make an inspection and classification. In case of dispute, the Bill provides for a reference to the chief inspector. It is prepared with a great deal of care to meet the case the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. IVES. That is not quite the point. The lumberman as a rule has his own scaler, and as a rule there is no difficulty; but occasionally the party who sells the logs thinks he has not received proper measurement, and what I want to know is whether in that case the seller can force the purchaser to submit to a survey and measurement by the Government culler, and whether the buyer or the seller would have to pay the culler, or whether the fee is divided?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understand that if an operator sells his lumber without professing to sell it under the measurement provided by this law, it is a question of mutual agreement between the buyer and the seller, and the Government officer has nothing to say in the matter at all. That is in keeping with the fact that the Act is not compulsory.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The objection I see to the Bill is, that it is going to saddle four permanent officers on the country at a salary of \$2,000 a year each.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We know what the result will be. There is no doubt that it has been considered in all its effects, and that the Government have already some people in their eye, who will fill these positions very well.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is not the slightest foundation for that statement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We know from our experience in this House, that these appointments will be made before many months elapse. Then, I do not understand how this law will work in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman says there will be one inspector for the three Maritime Provinces. Well, suppose Nova Scotia accepted the law, while New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island did not, then I suppose the Government would appoint an inspector. I do not know by what machinery it is to be accepted by the Provinces. Who is to be the judge that they require it? Can the hon. gentleman inform me how he is going to come to a conclusion that they require this Act in the Province of Nova Scotia? Will it be on the representation of one lumber concern, or two, or half a dozen, when there may be just as many opposed to it? I do not see how the hon. gentleman is going to arrive at any conclusion as to the necessity of appointing an inspector in that one Province. That would be the chief difficulty; and when he had the inspector appointed, I do not understand whether those who are not satisfied to come under the operation of the Act would be bound, the moment the inspector was appointed, to come under his control. That would take from them all freedom of action in the matter. Our present arrangement is very satisfactory, and before such a hard and fast Act as this is placed on the Statutes, the hon. gentleman should have been able to show the House that representations have been made to the Government as to the necessity of this action. In Nova Scotia the measurers of lumber are appointed by the county councils. They are sworn, and are employed and paid by the mill owners. They have no other salary, their action is always approved of between the merchant and the lumberman, and in that way there is no friction or difficulty whatever; but if we are to have a Dominion officer coming down there and telling the lumberman to stand to one side, that he is to be the judge, there will be difficulty. The hon. gentleman should show on what representations he proposes to bring the Act in force and whether it is to be binding on the majority, because the minority may ask for the operation of the Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman cannot have heard my statement before. Supposing that New Brunswick unanimously asked for this Act to be put in operation there, it would not be compulsory on a single individual so far as measuring, culling, or classification is concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the rules made by the boards of examiners in the respective districts be uniform throughout the Dominion, or will rules be made applicable to each district?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is one of the objects of the Bill. I think it would be impossible to frame any classification of lumber for the Dominion that would apply to the different localities throughout the country, and it is intended that the chief inspector and the board of examiners for the district in which they are acting shall recommend the classification best calculated to serve the interests of that particular district. The hon. gentleman will agree with me, that the actual classifications in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec differ widely. The more satisfactory way of dealing with the question is to have a classification framed for the particular district to which it applies.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would Ontario be included in one district?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Ontario would be one and Quebec another.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). There seems to be on the other side of the House a good deal of difference of opinion with regard to this matter. Speaking from the standpoint of one who has a knowledge of the workings of the Quebec office, which more especially affects the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, I may say that no serious objection, as far as the square timber men are concerned, is had to the operations of that office. The working of the office has been tolerably satisfactory to everybody engaged in the square timber trade, both manufacturers and purchasers; but I have heard for some years past, and notably last year from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the complaint that in the carrying out of the operations of the Quebec office, the consolidated revenue was drawn upon, and the people outside the trade altogether taxed to the extent of \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year for the purpose of keeping up that office. I understand the introduction of this resolution, and the Bill to be based upon it, is to get over the objection that other persons than those engaged in the lumber trade are called upon to contribute towards the expenses of an office so directly in the interest of that trade. In carrying out that object, the Minister of Inland Revenue has deemed it expedient, from the information I presume he has obtained from other Provinces, to place a uniform law upon our statutes applicable to the whole Dominion; and, as he has stated, it is proposed, not that the whole Dominion should be one district, but that separate districts should be established in the separate Provinces, and that a chief inspector should be established for each of those districts. As I understand from the explanation of the hon. the Minister, there will not be at the utmost more than six chief inspectors appointed altogether. That will involve an expenditure of say \$12,000 in addition to what may be paid to the board of examiners in the different districts. That will, at all events, be a saving to the country, even assuming that the payment to those inspectors should be taken out of the consolidated revenue altogether. There will no doubt be made the objection which has been made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) to the proposal that a registration fee shall be charged, and a fee on the output of the lumber, but, as I understand the hon. the Minister, that fee is necessary for the purpose of providing machinery which, whether it be used extensively or not, will be in the interests of the lumberman, because it will be competent for any person selling or purchasing lumber to say: If your inspection is not what we conceive it ought to be, we will agree to leave the matter to the inspection of one of the Government inspectors; so that while this tax may appear to be somewhat onerous and to bear somewhat heavily upon the lumber trade, the corresponding advantages that will be obtained by having some authoritative tribunal to whom disputes will be referred will be a sufficient advantage to counterbalance the charges that are proposed. But it seems to me that this proposal is not entirely equitable in its terms. I find it is provided that a registration fee of \$2 shall be charged each manufacturer, and, in addition to that, it is proposed that if the annual output of the mill is less than 1,000,000 feet board measure, there will be a charge of \$2 and an annual registration fee of \$2 charged for where the output is less than 1,000,000 feet. And if you go beyond 1,000,000 feet the registration fee will be \$10. It seems to me that there ought to be a gradation of the registration fee. The charge up to 1,000,000 feet should be \$2; then, if the production is 5,000,000 feet, it should be \$4; 10,000,000 feet, \$6; 20,000,000 feet, \$8, and over 20,000,000 feet, \$10. It seems to me that that gradation of the registration fee would be more acceptable and less objectionable than to make an absolute charge of \$2 on all

Mr. COSTIGAN.

outputs of less than 1,000,000 feet, and of \$10 on all over that amount. It has been objected that, where a mill produces 20,000,000 feet of lumber, there would be a charge, under this resolution, amounting to \$50. That is quite true, but that is not an excessive charge for the advantages which would be conferred.

Mr. KIRK. What advantage would be conferred?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have endeavoured to point out, that where disputes occur, there would be a governmental authority, or, at all events, a tribunal clothed with all the authority the Government can give it, to which these disputes will be referred.

Mr. KIRK. Does the hon. gentleman suppose it is necessary to have salaried officers at \$2,000 a year each, to decide differences which may possibly arise between lumber dealers and their scalars?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend will see that, under the present system, the people are called upon to pay \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year, and that has been objected to. Under this system which is proposed, even if you did tax the people, there would be a saving of a considerable amount of money; but as I understand the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue, it is that, whilst it is proposed to have these inspectors, no one will deny that it is desirable, if we have a number of licensed inspectors, to have some authority over them, someone who will be responsible to the Government for those licensed inspectors.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask, simply for information, does the hon. gentleman believe that there should be compulsory inspection?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). No; I do not hold that there should be compulsory inspection.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, if there is to be no compulsory inspection, if it is to be purely voluntary, what reason can there be to appoint an inspector at such a heavy salary, or at any salary at all?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I was just coming to that. There may be cases where inspectors holding annual licenses and authorised and required to inspect when called upon, might be guilty of some malfeasance of office, then they might do something which should deprive them of their licenses, and it seems to me that there ought to be some head to those officers who may be able to report to the Government the reasons which would justify them in taking away the licenses which enable these men to collect fees. That is one reason as it seems to me—and there may be other reasons—why the lumber trade might be fairly called upon to pay the salaries of the inspectors as proposed by this resolution, so that some supervision may be had over the men who are to be authorised to collect fees, provided they are employed. I do not believe there should be any compulsory inspection, and I understand that the Government do not propose compulsory inspection.

Mr. IVES. I would suggest to the Minister of Inland Revenue that, as this Bill is intended to provide certain facilities for the classification of pine lumber, it should be confined to pine, and that the fee should not be exacted from every manufacturer of lumber. Everyone who knows anything about the working of the lumbering business in the country, particularly in the Province of Quebec, knows that a statute based on the general terms of this resolution, would bear very hardly on a large number of farmers and others who make a small amount of lumber every winter. I cannot suppose that it is intended to apply this Bill to a farmer who makes 50,000 or 100,000 feet of logs for the mill, or to a man who makes 2,000 or 3,000 railway ties, but the wording of the resolution is broad enough to cover every case of

that kind, and that would involve great hardship to many of the people. I can see no advantage to be gained by this measure except by the manufacturers of pine lumber or pine timber. Everyone who knows anything about spruce knows that the inspection is a foreign inspection and that any inspection here would be useless. If spruce is shipped for the South American market, it has to go by way of New York or Boston, or Portland, and is sold, subject to inspection, at the seaboard. The same thing applies to hemlock, to scantlings and boards, which go subject to inspection when they arrive in New York, subject to classification there, and, if the shipper does not like the classification he gets, the only recourse he has is not to send any more. As I have said, as this inspection is intended to be useful to the manufacturers of pine lumber, I think it should be confined to that, and should not be extended to all lumber. If you sell railway ties to the Grand Trunk, for instance, they will not buy them excepting subject to being culled by their own cullers; so there is no advantage in this measure except to the manufacturers and dealers in pine lumber and pine timber.

Mr. PERLEY. I desire to make a remark or two in reference to what the last speaker (Mr. Ives) has said in regard to spruce lumber as applicable to pine lumber. I have had a long experience, as the House knows, in the sawing of pine lumber in this city, and I must say that, as far as my experience goes, there is no call for an Act of this kind for the culling of pine lumber. For the last 15 or 20 years, we have not required any official inspection of lumber, and have had no reason to call for inspection upon any transaction we have made. Our dealings have been upon the output of our mills, and, between the sawmill and the customers, there has never been, to my knowledge—and I am sure I should know of it if it existed—any question of dissatisfaction or trouble. I know there is not so far as my firm are concerned. I am quite sure every lumber manufacturing firm on the Ottawa will disapprove of an Act of this kind, subjecting them to a registration fee where there is no probability of their ever having occasion to call for inspection. I am perfectly sure of that, and I am sorry to have to oppose the provisions of this resolution. I think it would be an injustice to the lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley, and I consequently feel called upon to express my disapproval of it, because I think there is no occasion at all for a Bill of this kind as respects the business in sawn lumber in the Ottawa Valley. So far as the square timber is concerned I have nothing to say, because I am not very often interested in it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we are entitled to the views of the Minister of Justice and the First Minister upon this subject, because it seems to me that they propose here to put the lumbermen of the country to a certain amount of expense and inconvenience, with no definite object in the world, beyond that of furnishing positions for the parties who may be appointed inspectors. This is said to be a voluntary inspection—on what grounds is it to be upheld? What is the motive for it? Is it a regulation of commerce? The hon. gentlemen do not represent it as such; they represent it to be a means of classifying lumber, and practically to determine disputes that may arise between the vendor and the vendee of this lumber. Well, is not that interfering with the right of contract? If it were compulsory undoubtedly it would be; if it is voluntary it accomplishes no object or end. What is the use of providing for the appointment of an inspector when nobody is obliged to submit to this inspection, and when he decides nothing? You cannot make a law here to say that the parties to a contract shall be compelled to accept the inspection of your officer as final in any matter of dispute that may exist between them. No court in this country would enforce any such obligation if you were to put it in a statute. The par-

ties have a right to make their own contract, and this simple right belongs to them. You have no right to interfere with the provisions of that contract between the vendor and the buyer. If they do not agree they may decide who shall be their referee. I am told by those who are acquainted with the business, that it is in the interest of every lumberman to classify his own lumber, and when he agrees to furnish lumber of a particular class, he causes his own lumber to be inspected in order that what he proposes to give or furnish in fulfilment of his contract, shall be such as the law itself would require him to supply. If the hon. gentleman proposed something within their jurisdiction it would be different. I can understand, under the old practice that existed in the Province of Quebec, why there should be an inspection of square timber, but I do not understand why there should be an inspection of lumber, and with the design as explained by the Minister who has charge of this resolution. I think it is quite clear that no useful end is to be accomplished; the interests of the lumberman are not to be promoted; it will have nothing to do in securing for him a better price for his lumber than he otherwise would obtain. You simply propose to do that which, if you make it compulsory, would be an interference with the right of contract over which you have no jurisdiction at all, and which, if you make it voluntary, as you propose to do, can serve no purpose whatever.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister for information on one point. Suppose that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, this Act should be accepted under some system which the hon. gentleman has not yet explained, and the small lumber people, in the pursuit of their calling, during the winter, wanted to send their teams into the woods to get out a small quantity of logs and have them sawn in local mills, will each one of those parties have to pay \$2? Will every farmer be compelled to take out a license before he can get his logs sawn? Will the hon. gentleman explain that, because I do not quite understand it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have not had an opportunity of considering that point yet, it has not been raised. But if the party be a farmer he is not a manufacturer.

Mr. KIRK. Farmers are manufacturers of timber in my Province, very largely.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, if the hon. gentlemen are taking the view that was taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) it will be very difficult to satisfy them. The Bill is proposed to meet the charges made by different gentlemen outside the House, that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, particularly, a large amount of money is paid out for services for which the people do not get any benefit; and this Bill is to provide a remedy.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In what way?

Mr. COSTIGAN. By abolishing that system, and by providing some simple means of getting the inspection and the measurement done. In the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario the Act is to come into operation at once. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there is an Act which satisfies them very well, and they might continue to use it. The Act is not made for them, but they can avail themselves of it whenever they choose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has yet to consider the point which I raised. I think it is a most important point, as affecting the Lower Provinces particularly. The hon. gentleman says the farmers are not manufacturers; but almost any of these farmers or people living throughout the country during winter, are accustomed to get out logs and to send them down the streams to the local mills to have the lumber cut. My question was whether, under these circumstances, each one of these parties would

have to take out a license under the operation of this Bill, whether it came into force or not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; that is not the intention—I hope it is not. The Bill does not bear that construction. It is not intended to be a tax upon the farmer who gets out small quantities of lumber.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that, after the opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are familiar with the subject, the Minister would do well to limit the operations to lumber. Perhaps if it were confined to lumber it might not be so objectionable; but it is evidently useless so far as regards spruce, and hon. gentlemen opposite have shown plainly that it would be of no advantage as regards pine. Under these circumstances both these classes should be eliminated from the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. The object of the Bill, as stated by the hon. gentleman in charge of it, is to effect economy. The chief office is in Quebec city, and it has been frequently complained that the expenses of that office were altogether out of proportion to the revenues collected there. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has chosen a wrong course to effect the economy desired, because he does not propose to restrict the system, but to extend it all over the Dominion. The fact is, as has been stated more than once on this occasion, the revenue of the office at Quebec has diminished from year to year, and twelve years ago, in 1876, the expenditure had so much exceeded the revenue that it was thought proper to superannuate a certain number of cullers, and pension them at the public expense. Since that time the revenues have continued to decrease. What is the reason of that decrease? It is simply, so far as I understand it, and as it is explained by competent men, that the inspection has been less and less resorted to.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. It is because the quantity of square timber produced has been decreasing.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; the only lumbermen who patronise the office are the square timber producers; and although all other classes of lumber come within the Act, the office is not availed of. So all kinds of lumber are practically removed from the operation of the Act except the square timber. Under such circumstances a better way to effect the economy desired would be to diminish the expenses of the office at Quebec. I find that the expenses of that office last year exceeded \$18,000; and we have there a superintendent of cullers, a deputy superintendent, a cashier and ten clerks and messengers, and \$1,000 is paid for rent and \$2,000 for contingencies. A better plan is not to create a system of inspection all over the other Provinces, because in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia square timber is produced to a very limited extent, and there is no necessity for the existence of the system there, but a better plan would be to curtail the expenses of the office at Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has the correct view of this matter. The falling off in the revenue is from two causes: First, because the square timber trade has diminished very much; and, second, because deals are no longer culled at Quebec. In years past, when the Act now in force was brought into effect, all the deal, manufactured in the country were sent to Quebec by raft and there culled and shipped. To-day, none of the deals manufactured are sent to Quebec in that way. They are all culled at the mills by the cullers of the manufacturers, and the deal cullers at Quebec are of no use whatever to the trade and are not wanted. In my opinion the best way to arrange this matter would be to continue the culling of square timber as at present; it is necessary, for the square timber goes to Quebec and is shipped there just as it was in years gone by. So far as the deal cullers

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

are concerned, they are very old men, it is a very long time ago since any one of them was appointed; most of them are too blind to be able to cull deals, and they should be superannuated and let the whole affair die out. There is no necessity whatever for those inspectors, and they would only prove a nuisance to the trade. I would suggest to the Minister the propriety of withdrawing the resolution, except so far as the square timber culling is concerned; let the square timber culling continue, but so far as regards other inspection it would be perfectly worthless to the trade and we do not want it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Does the hon. gentleman propose to accept the suggestion I made with regard to a sliding scale?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think that is a very fair and reasonable suggestion. I have listened with attention to the objections taken to the Bill, and in my judgment what we have to consider is our present position in the matter. The last hon. gentleman who spoke said that the remedy we should apply was to continue the timber cullers at the Quebec office and retire the deal cullers. I am quite satisfied that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and another hon. gentleman who spoke for Nova Scotia, would not think that a very equitable way of settling the whole difficulty, for that office was simply for the square timber of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Abolish it altogether.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That would not be a very acceptable way to any one. We want to reduce the deficit that has existed in that branch of the service for many years. There may be some other way of getting at it, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to give their suggestions and their ideas to the Committee. In reply to the allegation that this measure will mean nothing but the creation of new offices with the new appointees, I assure the House that it is not intended to make any new appointments, but we would make use of the men now in the service and give them employment, and no new appointments would be made merely for the sake of favoring some particular person. We would take advantage of the measure to utilise some of the men who would otherwise retire, and of course there would be some men who must be retired. With regard to the point that it should not apply to the inspection of lumber, I may say that the present Act applies to all kinds of lumber, including pine, ash, basswood, butternut, red pine and other varieties; and yet it is said that I am going too far because I do not provide that it shall go beyond pine or spruce. I simply ask to provide machinery so that the board of examiners shall decide what classes of lumber shall be dealt with. Besides no lumberman will be obliged to have lumber inspected or to pay a cent if he does not choose to do so. The fee is a nominal one.

Mr. IVES. It would amount to \$50 a year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Those are the figures of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) but those figures are not in my Bill. If the hon. gentleman will take the figures given by the member for Renfrew (Mr. White) he will find that it will hardly exceed \$150 in any one case in the Dominion.

Mr. PERLEY. I may explain to the House that according to the provisions for the collection of this registration fee the annual payment upon the lumber sawn by my firm would amount to about \$120. I do not see any reason why the sawn timber trade should be thus assessed and forced to pay a registration fee when they have no possible requirements for any such services. I look upon this as an unjust assessment made upon the lumber trade, and I feel it my duty to express myself in that way in connection with the sawn timber trade of the Ottawa Valley. The amount of lumber sawn by my firm is about 55,000,000

feet annually and we would have first of all to pay \$10, and then one-fifth of a cent per thousand feet which would take \$115 or \$120. That would be the assessment on mills of the capacity of that of my firm, and I should look upon it as a very unjust tax.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In reference to the objections of my hon. friends from Russell (Mr. Edwards) and Ottawa (Mr. Perley), I wish to say that both of these gentlemen are large producers of deal that is shipped to the English market. Their principal objection to this resolution is that it imposes a tax for registration purposes and a tax upon the production of their mills. I think both these hon. gentlemen will agree with me that under the law as it exists the counting fee that is imposed upon them and for which they get no benefit at all, and which they must pay under the Act as it stands at present, would greatly exceed in both their cases the amount they would be called upon to pay under the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS. As regards this counting fee the system has been that while the culling has been done at our own mills, the counting fee has been charged at Quebec for which we get no return whatever, but we refused to pay that fee for years and do not pay it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. What are you afraid of this Act for, then?

Mr. EDWARDS. I will tell you. While I agree entirely in the statement that the only parties that would derive any benefit at all from this arrangement, would be the parties who were appointed as the examiners, at the same time I dissent entirely from the idea that the Government is making this proposition for the purpose of giving such situations. I believe that the Government proposes this matter with the idea of putting the regulations into better shape, but so far as I am concerned I do not think this proposition is going to better the thing at all, but that it will make it a good deal worse. I will be glad to offer any humble opinion I can to the Government in order that this matter may be put into a shape which will satisfy the lumbermen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This discussion shows that there is a great diversity of opinion on this subject, and of course it is useful in that regard. I should think, with the consent of my hon. friend who has charge of this resolution, that we would ask the Committee to pass the resolution now and allow the Bill to be introduced upon it. The Bill being introduced the whole question can be discussed, not only on the second reading but in Committee; and we are quite willing that in Committee the whole matter should be discussed as if on this resolution which is a basis of the Bill.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) respecting the inspection of timber and lumber.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. HAGGART moved second reading of Bill (No. 100) to further amend the Civil Service Act, chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is to decrease the amount paid to parties who are at present engaged in examining candidates for the Civil Service. The first section says:

"The Governor in Council may appoint a person who shall be clerk to the board at a salary not exceeding \$700 per annum."

The old clause in the Bill read:

"The Governor in Council may appoint a secretary to the board who may be one of the members of the board at a salary not exceeding \$1,000 per annum."

You can see by that clause in the Bill that this secretary cannot be a member of the board and his salary shall be reduced to \$700. The third clause says:

"Each member of the board shall receive such salary, not exceeding \$400 per annum, as is fixed by the Governor General in Council."

Under the old Act it was \$600 per annum. Instead of two examinations a year as before they are reduced to one for promotion and one for examination and less work will be entailed on the examiners.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many members compose the board?

Mr. HAGGART. Three, I think; but one of those, the secretary, Mr. LeSueur, is not to be a member of the board. The next clause is for the purpose of adding post office inspectors to those who may be appointed without examination. By the next clause, I propose to have the salaries of accountants of Inland Revenue made from \$600 to \$1,400, instead of from \$600 to \$1,200, as at present, and the salaries of special class excisemen made from \$1,400 to \$1,600, instead of from \$1,200 to \$1,400. It has been found that these gentlemen—there are three or four of them in the country—have great responsibilities, being in charge of large distilleries; some of them collect revenue amounting to from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000. The other amendment provides for a change in the manner of computing the salaries of railway mail clerks. It is not intended to make any addition to their salaries, but the amount that will be expended for that service will be increased \$250 or \$300 a year; that is for the convenience of accounting. It was a form agreed upon by the inspectors who assembled here for that purpose. The last clause will enable us to pay the salaries to the different postmasters, whose salaries you will see by the estimates have been increased. One of them is the postmaster at Toronto, whose present salary is \$3,000; we propose to make it equal to that of the postmaster at Montreal. Another is the Ottawa postmaster, whose salary it is proposed to increase from \$2,400 to \$2,600.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to enquire in regard to railway mail clerks. The present arrangement I understand is that the first-class, second-class and third-class receive different remuneration, which is graded for night service; but under this proposition it appears that they are to be all put upon the same footing, that is, each mail clerk is to receive an allowance not exceeding half a cent per mile for every mile travelled on duty, and an additional allowance of half a cent per mile for every mile so travelled between ten in the afternoon and six in the forenoon. What I would like to enquire is whether this will reduce the salaries and allowances of the mail clerks to any considerable extent, and if so by how much?

Mr. HAGGART. On the whole, it will not reduce them any, but those who do more travel will get more, and those who do less will get less. The payments will be made according to the amount of travel they do.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part, I think the explanations given by the hon. gentleman as to some features of his Bill are very unsatisfactory. In one respect I am a Conservative; I am a conservator of the laws of the country; I do not want them to be amended or dealt with in any way unless some adequate reason is given for doing so. The hon. gentleman has explained the various changes he proposes to make in the existing law, but he has altogether failed to give any reason that should induce his Conservative supporters to agree with him that the law should be amended. I am sure there is not a Conservative on the other side of the House who has not the deepest respect for the laws of the country, and who would not wish to see them altered without adequate reason. What is the reason, for instance, why a post office inspector should be appointed



without being subjected to an examination, as he is to-day? What reason can be given for taking that departure from the rule which has been established for the protection of the public and the efficiency of the service? Not one word of explanation has been given for that; and unless some adequate and satisfactory reason is given why we should make that departure, I do not think we should adopt the legislation of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the section is very little altered from the old one. At present, city postmasters, inspectors, collectors and preventive officers in the Customs Department, inspectors of weights and measures, and deputy collectors and preventive officers in the Inland Revenue Department may be appointed without examination; and it is proposed that post office inspectors, who are men to be chosen for special qualifications not to be found by an examination of the Civil Service board, but who are appointed because of their peculiar qualifications as men who will follow up any irregularities in the post office divisions, shall be included in that list.

Mr. LAURIER. But what is the reason of that amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just explained

Mr. LAURIER. I have not heard any explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot help that; I cannot furnish my hon. friend with apprehension.

Mr. IVES. I understand that it is not the intention of the Postmaster General to decrease the salaries of the railway mail clerks. He says there will be an increase in the case of some and a decrease in the case of others. I think probably I did not well understand him; but I gathered from what he said that if a railway mail clerk worked all night, he would suffer no diminution of salary, but if he did not, he might. It does seem to me as if the old plan of paying railway mail clerks was much more fair and equitable than that proposed. For instance, a railway mail clerk starts at 10 o'clock from Montreal to go to Toronto; he rides all night, and arrives at Toronto at half past seven or eight o'clock in the morning, and he receives half a cent per mile on the 300 miles, \$1.50, in addition to his ordinary salary. Another mail clerk starts at the same time from Island Pond, and arrives at the same time at Montreal, but he has only travelled 140 miles. I am not aware that he has worked any less number of hours or that he has suffered any less loss of sleep. I am not aware that he requires any less degree of intelligence, and if he has worked during the same hours, has suffered from the same want of sleep, must have the same qualifications, why should he not receive the same pay? Under the old plan he was paid for any night service so much extra. That is the equitable plan. Now he is to be paid according to the speed of the train he is fortunate enough to be employed upon. I do not see that clerks have any control over the speed of the train or the route given them, whether long or short. The present system may be scientific, but it is unjust and not equitable. I have received a perfect avalanche of communications from mail clerks, objecting to the proposed change, and I think there is a good deal of justice in what they say. Under the schedule in the existing law a railway mail clerk of the first class, for night service, after ten years' service, receives \$1,200; under the present Act he is to receive \$360, and half a cent a mile for what he travels over during the night, between ten p.m. and six a.m. There is a difference of \$240 in his salary for the year. That means, at half a cent, 48,000 miles which he must travel over during the year before he can receive the same salary as he does at present, or 160 miles a day for 300 days. I do not believe there are half a dozen mail clerks in the Domin-

Mr. LAURIER.

ion who can draw anything like the same salary under the new regulations that they did under the old. If the hon. Minister intends to reduce the salaries of the mail clerks he should do it openly, and not in this way.

Mr. HAGGART. The intention is not at all to reduce the salaries of the mail clerks. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railway travel as fast in Quebec and Nova Scotia as they do in Ontario, and if the mail clerk serves the same time on board the trains in those Provinces as he does in Ontario he will get the same salary. The addition he receives is not half a cent a mile per night, but half a cent a mile for every mile travelled in day time and half a cent a mile extra for night travel, or altogether one cent a mile for night travel. It is an injustice to the mail clerk who travels in the North-West, and puts in more time on the railway than another in Quebec or Nova Scotia—he may cover 1,000 miles in the same time that the other will but 600 miles—that no distinction should be made in the salaries. It is for the purpose of apportioning salaries according to the duties performed that this Bill is introduced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not quite understand the object of this amendment to which the hon. member has called attention, but I take it for granted that he means by relieving the post office inspectors from the previous law to enable the hon. gentleman to bring in persons who have never had any connection with the Post Office service before. That, I presume, he can do under this proposed measure. I think it is objectionable for more reasons than one. In the first place it is an injury to the service, especially the post office service, the members of which are hard worked men, as a rule, that an outsider should be brought in and put over their head, and although I have not a very special acquaintance with the details of that service, I am inclined to think, from the evidence of the case, that a post office inspector is much more likely to do his work well, if he has been trained in the office for a reasonable number of years and has become familiar with the various details connected with the work of the post office, than if he is a stranger to the work. Is it the object of the hon. gentleman to bring in persons who have had no previous connection with the post office service? It is deplorable and objectionable that we should interfere with the promotion of officials of the service who ought to have distributed amongst them the prizes; but, at present, the way that department is administered, we know the considerable prizes are given, not to men who have served their country for years in the arduous duties of the post office, but to men who have obtained their promotion by political work of a more or less reputable character—rather less than more. Besides that, I hold a post office inspector would do very much better work if he were familiar with the details of the service in various ways.

Mr. COOK. I would like to submit to the Postmaster General—if he will allow me the suggestion, it would atone somewhat for the shortcomings of his Bill—if he would add Bill No. 106 to it. That would give it grace, and elegance, and tone, and he would do a great deal for the protection of his country.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a very important subject, which we should give serious consideration. In the first place, it is proposed to reduce the number of examinations annually from two to one. That in itself is a step in the right direction, but at the same time my opinion is that we could well do away with these examining boards altogether. There was a suggestion made to this House some years ago that, by the departments agreeing to accept students of a certain grade from our high schools and seminaries of education, the necessity of passing the examination board, and all the necessary expenses

could be well done away with. There would be nothing at all to prevent the Postmaster General including a clause in his Bill that would enable us to accept students from any of those institutions of education who hold a certain degree of certificate, which would be amply sufficient to enable them to discharge the duties of post office clerk. I think by doing that, we could do away with the examination board altogether. I notice that in the last examining board Mr. LeSueur has been acting as secretary for the past year, for which he drew the sum of \$700. I noticed, also, in looking over the list of superannuated civil servants, that as such he draws \$1,400 a year. If his health was such that it became necessary for him to be superannuated, he should not be again engaged in the service and permitted to draw double pay in this way. Are we to suppose that there were some other reasons than ill-health for his retirement? I believe the superannuating system has been abused, and I think this is one of the features of its abuse. With regard to the other clause referred to, that of giving the Government power to employ any person to discharge the duties of inspector, it is unfair to the staff to pass an Act that would allow any person outside of the staff to be taken in and placed in the office of inspector. As has been truly said by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that a man who has served in the capacity of postmaster for a number of years is better able to discharge the duties of inspector than can a man who, no matter what his attainments in an educational point of view may be, has not had that experience. The third objectionable feature is the increase of the postmasters' salary in Toronto and in other places. I am certain the Government would have no difficulty in filling any of those positions for the salaries now given, yet we are still increasing the salaries notwithstanding our annual expense and the continued efforts on the part of the Opposition to prevent this increase. My own opinion is that a man in the city of Toronto can well discharge the duties of postmaster for \$3,000 a year. I think it is an ample allowance, and I am quite sure that there are hundreds of men in this country with sufficient educational attainments, and other qualifications, who would be only too glad to get the position and discharge the duties. Where is the cause, why is it thought necessary, without any reason being given, that we should raise this man's salary from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year, when we are required really to legislate in the other direction, that is, for a reduction instead of an increase in the expenses of this service? We admit that, in Toronto, the receipts are very large, but in other places the receipts are very little, if you deduct the expenses. If you look over the whole revenue of the Post Office, you will find that it is very small, after paying running expenses. I am reminded that it does not even do that. In view of a condition of things of that kind, why is it thought necessary to introduce an Act to increase a man's salary from \$3,000 to \$4,000, when we know that his services are well and amply paid to-day at \$3,000? I do not understand legislation of that kind. The Government may think it is popular, but if it is popular it should not be, and I think it is legislating in the wrong direction. I also think that we could do without an examining board, and that would save \$4,522 a year. As to the post offices, I am sure that hon. gentlemen can get any number of men to discharge the services required for the sums which are now paid. There is no more necessary officer than a sharp, shrewd, intelligent man as inspector, and to occupy that position, it is absolutely necessary that he should have had personal experience from the commencement up to the highest position in the service, so that he may efficiently discharge the duties of inspector, and if you take a man who has not had that experience, difficulties will be met with and troubles will arise in consequence of his lack of experience.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. the First Minister has given us a reason why the post office inspector should be taken away from the list of civil servants who are subject to examination, and should be put on the list of those who are not subject to examination; and the reason he gives is that the post office inspectors require special qualifications. I would have supposed that if a party is required to have special qualifications, it is necessary, if there is to be an examination at all, that there should be a special examination to ascertain those special qualifications. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I was going to say there is nothing in it, but I mean that there is nothing in the shake. There is this to be said about the examination: If the hon. gentleman admits that an examination is necessary in regard to some officers, why is it not necessary in this case? A certain literary attainment and a certain qualification are required for the admission of a clerk into the civil service. Is not that required also in the case of an inspector? I do not understand that the inspector requires less qualification than the civil servant who is subjected to an examination, especially the civil servant who is subjected to an examination for promotion. He requires to have at least the qualification possessed by the others, and he ought to have another qualification besides. If the hon. gentleman thinks that an examination is not the proper means to ascertain the special qualification, certainly it is necessary to ascertain the general qualification which the inspector should possess, as well as every other officer. But I am inclined to think that, if the hon. gentleman would take the House into his confidence, he would tell us that this amendment to the Act is necessary to meet a special case. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, has in his eye, or in his mind's eye, at all events, the appointment of some person who, he thinks, possesses this special qualification. I wonder if the gentleman lives near the city of Galt who possesses this special qualification, and whom it would be *infra dig* to subject to this special examination; I wonder whether the eminent services which that hon. gentleman—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What hon. gentleman?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the gentleman, has performed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the name?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have been told his name is Cowan.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never heard of that before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose not, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give us some other reason for this. It is also rumored that an hon. gentleman living in Toronto is the party who is to be appointed to a position as post office inspector, and it might be *infra dig*. to subject him to an examination. Now, the hon. gentleman could put an end to all these rumors and prevent the public from guessing in regard to the matter, if he would at once say who it is who is to be specially exempted from examination by this provision of the law. Then I observe that the postmasters in certain places are to receive larger salaries than they do at present. I think the Government ought to give serious consideration to the proposition of my hon. friend who spoke just before me (Mr. McMullen). The hon. gentleman will see that he is proposing to pay certain city postmasters more than he pays the Deputy Ministers. Is the qualification required by a city postmaster superior to that required by a Deputy Minister? Are his duties more arduous or more responsible? What is there in the position of a city postmaster that he should receive a larger salary than that of a Deputy Minister in the Public Service? Certainly, his intellectual attainments are not required to be greater, and the responsibility of his position

is not greater. I believe the Deputy Minister at present receives the ordinary salary of \$3,200 a year, while the postmasters in Toronto and Montreal are to get \$4,000 a year. The hon. gentleman says he is now paying \$4,000 to the postmaster in Montreal, and he proposes not to put down the salary of the postmaster in Montreal, but to put up the salary of the postmaster in Toronto. I do not think that is necessary in the public service. There are certain positions in the public service where you are obliged to take into consideration what men employed in similar positions elsewhere earn, and you are obliged to make the salaries such as to retain men of the first order of attainments, but you have no such difficulty in the case of postmasters. It is true, perhaps, that there are large sums and large interests passing through the hands of a postmaster, and that you require a trustworthy man to fill the position, but that does not require extraordinary ability, but simply integrity; and you can secure the services of men who may be trusted with the duties of a postmaster in the larger cities of the Dominion for, at all events, the salary which is received by the ordinary Deputy Minister. Now I do not say that you ought to reduce the salary of the present incumbent at Montreal, but I say you might provide that when the present incumbent disappears at Montreal, then the postmaster at Montreal shall receive the same salary as is now paid to the postmaster at Toronto. The postmaster at Toronto took his present position knowing what the salary was before he was appointed; and I do not think that he can say that his salary, looking at the duties he has to discharge, is altogether too low for one holding such a responsible position. Looking at the enormous burdens that are at present imposed upon the people of this country, it does seem to me that the Government ought not, in every step that is taken, propose to advance the charges upon the public by increasing the salaries of those parties

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I have any right to say anything—perhaps we had better go to committee before I say anything.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are not objecting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, then we will go into Committee of the Whole, because I would like to make some remarks in reply to my hon. friend. This clause which the hon. gentleman objects to, about inspectors of post offices being appointed without an examination, is the only one which gives independent existence to this Bill, the rest of the clauses being money clauses, must be commenced by resolution. So I will propose that the Bill be read the second time and be committed *pro forma* to Committee of the Whole, then we will take up item No. 23, which is the money resolutions, and then, in carrying them, we will have plenty of time to discuss this point with my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on Resolution (page 621) to amend the Civil Service Act, and to regulate the salaries of certain officers of the Civil Service.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that the objection to be taken to this resolution is one that we have taken on too many previous occasions, viz., that every Bill that is introduced by the Government, is going to impose an additional burden upon this country. Every Bill brought down here proposes some additional salary to some of the civil servants of the country. Now these things are growing to

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

such an extent that unless we make some protest as we go along we will find ourselves from year to year piling up such an expense in all these different departments, that it will become very formidable indeed. Now, the Postmaster General has not been able to show the House a necessity for any one of these proposed increases, notably why the postmaster at Toronto should have \$4,000, why the postmaster at Ottawa should have his salary increased from \$3,400 to \$2,600, while the postmasters of Halifax, St. John and Quebec are left just as they were. It is a little piece of favoritism; it is a little piece of political concession here right under the hon. gentleman's eyes, and I suppose there has been a certain amount of log-rolling going on by which he has been induced to bring down this resolution asking that the salaries be increased for Toronto and Ottawa. I say it is very unfair, it is a very improper course, it is one that cannot be approved of by the country, and cannot be justified by any member of this House, when you come to look into the condition of the country. As has been remarked by hon gentlemen who have preceded me, there are plenty of men in this House and out of it who would take those positions if they were vacant to-day. The Postmaster General knows very well that if he had a vacancy in Toronto, there are plenty of members in this House to-day who would be glad to get it at the present salary; and if there was a vacancy in Ottawa, they would be glad to get it, as a member of this House took it on a previous occasion. Therefore, the proposition is utterly unjustifiable, and I protest most solemnly against this continued and persistent increase in the salaries of civil servants on every occasion when the Government brings down a Bill. We have seen it in the early days of the Session, and the practice is followed up to-night by this Bill. Now, Sir, I say that I cannot understand why the postmaster in Ottawa should have his salary increased to \$2,600 a year, and the postmaster in Halifax only have \$2,400. The hon. gentleman will fail, I think, to convince this House that the duties of the postmaster in Ottawa are of a more onerous character than those at Halifax, St. John or Quebec, and if he cannot show that, he has no case before the House at all, and cannot justify the increase which he is asking this House to accede to. Then again, in clause 9 it says that where the postage collections are less than \$20,000, the salary is to be from \$1,400 to \$1,800, as the Postmaster General may determine. Well, there are a great many places all through the country where the postage collections will be very much under that sum, perhaps not a quarter of it, and still, under the operations of this Act, we are going to empower the Postmaster General to give them from \$1,400 to \$1,800.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no change in the law as it is at present; it is only repeating the law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It should not be left to the Postmaster General, but it should be fixed by statute. I protest against these increases, and notably, the increases in the cases of Ottawa and Toronto, and I repeat that they are unfair to other cities I have mentioned, cities equally as important as Ottawa, at least, although, I admit, they are smaller than Toronto.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the charge of the hon. gentleman that the Bill intends to increase the burdens of the people, I think when he has heard my explanation he will probably take an entirely different view of it. The proposition is to decrease the salary of the secretary of the board \$300, to decrease the salaries of three other gentlemen \$200 each, making \$900. The change in the railway mail service may effect a saving, as my deputy estimates, of \$250 or \$300 throughout the whole country. All the increases the Bill proposes is to the salaries of city post-

masters, \$1,200, so that the amount of increases and decreases exactly balances.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). There is a class of men serving in the post offices who are very inadequately paid, and they are the postmasters of the villages and towns. Their salaries range from \$300 to \$1,000. They have to devote their whole time to the work, they are just as fully employed as are the postmasters of large cities, such as Toronto and Montreal, and they very frequently have to pay assistants out of their salaries. I think the Postmaster General should take their case into consideration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Postmaster General, in answering my remarks, did not explain why the postmaster at Ottawa should have an increase over the postmasters at Halifax and St. John.

Mr. HAGGART. The Ottawa post office does twice the business of these other offices mentioned. The returns do not show exactly the business done. The postmaster here does all the business connected with the departments and his business is no doubt twice as large as the business of the postmaster either at Halifax or Quebec, so I am informed. With respect to the increase of the salary of the postmaster at Toronto, I may say that that is an important city, the receipts are as large as those in the city of Montreal—I am informed that they are \$40,000 more. The postmaster at Montreal receives \$4,000, and it is but right that when another officer performs the same duties and assumes the same responsibilities, and performs his duties as efficiently, he should receive the same salary as the postmaster at Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I do not think so. I think, on the contrary, if there is reasonable ground for believing that the official is receiving a larger salary than the sum for which an officer could be obtained to perform them fairly well, it is the duty of the Government and the duty of members of this House to take action so that the excessive salary be reduced to a fair scale. I do not care what the previous practice may have been, or what the law may have been in that respect. I think classes 1, 2 and 3, which are respectively \$3,500, \$3,750 and \$4,000 are altogether too large for the class of duties that are discharged by the postmasters. There is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said, and there has been no attempt made to answer him. In connection with the Post Office Department there is a deficit of \$729,000 a year, we cannot make both ends meet within three-quarters of a million, and the hon. gentleman under those circumstances should be very cautious about increasing the salary of postmasters or leaving them at too high a scale. I say that if you can obtain the services of a permanent deputy head of an important department in the Dominion for \$3,000 it is absurd that classes 1, 2 and 3 of city postmasters should be paid from \$250, \$500 and \$700 greater than a deputy head. It will be our duty at some other stage to move that instead of these being allowed, class 4 of \$3,250 be made the maximum in all cases where the incumbent is not at present in receipt of a higher salary. I would not interfere now, of course, with the men now receiving higher salaries, but I think \$3,250 is ample for the services of any postmaster in Montreal, Toronto or Quebec, or any city in the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. First, with respect to the remark made that the inspector of post offices should be examined like any other clerk in the Civil Service. We all know why the examination of civil servants was commenced and has been continued. We know there had been introduced, I am afraid by both sides when they had the power, the practice of appointing persons who did not possess the necessary clerical qualifications to become a decent clerk and writer. No doubt, in days of old, persons were

appointed from political considerations only, and to avoid that the Civil Service examination was adopted, to provide that men should write a good hand, should know the principles of arithmetic and possess a good common school education, and that was the principle of the Civil Service Bill. With respect to professional men, such as legal men, if required in their professional capacity; to engineers, if required in the service; to trained accountants, who belonged to a special profession, they are exempt by the terms of the Act; and so, of course, if the Postmaster General desires to appoint an inspector of post offices, the country can trust him to appoint a man who could pass the ordinary examination. It is merely to prevent illiterate persons getting into the Civil Service. The Act has worked well in that regard and in improving the character of the service. Then as to the statement, I think, made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that no outsider should be appointed so long as a man could be found inside the department to fill the office. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery is an old saying, and we follow in some respects the example of hon. gentlemen opposite. The late collector of Customs at Halifax was not a civil servant; I think the postmaster at Montreal was an outsider, he never was a clerk in the post office and never handled a mail bag. He was taken from outside—he is a very good man I dare say, but for political reasons he was placed there. And the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says we should not cut down the salary because he now holds the position, but that his successor should be cut down. That officer was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, he was an outsider. When he was appointed, the business of the Montreal office was not half what it is now, and I am informed they fixed the salary at \$4,000, and we cannot, in justice to hon. gentlemen opposite, suppose that they were extravagant ten or fifteen years ago, when they appointed Mr. Lamothe, and that they acted wrongly either in taking an outsider or in giving him too high a salary. When the business of the Toronto post office is larger than that of the Montreal office, we come forward and say that the postmaster at Toronto should receive as much as his confrère at Montreal. I do not think there is anything wrong in that proposition. But then you know we want to get over the charge that is generally made against us, but which in this case is being made against the hon. gentleman: that is, French influence. This French influence has raised Mr. Lamothe's salary to \$4,000, but you would not give a poor Englishman in Toronto the same salary, and you want to cut down—not Mr. Lamothe's salary—oh, no, but Mr. Patteson's who was not appointed by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I really think that this is not a fair game. I think that the hon. gentleman must see that in fixing the salary of this officer, who has more duties and more business going through his hands, at the same rate at which the late Government appointed this gentleman years and years ago—and not an unduly extravagant salary, I must say—that we are following their example. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, has shown that there is really no increase here, so then good naturedly, you will allow us to pass this resolution and we will have no recrimination, and we will not tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that years ago they gave Mr. Lamothe too high a salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman would imitate us in our administration we will not object. Come down to the twenty-three millions and a half of expenditure and we will agree to leave Mr. Lamothe's salary where it is and let you make Mr. Patteson's salary \$4,000 if you choose. If you are going to imitate us, imitate us all through. Be thorough in your imitation. Come down to the twenty-three millions and a half in your expenditure

and I will support you in making the increase of the salaries of postmasters.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Lamothe was appointed at the same salary as his predecessor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am told by my hon. friend that Mr. Lamothe was appointed at the same salary that his predecessor had.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just been asking, and I am told it is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not care one straw, or I do not think the House cares whether we appointed a man at too high a salary or not; but whether we did or not that is no justification for the hon. gentleman increasing salaries now that the deficit in the post office has been enormously increased. The deficit in our time was not more than \$400,000. The business has increased, no doubt, but so has the deficit, and it now amounts to \$729,000. The point I want to make is that surely if a salary of \$3,200 is enough to pay to a deputy head of a department of this Government who has very important duties, and who ought to be a man of first-class abilities, surely in all conscience, \$3,500 is enough for an ordinary postmaster in Toronto or Montreal. That is the point we make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are more important and less important departments here, and some of the deputy heads have more important duties than others. As the hon. gentleman knows some of the deputy heads get more than \$3,200, some of them get \$4,000 and some of them more than \$4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Trudeau gets more for one and I think that the Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Courtney, gets more than \$4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He may get a couple of hundred dollars more.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, they get more than \$3,200. The two great post offices of the Dominion are Montreal and Toronto. There are others of importance and I hope that the growth of the country, notwithstanding the efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite who repress the development of the country, will cause other towns in Canada to grow, and that the postmasters will have more important duties. Take, for instance, the duties of the postmaster in Montreal or Toronto. In the first place he has a large staff of clerks to manage; and, in the second place regularity and strict discipline is a matter of the utmost importance. A man may be of great intellectual capacity, yet if he has no order, if he has no firmness, and if he has not a sense of the necessity of keeping and saving time, he is not fit to be postmaster. You know we have transferred and are transferring all the savings banks which were Government saving banks formerly to the department of the Postmaster General. That is a money business, a banking business almost you might say, and it is of great and increasing importance. You want a thoroughly competent man, a man acquainted with accounts, and a man to see that a subordinate in the post office savings bank is a man of accounts himself, to fill the position of postmaster. Then the postmaster has got to attend to the registered letters, which is also an important matter. There is the parcel post and the book post, and one might go on naming the increasing business of the post office. The postmasters in those cities have got most onerous duties to perform; they have duties requiring regularity, energy, firmness of character, and a knowledge of accounts. I really do not think that when—in humble imitation of hon. friends opposite—we ask that the postmaster in Toronto shall have as much as the postmaster in Montreal, we are

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

really going to ruin the country by our extravagance. I understand that Mr. Gouin, the postmaster in Ottawa, has, in addition to the ordinary business which goes through the post office, and which is not reckoned in the public accounts, an enormous amount of mail matter connected with the different departments going through his hands. That puts his work upon a different scale from almost any post town in the whole Dominion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think that the right hon. gentleman should bear in mind all the circumstances connected with the appointment of Mr. Patteson as postmaster, when he asks that this poor Englishman, as he calls him, should get an increase of salary. He should remember that Mr. Lesslie who preceded Mr. Patteson was well qualified to discharge the duties of that office. When he was superannuated, and superannuated against his will I believe, he was just as capable of discharging his duties as at the time he was appointed. I am personally acquainted with Mr. Lesslie.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So am I.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have seen Mr. Lesslie, and I may say that he is just as active a man to-day as he was years ago, and just as capable of discharging the duties of the office, but it was necessary for the First Minister to find a place for this poor Englishman in the post office in Toronto; and in order to find a place for this poor Englishman, as he calls him, they superannuated Mr. Lesslie and appointed Mr. Patteson who had done them good service on the *Mail* newspaper, and had stabbed the Grits under the fifth rib for months before, by order of the First Minister, no doubt. He was the man who got the position and Mr. Lesslie was superannuated. The Government should remember that if they raised Mr. Patteson's salary to \$4,000, that, together with the superannuation of Mr. Lesslie, will make an annual charge of \$6,000 for the head of the post office at Toronto. The First Minister should take all this into consideration and remember the fact that Mr. Lesslie was superannuated to make room for Mr. Patteson and not lead the House to understand that there is no good reason why this salary should not be increased.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the Postmaster General refers to his own report he will see that so far from the Ottawa post office being more important than the office at Halifax, it is far behind it. I find that in Halifax last year, \$175,000 were issued in money orders and \$535,000 in money orders paid. In Ottawa the money orders issued amounted to \$190,000 and those paid amounted to only \$152,000. The receipts in Halifax were \$50,310 against \$46,000 at Ottawa. Therefore, I cannot see how the Postmaster General can make out that the amount of work here is greater than that performed in the Halifax post office. Halifax, the hon. gentleman must remember, is the distributing point for all the mails throughout the Province; the English mails arrive there and depart from there, and that will cause, I fancy, quite as much extra work as is thrown on the post office here by the departments. Therefore, there is no justification, on the ground on which the hon. gentleman has placed it, for asking the House to give an increase to the postmaster here, and not to the postmaster at Halifax as well.

Mr. HAGGART. If you look at the Estimates, you will see that the number of employés at Ottawa is nearly double the number at Halifax.

Mr. EISENHAUER. Well, I understand that the population of Ottawa is not much greater than that of Halifax, and what is the reason for all these officials?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. More business.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The Finance Minister said a few days ago that the Government were going to economise, but we now find that they are going to increase the

salaries of the judges and postmasters, and appoint inspectors of lumber. The hon. member for South Oxford stated a while ago that there was a deficiency of \$700 in the revenue of the post office here, and if the principle laid down by the Postmaster General were sound, he would close up the post office at Ottawa, because he closed up one in my county because the revenue was not sufficient to cover expenses. It had been open for years, and I know it was closed through the influence of the ex-member. I believe a large number of the people of that section are not supporters of the Government, and that office has been closed and the people have been obliged to travel to a post office which has been erected at a distance of two or three miles. I brought the matter to the notice of the hon. Postmaster General, but he acts on the principle that there is not enough revenue to keep it open. I say that the Ottawa post office should be closed on the same principle.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. First Minister did not make good his position that he followed the example of the Government that preceded him in increasing the salary of the postmaster at Toronto to \$4,000 a year. He said we had made the appointment of the postmaster at Montreal and fixed his salary at \$4,000. When the facts are recalled, we find that that salary was fixed by the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why did you not reduce it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is charging us with a sin of omission; but the hon. gentleman's sins are those of commission. He increased the salary to \$4,000 in the first place, and because we did not reduce that salary, he says that is a sufficient justification for his increasing somebody else's salary to \$4,000. Then, my hon. friend has shown that he superannuated a postmaster at Toronto for the purpose of making room for a friend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that is quite a mistake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it is not a mistake. I saw the communication from Mr. Lesslie himself, stating that he did not wish to be superannuated, that he considered himself fully equal to the discharge of the duties; and if I remember rightly, the hon. Minister of Public Works might be able to tell how it was that Mr. Lesslie was pressed to consent to superannuation, and how it was pointed out to him, that it was greatly in his interest to come to the conclusion that he was no longer fit to remain in the public service, and should ask the Government to retire him, in order that he should not be retired in some other way. Well, Sir, seeing that political exigencies rendered it necessary for the Government to turn out Mr. Lesslie, because Mr. Patteson's usefulness as a newspaper writer was gone, and that it was necessary to make room for another exponent of the views of the Government on the press, it seems to me that some regard should have been had to economy when the present Bill was under consideration. Now, although Mr. Lesslie is still able to discharge his duties to-day as well as he was before he was retired, his salary has to be provided for out of the public Treasury, and Mr. Patteson's salary as well; and, in addition, the hon. gentleman proposes to give Mr. Patteson another hoist. I am afraid the hon. gentleman did not give us that candid explanation which he said he would when we went into Committee. He has not told us who this inspector is to be who is to be exempt from examination. I do not know that we should have been in Committee yet if it was not for our anxiety to know who this inspector is to be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to tell the hon. gentleman I do not know.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am astonished at the hon. gentleman's ignorance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would not be astonished at any amount of ignorance on the part of the hon. gentleman. But, seriously, I regret much that the question of Mr. Lesslie's superannuation has been obtruded into this discussion; that has opened up a new leaf. The question is not about Mr. Lesslie, but the question is whether the salary of the postmaster at Toronto ought to be raised. Mr. Lesslie I knew when a boy at Kingston, before he went to Toronto; his father and brother were book-sellers there. I know all about him, and I know all about the circumstance of his superannuation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think Mr. Lesslie would regret the matter being brought up here, because he has continually stated that he was superannuated against his will, and that he was just as able to discharge the duties of his office then as when he was appointed, and even better; and to this day he is as well qualified to discharge the duties of postmaster as the man who occupies the position. It is a question that ought to be brought into examination when this matter is up, because the charge for that office is now being raised to about \$6,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just point out that it seems to me absurd that the salary of the deputy head of the Post Office Department here, the superior of the postmasters, is only to be \$3,200, which is largely below the salaries of first class, second class and third class postmasters.

Committee rose and reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### JESUITS' ESTATE ACT.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), as the debate in which the House is now engaged will in all probability close to-morrow, at what date he intends to bring forward the motion which he said he would upon the Jesuits' Estate Act?

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman must be aware that since I gave notice of this motion, on the 1st March, there has been no day on which it could have been possibly brought forward. If the debate we are now engaged in concludes to-morrow evening as is expected, and I am sure we all hope that it may, I shall be prepared to proceed with my motion on the next occasion upon which the Minister of Finance moves to go into Supply; probably, I suppose, in the ordinary course of business, on Thursday next or whenever, whatever next, the occasion may arise.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope that the Government will be prepared to go into Supply on Thursday next.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall take that into consideration between now and Thursday.

Mr. LAURIER. In the meantime can we expect that the papers connected with the question will be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; they will be brought down to-morrow. I think I have got them now, but I wish to look over them.

#### TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BARRON. The First Minister was not in his place the other day when I asked the question regarding the report of the commissioners upon the investigation, whether it would be advisable or not to go on with the works on the Trent Valley Canal. I said then, and I say again, that a great many people in the locality through which this canal will run are deeply interested in the subject and wish to know what the results will be. I would like to know if the report has been received, and if it is not received, when it is expected, because I am informed that one of the commissioners has left Canada to remain away for a long time, and that for some time before his doing so no work whatever was done by the commissioners, in the way of taking evidence or otherwise, regarding the subject. There is no reason in the world, so far as I can find out, why the report should not have been received by the Government, and the country put in possession of its contents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to send me a slip across the floor mentioning what he wants, and I will send the answer over to him.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the incorporation of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

#### TITLE AND MORTGAGE GUARANTEE CO.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I was not in the House at the time motions were called, and I have just received a note asking me, in the absence of the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith), to move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the Title and Mortgage Guarantee Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. MACDOWALL moved that the Bill be now read the second time, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what is the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The recommendation of the committee was this: Unless the Bill be read the second time to-day, it is likely that it will not become law at all. There would not be sufficient time to have it referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee and have it reported upon by that committee before the end of the Session. Therefore, the Standing Orders Committee has recommended that it be read the first and the second time to-day. The object of the Bill is similar to that of a Bill which has already passed the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TROW. I question very much if it will be a public calamity if the Bill be never again heard of. I do not see why the House should go out of its order for the sake of this Bill. Let it take its regular course.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the Bill been printed?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. We are asked to-day to read it the first and the second time, and to refer it to the Banking and

Mr. LAURIER.

Commerce Committee, without knowing anything about it. Of course, I would not like to obstruct my hon. friend in his procedure, but are we to have any practice or rules at all to prevent hasty legislation? I would like to know the reason for the delay. Was the Bill not duly advertised? or was there simply some delay in the presenting of the petition?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The Bill was properly advertised and all regulations were complied with, but the principal promoter of the Bill was taken very ill, and in consequence of that the delay occurred. I suppose that, to use a legal term, the delay was occasioned by the hand of God; and on that account, we cannot have stronger reason in appealing to this House for a little consideration. The Session is likely to be very short, and unless this Bill passes the first and second reading now, it will not be able to become law this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After that appeal, I think my hon. friend opposite will allow the Bill to be read the second time.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not quite sure this is a wise practice we are introducing. We are going very far in permitting the Bill to be read the first time to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This will not be a precedent.

Mr. LAURIER. I have heard that several times before. Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sum has been expended on the Intercolonial Railroad and charged to capital account from 1st July, 1888, to 1st March, 1889?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The expenditure from 1st July, 1888, to 31st January, 1889, was \$400,773 88. The approximate expenditure for February, 1889, is \$9,300.

#### HONORABLE J. R. GOWAN.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. Cook) asked, Is the Honorable J. R. Gowan, Senator of the Dominion of Canada, the same person who was judge of the county of Simcoe? If so, was he pensioned before being appointed to the Senate? What pension does he receive, and what is the total amount to date paid him on account of such pension?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Hon. J. R. Gowan was judge of the district of Simcoe from 1843 to 1883. Since then he has been retired from that position. He has received the retiring allowance provided by law for County Court Judges who have served more than 25 years, namely, \$1,737.73 annually. He commenced to receive this allowance before he was made Senator.

#### TÉMISCOUATA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, 1. What amount has the Témiscouata Railway Company received from the Government, up to this date, on the subsidy to which they are entitled? 2. What amount remains due to the company on the said subsidy? 3. Why has not the balance, if any, been paid, and when will it be paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. The amount which the Témiscouata Railway Company have received from the Government, up to this date, on their subsidy, is \$412,900. 2. There is no sum due on the subsidy, but the balance of the subsidy applicable to the main line is \$70,700. 3. The balance has not been paid because the road has not been completed, and it will be paid when the road is completed.

## WILLIAM BANNERMAN.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, 1. At what date was William Bannerman appointed postmaster at Calgary? 2. How long did he continue postmaster of Calgary? 3. Did he leave that office a defaulter to the Government? 4. If so, what was the amount of his defalcation? 5. Was he at any time acting as sub-collector, or in any other capacity, in the employment of the Customs Department at Calgary, or at any other point in the North-West Territories? 6. If at any time serving in such capacity, at what time did he enter upon the duties of such position, and when did he cease to discharge such duties? 7. If employed in any capacity by the Customs Department, was he, in the discharge of such duties, a defaulter to the Government? 8. If a defaulter, what means have been taken to ascertain his whereabouts?

Mr. HAGGART. William Bannerman was appointed postmaster at Calgary the 1st of October, 1883. He continued postmaster until March, 1885. He owed the department a balance of \$2,071.68. Of this amount, \$2,000 was recovered on his bond, and the balance is still unpaid.

Mr. BOWELL. William Bannerman was appointed to the Customs as sub-collector by Order in Council the 24th of March, 1884. He had never complied with the terms required of him, viz.: to furnish bonds or sureties, and to report himself for duty to the Collector at Winnipeg. Consequently he was never recognised or authorised to act as such sub-collector, and his name was never entered on the list of Customs officers. He was authorised on the 21st July, 1883, to act as preventive officer, but had no authority to collect dues or other revenues. I am not aware of his being a defaulter in Customs funds, and, consequently, no means has been taken to ascertain his whereabouts.

## WILLIAM LOGAN.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, 1st. Was William Logan a contractor for the carrying of the mail between Pickering Village and Pickering Station in 1888? 2nd. Does the name of B. Bunting appear as one of the sureties upon the bond given as security for such contract? 3rd. Is this bond now in the custody of the Post Office Department?

Mr. HAGGART. The conveyance of mails between the post office and railway station at Pickering is provided for by the Grand Trunk. The Post Office Department has no information as to the names of the persons who are employed by the Grand Trunk to carry the mail.

## SIMS AND SLATER.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the sum of \$50,000, or any portion thereof, which was deposited in the Department of Railways and Canals by the sureties of Sims & Slater, contractors of the eastern section of the Cape Breton Railway, has been returned by the Department of Railways to the sureties, or otherwise disposed of? If so, what amount, and for what purpose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An Order in Council was passed the 6th of November, authorising the giving back to Sims & Slater the \$50,000 deposited as security for the due performance of their contract on the Cape Breton Railway. Before giving it up a bond was taken from the surety the 23rd of November, engaging to pay all claims that might be legally made against the firm of Sims & Slater in connection with the said contract.

## MACDONALD AND DOWLING'S GULCHES.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether any complaints have been made by the engineer in charge of the construction of

the western section of the Cape Breton Railway in reference to the manner in which works have been prosecuted over Macdonald and Dowling's gulches by the contractors? Have the contractors driven the piles in those gulches as required by their specifications?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No complaints have been made, but a full description of the driving of piles at Macdonald and Dowling's gulches has been received. The contractors have driven piles in these gulches as required by their specification.

## FRENCH-CANADIAN REPATRIATION.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. WILSON, Elgin) asked, What steps have been taken by the Government to carry out the policy or scheme of repatriation which was referred to by Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, in a public speech delivered in Montreal in November, 1883? Is the measure referred to by Sir Hector Langevin to be introduced during the present Session of Parliament, and if not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The measure which was referred to by me in the public speech at Montreal has been put into execution by the Government from that period, and therefore there is no measure to be introduced during the present Session.

## CORNWALL CANAL.

House resumed consideration of Mr. Bérger's motion for:

Copies of reports, plans and surveys of the then proposed Cornwall Canal by J. B. Mills and Benjamin Wright, Esq.'s, Civil Engineers, and by Capt. P. Cole, Royal Engineer, in the years 1832, 1833 and 1834; also for survey and report of Colin Garman, Esq., C. E., of a proposed change of location of the Cornwall Canal, from Sand Bridge through Hooples' Creek to Archibald's Point, with plans, profiles and estimates.

Mr. BÉRGER. When the House rose at six o'clock on Wednesday last, I was discussing the manner of the construction of the Cornwall Canal, the foundation upon which it was constructed, and the materials with which it was constructed, and I quoted to the House the opinion of Mr. J. B. Mills, the engineer, as to the want of safety of a bank constructed along the river, and the necessity of constructing an inland canal. I now come to that portion of Mr. Page's report of the 27th February last, in which he says:

"It is quite true that the volume of water that passes down the 'Sny' is very small compared with the main body of the River St. Lawrence; at the narrowest place immediately below the rapids, the sectional area of the waterway at the lowest stage of the river is about 600 square feet, all of which passes through the dam at Moulinette and the opening made in it. When the river is at its high stages, the volume that passes down the 'Sny' is, of course, proportionately greater. In January, 1888, during an ice jam, large quantities of ice passed down the north branch, and destroyed in a great measure the mills and dam at Moulinette. If there had been a dam at that time at the north-west point of the island, it is fully believed that no one can say with any degree of certainty what would result, nor indeed what would be the effect at any time of closing the north branch of the river. The St. Lawrence is on too grand a scale to admit of the probable result of interference with it to be even approximated by the use of formulae fairly applicable to ordinary streams. It is a well-known fact that the river has been seriously affected by causes either little understood or altogether ignored by those desirous of accomplishing certain objects, apparently irrespective of ulterior results."

This criticism of the chief engineer upon the report of Mr. Keefer is certainly a most unfair one. He gives his Minister to understand that a large volume of water passed through the Chenailles, and that, if a dam were constructed, as was proposed, at the head of Sheik's Island, a serious result would ensue. If such a dam of the proportions mentioned had been constructed in 1838, at the head of Sheik's Island, not a drop of water could have passed through the Chenailles channel. The reference he makes to the gentleman whose report he is criticising, is unworthy



of a professional man. The Chief Engineer of Canals might very properly say that the plans recommended by Mr. Samuel Keefer would not accomplish the ends desired, but there was nothing to warrant him in speaking of Mr. Samuel Keefer in this way, and to say that the causes affecting the river were "either little understood, or altogether ignored by those desirous of accomplishing certain objects, apparently irrespective of ulterior results." Such a criticism ought not to come from the Chief Engineer of Canals, but it serves to prove, as I said in the first part of my remarks, that the professional jealousy which served to make this an unsafe canal fifty years ago is to-day attempting to bring about the same result. He says:

"The effect of cutting loose a sheet of ice in a bay, then swinging it across the channel, has been known to lead to the drowning out for a time of a considerable tract of land along the margin of the river, and the closing of a branch of the river at the head of the Beauharnois Canal is well known to have led to a vast deal of trouble and an outlay for land damages of nearly \$400,000."

There is no parallel whatever between the two cases—the closing of a branch of a river at Beauharnois, where there was a swift current, the length 600 or 800 feet and the depth 18 feet, and the closing of what he chooses to call the river, but which is not the river, only a little Chenailles, at the head of Sheik's Island where there is never more than two feet of water. In the latter case it is not possible that any damage could have been done by erecting a dam at that place. He endeavors, however, to create the impression that damage would result to the lands on the American side of the river, and thereby to induce the Minister to imagine that a dam should not be constructed at the head of Sheik's Island. What is the fact? After the dam was erected, all the water would go during the period of a flood, as it goes now between the islands, Barnhart's Island and the American shore, and the banks on the American shore are from 60 to 80 feet high, so that it is impossible that there could be any flooding of the American lands, for the water has never been known to rise more than 32 or 33 feet; therefore, no damage could arise, and there could be no complication with a foreign country. I think I have now dealt with every passage in Mr. Page's report, and I have shown very fully, by the reports of the engineers employed in the construction of the canal, and by all the evidence I have been able to obtain as to the manner in which the work was performed, to the House and to the public that this work was improperly located in the beginning, that the foundation upon which the banks were laid was bad, that the method of construction was bad, and that that might have been expected from the selection of the engineers under whose direction the work was done. To sustain my contention as to the engineers, let me read a passage from the *Engineering News*, a high authority in the United States, as to the result to banks when they are made under such circumstances, and, bear in mind, that the construction of the banks of the Cornwall Canal was under the direction of the consulting engineer, Mr. Wright, who was then also chief engineer of the Erie Canal. What was the result to the Erie Canal? The *Engineering News* says:

"The Erie Canal, 360 miles long, in a great many places forms a series of earthen dams, ranging from 10 feet to 50 feet in height, with water from 7 feet to 30 feet deep behind them. These banks were generally made of water-tight earth, with vertical puddle walls in the middle. Many of these banks have failed from improper construction. In a dozen or more places—"

And this shows that the same causes that resulted in the destruction of our banks here, have resulted in the destruction of the banks of the Erie Canal—

"In a dozen or more places the wheeling planks used in construction had been covered up, and thus provided for the escape of the first film of water which finally resulted in a breach. In another case an old tow-ropes left in the bank resulted in a breach. A third unlooked-for source of trouble resulted from the dumping of the wheeling planks, running across the bank, on material containing small stones."

Mr. BERGIN.

One would suppose that the engineer was speaking of the destruction of the banks from the Long Sault to Mille Roches in the Cornwall Canal.

"This stone naturally rolled to the foot of the slope and practically formed a blind drain which eventually brought about a leak."

Now, Sir, if this had been written of the Cornwall Canal, it would have been a strictly accurate representation of the causes and effects which have characterised that canal. I shall bring only one other authority to show that the banks of the Cornwall Canal are not in a condition to be meddled with in the manner in which it is proposed to meddle with them by the chief engineer, and the authority I shall bring in support of my statement, is that of the chief engineer himself, in his report made in the year 1874, on the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, to the Minister of Public Works. Speaking of the improved canal, he says this:

"From the general appearance of the south bank, together with what could be learned of its formation, there is reason to believe that it would be injudicious to interfere with it in any way. The widening must, therefore, be done altogether on the north side, although the ground is, for the most part, high, and has every indication of being unusually hard."

And you will remember, Sir, that, on Wednesday last, I quoted from the report of Mr. Page, made on the 27th February, that he actually had in contemplation, notwithstanding that he knew the insecurity of this bank of the canal, to go on and enlarge it in the manner proposed. He also adds:

"It may also be observed that the ground on the landward side is fully 40 feet higher than the proposed bottom of the reach. From the depth which the channel has to be sunk, it will be evident that the guard lock must be taken down and a new one built; at the same time a wider raceway formed, and a much larger supply weir constructed. To admit of this being done, and of new structures being placed in nearly the same positions as the present ones, the water would have to be drawn off for one full winter, a state of matters that should, if possible, be avoided, as it would involve the stoppage of all the mills and factories at Cornwall, and thereby throw a great number of persons out of employment. By the selection of another site for the lock and weir, this unfavorable result, it is believed, might be entirely avoided, a better class of work secured, and the outlay very little, if any, increased. There is, however, good reason to believe—"

And I would ask the attention of the Government to this, because it is the severest possible condemnation of the plan which he proposes now to follow—

"—that any place much below the present structure could not be judiciously chosen for the purpose, as the present water-level of the canal is several feet higher than that of the river immediately opposite, whilst the bank between them is of a nature unlikely to retain the water, if the level of the high stages of the river were extended farther downwards."

Yet the man who penned this report in 1874, who knew so thoroughly then that the bank was so bad that he could not move the guard lock further down, to-day, in his report, affirms that the bank is thoroughly safe and thoroughly sound, and that he has no hesitation in saying that the construction, under his present proposed plan, is feasible and safe, and that there can be no doubt of the correctness of his statement. If that is not enough, let me read you this further passage from his report:

"It is, therefore, believed that whatever advantages could be gained from a more easterly position for the guard-lock, they are more than counterbalanced by the risk connected with raising the water on an uncertain portion of the bank."

This, Sir, is the testimony of the Chief Engineer of Canals himself, and I do not think that anything has occurred to improve the quality of the bank from that time. He, himself, has shown by the report he has made, that the breach which occurred in the bank in the month of October last, and which caused so much injury to the commerce of this country, which resulted in such terrible loss to the merchants, mariners and others, in this country, was produced in the manner which had been predicted by himself and by the engineers who constructed this canal. He objects, it is true, to the dams which we proposed, as being equally uncertain and insecure. He surely cannot have consulted the engineering works of modern times, or he would know,

from the reports that had been given in connection with the great dams that have broken away in different places in other countries, that there is a method of making dams secure, dams which will last for all time. The causes through which dams heretofore have broken away, have been thoroughly exposed, and amongst those causes is the cause of the breaking away of the banks of the Cornwall Canal in the month of October last, and that cause was the puddling of that canal by Colonel Philpotts, in his endeavor to make the bank, which he knew was bad, perfectly safe. Let me read to you from Mr. McAlpine—and there is no higher engineering authority on this continent, or in the old world, upon works of this kind—what he says as regards this puddling of banks, and he gives it as the result of an examination made in the breaking away of dams, both in the old country and in this, particularly the Croton dam, that was constructed by Mr. Jervis, one of the most eminent engineers in the United States, and another one which was constructed by the then Major General R. E. Lee, the great Confederate General of the South, one of the most accomplished engineers in America.

"No puddle wall should be made through the bank, for the effect of puddling is to render the earth more compact, and its eventual settlement will be less than that of the adjacent earth. And by reason of this unequal settlement, in time a vertical crack will be produced, extending along both faces of the puddle wall, and into these cracks rain or seepage water will settle and make it almost impossible to effect a subsequent union of the two masses."

And this, Sir, is what occurred in the Cornwall Canal banks. When it broke away, there were to be seen standing up, like broken pillars, portions of the puddle wall. They had not settled, the others had broken away from them, and that very puddling had been, to a great extent, the cause of the break. With this I conclude what I have to say upon Mr. Page's report of the 27th of February, and which, I repeat, would not have seen the light but for the notice which I put upon the paper, asking for it. This I have reason to know, because I asked the Minister of Railways to cause a survey to be made from Hooples' Creek to Sand Bridge, with a view to getting an increased volume of water, so that the Cornwall Canal might have a sufficient supply, both for manufacturing and navigation purposes. That survey was made, plans and profiles were prepared, and estimates were also prepared and sent in to the chief engineer, but they were pigeon-holed, and we have not seen them yet. The chief engineer gives it to be understood that any change in the work will cost a very much larger sum of money than that which he now proposes to expend. The same excuse for not building an inland canal was made in 1833, with the result that we have had several breaks, and although in the early days those breaks did not cause much interruption to the trade of the country, and did not cause any very serious damage to trade, yet this last one was so disastrous that the country cannot afford to-day, no matter at what cost, to leave the canal in an insecure condition. Let me compare the estimate which Mr. Page has made with the estimate which I have caused to be prepared, and which I have reason to know is in excess of what the work could be contracted for. Before doing this, let me briefly state to the House the changes which are sought to be made. These changes are: (1) A canal to be made from Archibald's Point through the low ground by Hooples' Creek to Sand Bridge; (2) A dam at the foot and head of Sheik's Island; and (3) the removal entirely of the lock at No. 19, and the reduction of the level between Nos. 20 and 19 to the level of No. 18. This would also do away with a guard lock, and as the result we would have seven miles of uninterrupted navigation from Archibald's Point to Maple Grove, requiring no towpath, and which distance could be traversed in from one hour to one hour and fifteen minutes, thus re-

ducing the time now occupied by a vessel in passing through the Cornwall Canal—generally ten hours up and twelve hours down—to between four and five hours. I ask the House if such a change as that in the interests of the trade of the country is not worth the expenditure even of a hundred thousand dollars or so in excess of Mr. Page's estimate of the cost of the present work? But, when I come to read my estimate I think hon. members will find that the work it is proposed to carry out, in order to make the canal perfectly safe, will cost less than the work proposed by Mr. Page. The estimated amount of the contracts that he has given out from Mille Roches to the Long Sault is \$1,200,000. To this I add—for which he has made no estimate, and I am sure I am \$75,000 or \$100,000 under what it will cost—for crib-work and rip-rap, which he proposes to add afterwards, \$300,000, which will bring the entire cost of Mr. Page's proposed work up to \$1,500,000. What is the estimate for the changes proposed? A new canal from Archibald's Point to Sand Bridge, inland, that can never break away, \$900,000; cost of the two dams, which Mr. Keefer proposes, \$195,000; from Maple Grove to Mille Roches, including bridge, \$140,000; compensation to contractors on account of change of line and abandonment of existing contract, say \$100,000, which will make a total of \$1,235,000. From that sum I should deduct the cost of two locks, which at a very low estimate would be \$300,000, or making the entire sum \$935,000, as against Mr. Page's estimate of \$1,500,000. But as our plan would also necessitate the raising of lock 20 six feet, I am willing to allow for that the full cost of the locks \$150,000, which would make the total cost of our plan \$1,135,000, still leaving a saving of \$315,000. In addition to the saving which this plan would cause, there is the maintenance and operating of two locks for all time saved by our proposition, or about, including interest on capital, \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year. There is one remark to be made in regard to the change we propose. No matter if our plan costs more than that of Mr. Page, if it were carried out the Cornwall Canal could be injured by nothing short of an earthquake. But I have yet to find the engineer or practical man who will say for one moment that the present Cornwall Canal bank will be safe for one hour when the frost begins to come out of the ground. I go further, and I venture to predict that where the break occurred in the canal in October last, unless some change is made in the plan which the chief engineer is following to-day to repair that bank, the whole of it will be in the river by the middle of June. Why, any man of common sense—a man does not require to be an engineer to understand it—knows that if you throw great blocks of frozen earth into the water, this material cannot possibly knit together or consolidate. This earth is thrown in on the top of stone, there is no effort made to pulverize it, and when the frost comes out the mass will explode and the whole run into the river. A man does not require to be an engineer to know that, and I say, and am speaking with full knowledge when I say, that there never was a more mismanaged work than the repairing of that breach in the months of October and November last, and I charge that the Chief Engineer of Canals allowed most valuable time to elapse after the repair of that break. Then was the time when he should have taken the utmost precaution to have strengthened the bank and prevented it from ever falling away. During many weeks he had very fine weather, after the rainy season, during which the bank could have been repaired. He could have employed any number of men, and have put in solid dry earth, not the frozen material he is using there to-day, and in three weeks at the outside, long before the frost came, he could have made a solid and fairly strong bank, which would have lasted this season at all events. But he did not choose to do so, and the result will be as I predict. I now propose to direct the attention of the

House to the dangerous state of this canal in other respects. The entrance to the canal is a tortuous, difficult and dangerous one. A tug when entering is obliged to steer over to the north shore of the canal in order to get within the pier. As she does so the current catches the hindermost barges of her tow and they are swung out to the stream, and whilst they are swinging to the stream she makes her way across from the north shore to get inside the pier which is on the south side of the canal, and then those barges swing back. They are caught there by the eddy, swung across again to the pier, and very often barges have sunk at the pier, and sometimes have broken away and drifted down to strand on Crab Island, or some place in the neighborhood. This causes great loss, and the underwriters are obliged to pay large sums of money in consequence. This is not a matter of which the chief engineer ought to be held entirely innocent, because he knows the condition of the river, he knows the state of the current and the eddies, he knows that the entrance is too narrow, he knows that there are boulders at the entrance to the channel on which vessels have grounded, and he knows, moreover, what is a matter of great importance to the town of Cornwall, that during three and sometimes four weeks of the year, the entrance to the canal is frozen solid to the bottom, that not a drop of water enters, and that the consequences are two thousand poor people in the town of Cornwall are during all that time unemployed. But, Sir, what excuse does he offer for leaving the canal in this dangerous state? He says that his excuse is that it is caused by frazil, and that nobody knows anything about frazil. Frazil has no more to do with it than I have. I took the chief engineer up there, and I pointed out to him that the ice comes down the river and fills up the channel between the pier and the main shore, then so soon as the surface is covered the blocks of ice that follow go under the top ice and so on, and so on, until it is filled to the bottom. It is only at great risk of life to the canal laborers that they are ever able to make a passage through that ice so as to get a supply of water for the mills. That is all because the chief engineer is wedded to his idols, and he appears to have seen nothing, to have heard nothing, and to have learned nothing, during the thirty years he has been in charge of the work. Because of that, forsooth, the canal is to remain in that dangerous condition and no change whatever is to be made. Having said this much as to the entrance at the head of the canal, let me say something as to the entrance at the foot. A few years ago, when the manufacturers and the forwarders of this country were calling for an increased water supply to the Cornwall Canal, the chief engineer recommended that the work of the improvement of the canal should be begun; but, in keeping with everything which he has done in connection with these canals, he proposed to give us a water supply, not by building new locks and a larger entrance at the head, but by building new locks and removing the entrance at the foot. Instead of giving us an increased water supply he showed us the way to let the water out, but he found out no means of letting the water in.

Mr. RYKERT. How did he do that?

Mr. BERGIN. By building the locks at the foot instead of at the head of the canal. Had they been built at the head they would have an additional supply. Now, this entrance at the foot is a dangerous entrance as well as the entrance at the head of the canal. We have no range lights at the foot, there are no buoys or beacons put upon the north shore of the Cornwall Island, and no lights to show the mariners the new channel which it is necessary for them to take if they would enter the Cornwall Canal with safety. We all remember the terrible accident to the *Passport* two or three years ago, by which the Riche-lieu and Ontario Navigation Co. lost an immense sum

Mr. BERGIN.

of money, and it was a miracle that a large number of lives were not lost also. Why did this accident occur? Because there were no range lights, no buoy or no beacon on the north side of the Cornwall Canal. Mariners to this day are ignorant that there is a fine channel between Peloe's and Colquhoun's Island. There is a safe channel, a deep channel and a straight channel running directly into the mouth of the canal, but they have had no information given to them, and they have gone on ever since that day using the only channel known to them, a channel on the north side hugging the north shore and crossing in a current to be caught in the eddy and forced upon the stone pier on the south side of the entrance to the canal. I charge that the accident to the *Passport* is not the only accident which has happened in consequence of the carelessness (to use the mildest possible term) of the chief engineer. Only the other day, comparatively speaking, the steamer *Passport* was wrecked at the foot of lock 19, when the captain had his thigh bone broken. He escaped with his life it is true, but several men were seriously injured. What brought about that accident? It was the improper construction of the weir at that lock, which was constructed many years ago under the direction of Mr. Legge. Mr. Page discovered long since that that weir was not only improperly located, but that it was improperly constructed. In his report of 1874 he pointed out the danger to navigation from that weir. He might have had occasion to point out a greater danger to navigation but for the close and watchful attention of the superintendent of the canal, who saw that the swash from this weir was constantly wearing away the bank; had it not been for the superintendent we would have had a breach in that bank at the foot of the lock as we had a breach the other day at another portion of the canal. Mr. Page himself was perfectly aware of this and during all these years, although it would not have cost a single dollar to this country to have altered that weir—because every day the men upon his scows were hauling earth away to strengthen the banks in the portions that appeared to them to be weakened at the time—and they could have taken that earth and constructed a new weir during these fifteen or twenty years; the weir would have led down straight into the canal, and the water would not have interfered with any vessel or have done any damage of any kind. Speaking of that weir, Mr. Page says:

"The balance of the supply required for the Cornwall level, in addition to that above stated, is furnished over and through a weir situated at right angles to the lock, a place nearly opposite the lower quoin."

It is almost incredible that a man of the high reputation of the Chief Engineer of Canals should have allowed that weir to remain there during so many years without making any attempt to alter or improve it, knowing full well that it must do great injury to navigation. The report goes on to say:

"It will be obvious that this means of admitting the supply must be wholly inadequate to the requirements, when it is borne in mind that at low stages of the river the water above the guard lock is on the same level as that below it, and frequently, during some years, the river level is not more than one foot over that of the canal."

He says again:

"The reach between locks 18 and 19 is 7,789 feet in length, and the supply to it is maintained in a similar manner to that of the level below, except that the weir is below the lock and in a position which throws the current more directly across the channel. The supply to this reach passes over and through a weir built on the north side, opposite the head of the lock, thence by a raceway which enters a short distance lower down on the same level as that of the canal. It is, however, found that the position and direction of the strong current thus produced are very objectionable to upward-bound vessels entering the lock."

Here, Sir, I have the whole case stated by Mr. Page himself, an acknowledgment made fifteen years ago that this weir was a source of danger to vessels, and more particularly to upward-bound vessels. Now, Sir, let me draw your attention to the condition of the locks, and I will

speak first of the lock gates. Except in the two new locks which have been constructed, there is not to-day a lock gate on the Cornwall Canal that is fit for service. These lock gates, the majority of them, have been in use over 20 years, and during that time the gate posts have been worn; the stone in which the gate posts fit, and they ought to fit tightly, has been worn away; the gates have worn away; the heel points or pivots of the gates have worn away, and the sockets in which the heel points rest, and which are made of brass, have become enlarged, and consequently when the gates are opened they sway and swing. They have not a true pivot point on which to rest nor true sockets in which the points can work. That is not all. There is not to-day in a single lock a track on which any gate can run, and run with ease and facility, or which a man can move without the exertion of more than fairly honest effort. Why, Sir, on one of these locks we have had men injured for life over and over again, because the gates were so out of gear that it was impossible for the men to handle them. One man is lying to-day a helpless cripple, with an injured spine, and he will be so for all time, having been stricken down in the very prime of life in his attempts to open a gate which two men could not open without difficulty. His little family are dependent upon him for bread, he is powerless to help them. Not far from the canal is another man, a living corpse. In attempting to open the gates, he so over-exerted himself that his bowels were forced out, he was at death's door, and for two years past he has had a living death. All these things might have been avoided if the service of the canal had not been starved for years and years. Every representation that has been made with the view of having the service improved has been met with the answer: Wait until the canals are enlarged, and then we will have this done. It is the old story over again: Wait till the horse is stolen, and then lock the stable door. What I have said of the lock gates I may also say of the foundations. The foundations of each lock are rapidly going to pieces. At the foot of each lock, except lock 17—and I will explain why it is not in the same condition in a moment or two—I am speaking now of the old locks—there is a hole from ten to twelve feet deep, and as much in diameter, under the foundations, made by the constant dripping of the water during all these years; and the same would be found at lock 17, but that they found that the bottom was going to drop into the hole two or three years ago, and then they filled it up with stone. Is that a condition in which a great public work like this ought to be? And the mitre sills—well, the less I say about their condition the better. That there is not a good mitre sill on that whole canal—and I do not except those on the new locks—is a fact that cannot be questioned. Now, Sir, let me draw your attention to the method of opening the gates. We all know that a few years ago the Chief Engineer of Canals made a change in the gates. It was not an improvement, because most of the so-called improvements he was obliged to change almost immediately after constructing them. The valves did not work well; complicated machinery was employed, some of which is left. What I maintain is that everything in the shape of machinery in connection with the canal ought to be of the most simple character. It ought to be of a nature that can be comprehended by the poorest intellect. You know the material out of which lock laborers are generally made—not skilled men, machinists or mechanics, but ordinary laborers; and therefore the machinery put into their hands to work with ought to be of the simplest kind. But instead of that, the machinery given to them was of the most complicated kind. Then, one would think that in putting in these new locks to improve, as he said, the Cornwall Canal, the chief engineer would improve the method of opening the gates. But no; he went back to the old complicated plan of capstan and bars, which was in use when the canal was built. That

plan would not work, it would not open and shut a gate and the engineer was obliged to resort to the old method of opening the gates. He took the crabs from the old locks and employed them on the new locks in order that the gates could be opened and shut. The Chief Engineer of Canals knows all about that; I have gone with him to the canals, and he has seen all this; and will you believe it?—in the specifications for the new locks he proposes to build on this canal, the same old method of capstan and bar, which experience has proven cannot work, has been called for. This is the way in which the Cornwall Canal is being managed, and it is time I should call the attention of the Government and the country to the matter. Why, Sir, the superintendent of the canal, the masters, the lock laborers, all are blamed for every little accident that may happen on that canal; but the real master, the man without whose authority the superintendent cannot dismiss any man, is the man to blame, and not the men under him who have no control over the canal except to carry out his instructions. You have no idea of the difficulty I have had in obtaining information about this canal. I have gone repeatedly to the engineers employed by him and asked for information, but I could not get it without the authority of the chief engineer. I will show you how important it is to the country that information should be obtained and laid before the country as to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and how impossible it has been for me, up to this time, to get that information. We have, Sir, on the Lachine Canal—I do not know whether we have not also on the Beauharnois Canal—a telephone apparatus, which has been found to be of immense service. We have asked Mr. Page over and over again to give us a telephone service on the Cornwall Canal; but no, no matter what other canal gets a telephone service, he has none for the Cornwall Canal. You can well understand that once a break takes place in a gate, or a weir is stopped, or a valve breaks, or any accident occurs that requires immediate attention, should it happen at the head of the canal, a man has to come, perhaps in the dead of the night, twelve miles to the superintendent to give him information, and then they have to travel back twelve miles again, so that from twelve to twenty-four hours is lost, to the serious damage of the trade of the country, before any repairing can be done. All that might be avoided by the establishment of a telephone, which would cost but a trifle. The Cornwall Canal is lighted up, as it has been for many years past, by coal oil. Why can it not be lighted, as the Lachine Canal is, by electric light, and thus give extra advantage to mariners? We found the benefit of the electric light during the breach in the canal in the fall, when electrical apparatus was established there, and work was done both night and day. That would greatly facilitate the working of the canal, and had we an electric light of our own at the time the break occurred, much time would have been saved. All these drawbacks mean great delay in the passage of vessels through the canal, and these delays have been complained of time and again. They have been frequently brought before the chief engineer, but he never could see his way to increase the facilities or to lessen the time occupied in passing through the canal. Now, I have pointed out to him a way by which he can make an uninterrupted inland canal at less cost than by the means which he proposes. By making the head of the canal at lock 20, he will diminish the delay in passing through the canal from the number of hours I have mentioned to four or five hours. All these things I have mentioned—the telegraph or telephone, the electric light—will contribute towards the safety of the navigation of the canal. I wish to say a word or two as to the condition of the lock houses. I suppose that the plans for these houses were submitted to

the Chief Engineer of Canals. I know that the intention of the Government has never been directed to the condition of these lock houses, but now that they will of necessity be obliged, in consequence of the change in the location and the new entrance to the Cornwall Canal at the foot, and in consequence of the floods which occurred, to build new lock houses, I ask them at all events to make some little provision for the health of the people who occupy them. These houses have two small rooms on the ground floor. They are only one story in height. The lock laborers, almost without exception, are married men with families—some of them very young, some of them almost at the full age, or, at all events, young boys and girls at the age of puberty; and they are obliged to crawl in by a little hole under the roof or else remain in the same room with their parents below. Is that a condition in which laborers ought to be placed by the parties having control of the canal? They ought at least to have a room or two, and these rooms ought to be of the height and size that would give them a sufficient quantity of air to breathe, to enable them to live in health during the hot season, for we know that, during the hot weather, people confined in small rooms cannot possibly be in a good state of health. I think it my duty, because these are little matters which have not yet been brought before the Government, and of which they could possibly know nothing, to bring before them now in order that precautions may be taken to secure the health and safety of these lock laborers. I have spoken strongly upon what I believe to be the defects in the management of the Cornwall Canal, and it may be that some of those who have listened to me are under the impression that I have some personal feeling against the chief engineer. Quite the contrary. The only personal feeling I have for him is one of very great respect. I believe his intentions are good, but intentions will not remedy the evils of which I complain. He, no doubt, has upon his hands perhaps more than he is able to attend to, and in that case help should be provided for him. Having said so much about the Cornwall Canal, I think it only proper that I should say something about the approaches to the canal from the westward of the river and to the eastward. The general impression is that no vessel can reach Montreal from Kingston that draws more than 14 feet of water. As the river is at present, this is true; but if you will look into the reports of Mr. Page, you will find that, at a comparatively small expense, a channel of 20 feet, safe and commodious—a wide channel without any danger of collision—can be made, all the way from Kingston to Montreal. Gentlemen who have been in the habit of going to Kingston by the river from Prescott and Brockville know what a narrow and tortuous channel it is in many places. We all know that at some point between Brockville and Kingston the channel is so narrow that it is almost dangerous for vessels to meet, particularly at Fiddler's Elbow, which is a point pretty well known to almost everyone who travels over that route. Some years ago, when I was at Prescott in command of the 59th Battalion, I had occasion to come in contact with a corps of engineers belonging to the United States service, who were then making a topographical survey of the lakes and river. We had the honor of entertaining these gentlemen at dinner one night, and during the course of conversation the chief of the party informed me that he had had a very pleasant interview, a few days before, with our surveyors in their camp on one of the islands above. He further told me, to my astonishment, that our engineers had pointed out to him several mistakes, and on going back to correct their survey he found that everything which had been said by our engineers was strictly correct, and that the fault had been in his own men, who had been careless in throwing the line and plummet. He said: We have been taught also a useful lesson by your engineers, who employ long poles when the water is swift, and in that way they get a more

Mr. BERGIN.

accurate measurement than by line and plummet, which are apt to be carried away, and to make the water appear deeper than it is, I have looked over the plans issued by the United States, and I find there is a perfectly safe and wide channel of more than a mile and a half shorter from Brockville than any of the channels now employed by our people. I would like to know what has become of the report of the survey made by our engineers at that time. I have looked in vain for it through the public documents. I have appealed to Mr. Page's engineers, and they told me they had no authority to give me any information; that whatever report was made, was made to the chief engineer, and that if he did not give it to the country they had no authority to give it; and they would not enlighten me in any way. But the fact is as I have stated. I have studied carefully the plans of the United States engineers, and I find that we can have a safe, wide channel, comparatively, in place of the tortuous and insufficient channel we have now, in no place less than 20 feet of water, and in places even 200 feet. A survey of Lake St. Francis was made in the year 1834 by Mr. Thomson, and the result of that survey, made under the authority of the Government of Upper Canada, showed that all the way from Cornwall to Coteau there was a channel nowhere less than 20 feet. And to-day vessels are grounding every little while upon the shoals in Lake St. Francis when within a few feet of a channel 1,200 feet wide, no less than 20 feet deep, and in the majority of places 80 feet deep. Why is that? Because the chief engineer has not issued a chart of that channel and pointed out where the wide and deep and safe channel is. I might go further and might keep on until 6 o'clock pointing out the laches in connection with this Cornwall Canal, but I think I have shown enough to prove to the Government and to the country that the closest enquiry should be made before any money be expended upon the contracts which have been let by Mr. Page. If I had been able to get the information, if I had known that the contracts were going to be made without proper enquiry on the part of the chief engineer, I would have moved in this matter twelve months ago, but I had no idea that the contracts would be let in that way though. I knew that Mr. Page was obstinately determined to pursue his own course. When I took him to the head of the canal, and showed him the current which carried the ice inside the pier and showed him that there was no such current through Hoopes' Creek to Archibald's Point, and that there never could be an obstruction by ice if the canal were carried in through there, he refused on the ground that so much money had been expended before. I pointed out to him that he was in no way responsible for the location of the original canal, that he was not in the country at the time, and that it would redound to his credit to remedy the evils which were complained of. He saw those evils and admitted them, but he would not change them because so much money had been already expended. He was determined to send much good money after bad, and the result is seen now. I tell the Government that, if they will issue a Royal Commission, as I hope they will, I shall be prepared to establish every statement I have made by the best scientific and practical authorities in this country. With the permission of the House, I desire to add to the resolution:

And the plans, profiles and estimates made by Mr. Clewes in the year 1886.

Mr. MULLOCK. I think the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) might more properly have been directed towards the Department of Railways and Canals than a mere servant of the department. It is a new doctrine to lay down in the House that subordinates are to be answerable on the floor of the House while their chiefs go uncensured and un-

criticised. I think my hon. friend would have adopted a more courageous course, had he in this case confined his observations and criticisms to the Administration, rather than to an absent man. He has told us that the chief engineer in the employment of the Government is not possessed of the professional knowledge necessary to discharge his duties. He has criticised in various ways the shortcomings of the chief engineer. I think those are observations which cannot be accepted as absolutely accurate, coming, I think, from a person who is not capable, from his lack of professional knowledge, to be an infallible judge of what are, and what are not, the requirements of an engineer. I think it was General Grant who said, when he had closed his great military career, that the most ungenerous critics for military men who had been successful, were those men who had been drummed out of the service because they were unable to acquire even the elementary knowledge of the goose step. I believe I have seen it stated by a learned writer, that it is necessary that a man should serve his time to every trade except criticism, for critics are ready made. I have not the pleasure of knowing the chief engineer referred to, except by reputation, but we all know that he has a professional reputation extending far beyond Canada, and that the works he has superintended have deservedly earned for Canada the reputation of having the best system of canals on the face of the earth. His reputation is not limited to Canada, or to the western world, but great engineers, sent from Europe to learn what is best and newest in hydraulic engineering, have visited the great canals of Canada, have examined those works, and have recommended them to their own country. Knowing this, and knowing nothing whatever of the merits or demerits of this particular question, I think it would be unworthy of this House to admit that this is the proper course for any hon. gentleman to pursue, to appeal to the House against a subordinate of the department, unless it can be shown, beyond all question, that the chief of the department, the responsible head, has, first of all, been appealed to, and has refused to listen to the appeal, and has been incapable, for some reason or another, of redressing the alleged wrong. The hon. gentleman says that this incompetence, which he charges has shown itself in regard to this Cornwall Canal, has existed for a term of years. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) has had a seat in this House for fifteen or twenty years, but this is the first time, at all events within my recollection, that he has addressed himself to this question. I have never heard a reference to this matter from him before. He tells us that the incompetence of the engineer in regard to the canals, and especially in regard to the Cornwall Canal, has been shown for many years. Was it not then his duty, first of all, when he came to the conclusion that the engineer was not fit for his work, to prevent further mistakes by laying his grievances before the responsible head? It appears to me that would have been the proper course; perhaps he has adopted that course. I ask, has he adopted that course?

Mr. BERGIN. Go on, go on.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman does not say. In his address he did not refer to any such course as that. He did not say that he had appealed from time to time to one branch of the Administration or to another, but he seems to have laid by, all these years, and been making note of grievances that have occurred in his constituency, and at last, with indignation, he bursts upon this House in a speech extending over very nearly two days. Now, all that he has stated may or may not be true, but I think it is due to the Administration to adopt the responsibility of this case and to disapprove of, and, if they have the courage, to protect their officials from an attack of this kind. Those public works have been conducted under the direction of a responsible head. I do not understand that an engineer can proceed with the

expenditure of money without first submitting his plans to his chief. Now, that was done in every case; it must have been done. Every expenditure of money voted by Parliament must be made with the assent and approval of the responsible head. It has to be done, it is on that theory that we vote money and place it at the disposal of the Administration of the day, and if there has been a waste of money, not the deputy, being the agent of the Minister, but the Minister, is responsible, therefore. It is a curious theory if we can affirm that there has been a waste of money and that we can only censure the agent who, according to our theory, at least, has been simply carrying out the directions of his principal, the head of the department. For these reasons I think that the speech of the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order, from a parliamentary standpoint. He has adopted an entirely wrong tone. These complaints, first of all, I think, should have been directed to the department, either privately or on the floor of the Parliament, I do not care which, but the charge should be made against the responsible party, the Government of the day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is, of course, no objection to the granting of the papers which the hon. gentleman has moved for. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the Government must and ought to see that their subordinates in the different offices, the permanent officers, should get fair play, and I am not at all aware that any failure on that score can be attributable to the Government. But members of Parliament are free men, and they are here for the purpose of protecting the public interest. If they feel it necessary to attack the course pursued by the subordinates, or by their masters, or by the Government, it is perfectly open for them to do so, it is their duty to do so. I have been called away a good deal, both when the hon. gentleman spoke last week, and to-day, and I have not been able to follow him fully, although I heard a considerable portion of his speech on the first occasion. I understand that he has reviewed fully the system on which canals have been built in the vicinity of the St. Lawrence. It is quite open to him to do so. He has a right to reflect upon the skill, or the want of skill, in the construction of these canals; he has a right to look at the different reports made by the chief engineer, and either approve or disapprove of them. The Government—and a good many Governments have been concerned in the construction of that canal—the Governments all are responsible for whatever was done during their existence. The hon. gentleman who spoke last knows, of course, that any government must be in the hands, to a considerable extent, of the professional men whom they employ in all these public works. In very few instances are the members of any political government professional men, and able personally to judge of the accuracy or otherwise of the reports of their scientific employés. Every government has got to consider whether, in the first place, a great work should be undertaken or not; then they are bound to get the best scientific information that they can, and they have to rely on the reports made by their engineers, or their professional men, and finally come to the best decision they can as to how the work is to be carried on. I do not think that we can limit the power or the right of a member of Parliament to scrutinise fully and freely all such matters.

Mr. MULOCK. It is only a question of taste, that is all, not a question of right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman said it was out of order; he used that expression.

Mr. MULOCK. I meant in that sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, every hon. member, as long as his speech is parliamentary and does not offend any rules, is to be his own judge as to the question

of taste. The House can agree with him in that, or some of the House may not agree with him; it is a matter for each member to judge for himself, and to be governed by his own sense of propriety in using language. All the House can ask, or you, Mr. Speaker, can insist upon, is that there shall be no breach of parliamentary orders or rules. I will also say that I have always had a high respect for Mr. Page, although certainly I am not a competent judge as to engineering work; but I have always had a high respect for the common sense, experience and professional ability of Mr. Page. He has been of late years, I think, the head engineer of the canal branch of the Department of Railways and Canals. My opinion one way or the other would not be of much value, but I know that it has been corroborated, not only in verbal conversation with other professional men, but by reports and correspondence, from which I gather, that his status as a competent engineer is high amongst his professional brethren.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF THE FREE LIST.

Mr. PLATT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to remove the duty on, and place upon the Free List, all grains and seeds which do not ripen in Canada, but which are now largely imported and sown for the production of food for cattle under the system of feeding called Soiling and Ensilage, now largely adopted by the farmers of Canada.

He said: This motion requires some slight change in our Customs tariff. I am aware that our tariff is considered by some, notably by hon. gentlemen opposite, to be a sacred institution, which profane hands, at least, should not dare to touch. I am likewise aware that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches watch with peculiar care, and even with a jealous eye, any attempted innovation upon that peculiar institution, and are likely to regard with extreme care any attempt to infringe upon that portion of the Customs tariff which goes to make up the National Policy. But, notwithstanding that this resolution does propose to effect slight changes in the tariff, I think it will tax the ingenuity of hon. gentlemen opposite to interpret it as meaning anything antagonistic to the National Policy. On the contrary, I think they will be forced to conclude that the amendment proposed is in strict conformity with the principles of the National Policy as announced from time to time and from place to place. It is no conspiracy against the National Policy, or even against the system of protection; it is simply an attempt to obtain, if possible, from Parliament a recognition of the enterprise of the farming community, and of their efforts to maintain their calling at the highest point among the callings of people in this country, which I hold it occupies at the present time. In order to do this, I am asking Parliament for no grant, no Government assistance, but simply for the removal of an obstacle in the way of their richly-deserved progress. The branch of industry to which I allude may be considered a new departure on the part of the farmers of this country, it is one of our infant industries, at least it is an infant branch of one of our oldest and most important industries. It has, however, already obtained vast prospective proportions, and I consider it is far-reaching in its effect on the future welfare of our agricultural industries. It is well known to all of us that agriculture, with the conditions under which it is surrounded, in order to maintain its position as an industry, must of necessity seek different methods of advancement from those adopted and pursued in the early history of the country. The conditions which render this necessary are varied and, for the most part, unavoidable. Climatic changes, the depletion of the soil, the opening up of new territory, thereby increasing the extent

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of competition which our cereals have to meet with in the markets of the world, are all causes which conspire to compel the farming community to cast about for some new and better method by which to attain success in their calling. In this emergency the farming community have, I may say, with a general consensus of the opinion of the most intelligent and enterprising of the farmers, cast their eyes towards stock-raising or dairy farming as the most likely to be followed with success; and the result is that it is almost universally adopted, in some countries to a large extent, and in others to a smaller extent, throughout the Province of Ontario. In order to make this departure successful new lines have been laid down by successful farmers, and they have adopted new methods of keeping stock. It is well known that hay, grasses and roots have been found by experience to be too expensive for stock-feeding, and resort is now generally being had to what is known as soiling and ensilage, which simply means this: the production of the largest possible amount of nutritious and milk-producing food from a certain acreage of land, and feeding the same in a green and uncured state to sheltered animals both during winter and summer. I need not explain the details of this system; if this should be necessary, there are practical farmers in the House who can do it more successfully than I can. Suffice it to say that this system is very largely advocated by the most intelligent farmers in the country, and during the last year it has formed a great theme of discussion at the annual meetings of the Dairymen's Association and the Farmers' Institutes throughout Ontario. These discussions have led other farmers to determine to try this system more largely in the future than in the past. The seeds which are used for the production of the cheap food of which I am speaking have thus far been certain varieties of corn of northern production, varieties which do not, and cannot, I believe, be successfully ripened in this country, but which are very largely used for the production of this cheap food, large quantities being used throughout Ontario last summer. I cannot give the House the exact quantity, because I do not think the Trade and Navigation Returns make any definite distinction between corn imported for that purpose and corn imported for other purposes; but I know this fact, that a single importer of this kind of seed received twenty-eight car loads which came to London. This may be taken as an index of the extent of this industry; and I can assure the House the prospect is that during the coming season much more seed will be required in Ontario than has been used in any previous year. Besides these varieties of corn of southern growth, I have seen exhibited at meetings of Farmers' Institutes various other seeds, beans, peas and various grasses, all southern grown, and which are now being largely used in the middle and northern States, and which, no doubt, will be largely imported by Ontario farmers during the coming season. I submit it can in no way be considered as any innovation of the National Policy to ask that the Customs tax be removed from the seed of which I am speaking. It may be said, of course, that it would be too much trouble, that it would be hardly worth while to make tariff changes for so small a matter. It may be considered a small matter by some persons, but it is in the aggregate a very large matter, and one of very deep interest to the agriculturists of the country. We know that in farming, as in other branches of industry, the cost of production must be very carefully watched, in order to make that calling a success. We have heard very much of late about the desirability of keeping our cattle at home and of shipping to foreign countries the products thereof. This, I grant, would be of very great benefit to the country if it could be successfully carried out; but it cannot be successfully carried out until we have some improved system of feeding stock, and we can-

not expect to have an improved system of feeding until we have cheaper food, and we cannot have cheaper food until our system of soiling and ensilage reaches a greater degree of perfection throughout the Province than it has reached up to the present time. We may consider the fodder fed to cattle as essentially a raw material, and if we carry out this much advocated principle of the National Policy, to feed our cattle and retain them at home while we ship the products, we would consider the feed as raw material, the animal as the machine, and milk, butter, cheese and beef as the products to ship. We cannot expect to have cheap products until we have cheap raw material for its production. Some time ago—two years ago, I think—the author of the National Policy and the present leader of this House very concisely defined what he considered the National Policy to be, and I will read his short definition. The right hon. gentleman said:

“That policy the Government adopted and carried out, in 1879—the National Policy—was simply this: that it made the free list as wide as possible of the articles which could not, for climatic or other reasons, be produced or manufactured in Canada, and that raw material which could be made up here would be imported free.”

This, Sir, is the definition of the National Policy given by the leader of this House, and if that be a true definition I cannot see how he or any of his followers can consistently object to the proposition I am now making. If we are to have raw materials admitted free, then I submit that what I am asking is that a raw material be admitted free. If we are to have admitted articles free which cannot for climatic reasons be produced here, I submit that I am asking the removal of a tax on an article which cannot from climatic reasons be produced in Canada. Besides that I am asking for the free importation of an article which enters into what I may say is the principal industry of this country, and into the youngest branch of that industry. Last year, when I brought this matter to the attention of the House, in a very few words the then Minister of Finance (Sir Charles Tupper) informed me that he could see no possible reason why my request should not be granted, and that if any tariff changes were made the proposition should be considered. I leave it to this House to consider whether or not they can justify the refusal of the request which I am now making on behalf of the farming industries of the country, or whether they will grant it. I make no lengthy appeal, but what I have said is as short and concise as possible. I can assure the House that this is a matter of very considerable interest to the farming community throughout this country, and some disappointment will be felt if the request is not granted.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As the National Policy, when first introduced, was for the purpose of promoting all the different industries of the country, the agricultural industry along with the others, and as this is a very important period in the history of agriculture in the Dominion of Canada, I think we should consider what help we can give to our farmers. One of the principal agricultural industries, the manufacture of cheese, has been in a rather depressed condition during the last two years, from two causes—first, from the large shrinkage which has taken place in the produce of the country, and, second, the shrinkage which has taken place in the price, farmers in consequence are compelled to look around to see what can be done in order to enable them to produce more cheaply. In this connection there is nothing that has presented itself to the mind of the practical farmer of the Dominion of Canada at the present time, equal to the production of ensilage. I believe that this is a very small boom indeed for the farmers to request of Parliament. It is certainly made in the interest of dairying both as far as butter and cheese is concerned. Our climate is continually changing and we find that changes have taken place within the last few years which makes it imperative upon every farmer, in order

to be successful, to provide some kind of summer feed for their cattle when pastures fail. There is no other feed that we know of, which the same quantity of land will produce to the same amount as this feed. But seed corn is something we cannot get in our own country. It has to be brought from the United States, and I hope, therefore, that the Government will see their way to grant this request, and to give us this seed free of duty, in order that we may be able to raise cheaper feed for our cattle. While we have not had the pleasure of any experiment in this direction from our our experimental farm here, we must remember that the farm is only young yet, and perhaps it has not had the opportunity of doing so, but I hope that the Government will see their way to give us the seed free, so that we may experiment for ourselves. I believe, if they do so, it will be the means of enabling the farmers of Canada to produce both beef cattle and dairy produce more cheaply than any other system which has yet been introduced into the country.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the proposition moved by the two hon. gentlemen opposite, I can only say that corn introduced in this country pays  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per bushel. In the section of the country which I represent we use a good deal of it for the purpose of being sown broadcast and being cut green, for feeding cattle and for ensilage. We must all remember that that duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel was put on corn coming into the country for the purpose of protecting our own corn growers in western Ontario. It is news to me that we cannot grow this article for dairy and other purposes when it is sown broadcast in our section of the country. I thought that the corn which was used for that purpose is the corn, or a similar corn, that is grown in the counties of Kent and Essex. There may be perhaps some of it that is from a southern part of the States and a different kind of corn, but as a general rule that corn is used in our section of the country and it suits perfectly well for cutting and for green purposes. No other seed has been mentioned by hon. gentlemen which should be admitted free. They told the House that there are a lot of other seeds which can be sown broadcast and used for this purpose that ought to be admitted free, but the only seed that they have mentioned is corn, and the duty put upon corn was for the purpose of protecting the corn growers in our own portion of the country. Their corn can be used perfectly well for purposes of ensilage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say a few words with reference to this subject. I live in the corn-growing belt along Lake Erie, and the kind of corn that is sown for green feed there is known as the mammoth sweet corn, and which does not mature in any of those counties. I believe possibly that in some seasons it may mature in some extreme southwestern portions of Essex County, but it is very uncertain whether it will mature there or not. The seed used by farmers is almost invariably imported from the United States, and my friend from Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt) is right in saying that it would be in the interests of the farming community of this country to allow that particular kind of corn in free of duty. There is perhaps not one year in half a dozen when that corn matures in any part of Canada. The cheese factories make a practice of importing this corn and soiling it to their customers for seed purposes, at cost price. Of course, with the duty on, it costs  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents more to the farmer than if the duty were removed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I endorse the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with regard to the seed used for this purpose. It cannot be grown in the counties mentioned by the Postmaster General. The corn grown in the vicinity of Chatham is not suitable for the purposes referred to by the member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt), and I may



say that I was present at a Farmers' Institute meeting, held shortly before the opening of Parliament, when this question was under discussion, and I can assure the House that it is a question which has excited a great deal of attention among the farmers of Ontario, who find that it is necessary to provide some cheaper food for their stock in the winter time. I think it is but fair to the farmers of this country that they should receive some benefits in the direction indicated by this motion.

**Mr. MULOCK.** The hon. Postmaster General asks whether there was any other seed than corn which did not ripen in Canada, and which would be useful for the purposes indicated. I think there is another seed which is imported for the purpose of growing food for cattle, and which does not ripen, or, if it does, only under great difficulties, in Canada—that is, millet seed.

**Mr. HAGGART.** It ripens here.

**Mr. MULOCK.** I do not know, of course, but it is stated in the press that it does not ripen in Canada. But, whether it does or not, last spring a portion of eastern Ontario, and, perhaps, other districts, suffered very severely from drought, and the grains that were sown in the early spring perished. It was too late to grow the ordinary crops which farmers use for fodder. At that time—well on in June—the only thing they could do was to plough up the land where the spring grains had been killed by the drought, and plant millet. But there was no millet seed in the country. If it does grow in Canada there was none to be found when it was wanted last year; and it became necessary to import large quantities of it. When the seed came to the Custom house the Minister of Customs, interpreting the Customs Act, held that it was a grain, a cereal, and liable to pay a duty of 20 per cent. Of course, I am not criticising the action of the Minister of Customs in making that ruling, as he was simply carrying out the law; but it was a carrying out of the law which operated very hardly upon the farmers. They had to suffer enough; they had lost their crops, and, when they tried to help themselves, the Government taxed them, in their distress and exigency, 20 per cent. *ad valorem* upon the seed which they resorted to. Now, I do not think it is in the interest of the country that seeds of the class referred to, imported under the circumstances mentioned, for producing food for cattle, should be taxed, and I think it would be only doing what is in the best interest of the country to place them on the free list.

**Mr. BOWELL.** Perhaps the strongest objection which I can have to the passage of this resolution is the impracticability of carrying it out. It states that we should place on the free list all grains and seeds which do not ripen in Canada, but which are now largely used for certain purposes and imported from foreign countries. Well, it is somewhat difficult, I should judge, to decide what seeds there are that would come under this designation. There has been but one variety of corn referred to, so far as I am aware, that has not ripened in Canada; that is what is termed the large sweet or dent corn, called by some, I believe, the horse-tooth corn, principally grown in Ohio. There are very few grains and seeds, and very few varieties of corn, if any, that will not ripen in some portions of Canada. I have a distinct recollection of certain varieties of corn having been introduced in the section of country where I live, and it was some years before they would mature so that they could be grown successfully. But this corn, like other seeds, becomes in time acclimatised, and can be grown successfully. I know that is the case in the section of country I come from; and though not a farmer, I have had some little experience, in connection with agricultural societies, of the wants and requirements of the yeomanry of the country. But apart from that, besides the class of corn to which I have referred, I

**Mr. CHARLTON.**

am not aware of any other kind that will not ripen in Canada; and even assuming that this variety will not ripen, how much of a tax is imposed upon the very largest farmers in Ontario by the duty? The dairy industry is carried on very extensively in the county of Hastings. We have some forty or fifty cheese factories, and some farmers have from 50 to 100 cows on their farms; but I am not aware that any of them would sow for the purpose indicated more than from six to ten bushels of seed. Suppose I assume that the largest farmer would sow ten bushels of this particular kind of corn; he would have to pay a duty of 75 cents. That would be the enormous tax which this iniquitous National Policy, as hon. gentlemen opposite designate it, would impose upon him. But the probability is that not one farmer in fifty would use over five bushels of the corn referred to, for there are many who use corn that will ripen in the country. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) spoke of grasses which are largely used for feeding purposes. All grass seeds that come under that designation are free already. Although the decision of the department was that millet could not be ruled as grass seed, I confess that, after considering the matter, I have grave doubts whether the ruling was right; and if after further investigation I find that I have been wrong in that decision, I shall be happy to change it.

**Mr. MULOCK.** The Postmaster General says millet will ripen here.

**Mr. BOWELL.** That is another matter. Millet and Hungarian grass will ripen in this country, and so will most of the articles mentioned here. If the motion had been for one kind of grain for certain purposes, we could have understood it; but the first thing for the Customs Department to do in questions of this kind would be to decide whether the particular seed imported was not on the free list already, and most of them are. To decide whether they would ripen in this country or not would necessitate an investigation from one end of the Dominion to the other, which would render it utterly impossible to carry out the resolution without an immense amount of trouble and dissatisfaction from every importer in the country, and those who imported grain which would ripen in the country, and which had to pay a duty upon it. A moment's reflection will show the hon. gentleman that his motion is impracticable and could not with any degree of safety or justice, either to the revenue or the different importers, be carried out. I question very much whether there is such an agitation in the country as has been referred to. The agitation has arisen through the efforts of politicians who are opposed to the whole policy of the Government and desire to attack it in piecemeal. That may be legitimate enough from a political standpoint, but I would advise the House, before adopting the resolution, to reflect as to whether it could be possibly enforced. It would be much better to say that all corn and seeds, and all grains used by the farmer, should be put upon the free list. Such a resolution would be comprehensive and easily understood.

**Mr. PLATT.** I will amend it that way.

**Mr. BOWELL.** And I should have great pleasure in voting against it if you did; but that would be a straightforward and a manly way of attacking the whole policy, and would enable those who are in favor of that policy to defend it upon broader grounds than they can on a piecemeal resolution such as this one. This resolution would be applied, if adopted, to authorise the admission free of all kinds of seeds. It would include turnips and potatoes, and mangolds. In England, the turnip-tops, beet-tops, and all green things of the kind are used for the purposes of feeding cattle under the system called soiling and ensilage, while the root itself is growing. That may seem strange,

but it is the case. In the agricultural sections of the old country every possible thing is utilised which can be obtained for the purposes of feeding cattle. Where labor is plentiful the children are sent into the fields to gather the surplus leaves which would otherwise rot while the root matures, but which, while in a succulent state, are preserved and fed to cattle. It would apply to vegetables, to barley, wheat and oats, and to winter rye, which is often sown in the summer for the purpose of being cut for the feeding of cattle. I do not think, under the circumstances, the House should adopt this resolution. If any particular quality of corn can be designated which cannot and does not ripen in any section of this country, and which is largely used for the purpose indicated in the resolution, that would be a question which the Government would take into consideration and deal with liberally, as we do in all cases where articles have been brought under our notice which are used in manufactures and are not produced in this country; but the adoption of a resolution of this kind is altogether out of the question, and if carried would be impracticable.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I have the honor to represent an agricultural constituency, and one which is largely engaged in the dairy industry. This resolution reads that it is expedient to remove the duty on articles and place upon the free list all grains and seeds which do not ripen in Canada. The hon. gentlemen opposite claim there is a certain kind of corn—which we generally designate horse-tooth corn—which does not generally ripen in this country. This corn is sown for feeding purposes, but at the same time it is as good for feeding as the corn we grow in this country. Place that resolution on the statute, and what will be the consequence? I deal largely in corn, and I import a cargo of this corn free of duty, and sell it out to the farmers for feeding, or sowing, or any other purpose. The practical result would be to reduce the price of corn grown in this country, and every other grain fit to feed our cattle with, simply by  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel. If the corn does not ripen in this country, the millet seed does. I have grown it largely myself on an island near Gananoque, and I have seen it grown and ripen in the North-West. But if there is a corn that does not ripen in this country, and which is required for raising green feed for cattle and for ensilage, why not pass an Order in Council, which the Government, I am sure, will readily do, admitting this kind of corn free when imported and sown for the purpose of ensilage, but not to come in for feeding purposes so as to come into competition with the grain grown in the country. There is not a farmer in my county who would favor admitting this corn free of duty for feeding purposes. The effect would be to reduce the price of coarse grains of all kinds for feeding purposes.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** Like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I have the honor of representing an agricultural constituency, and an agricultural constituency largely engaged in dairy farming. I cannot believe that my hon. friend's constituents are not as far advanced in modern improvements, with regard to farming, as mine. If they are, they do not use generally dent corn for feeding purposes. That kind of corn was used some years ago largely for that purpose, that is for summer feeding, but it has never been used for ensilage. As the result of experiments, other varieties of corn—one mentioned by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the mammoth sweet corn, but more particularly a variety of corn from the south—are used in the county I represent and the Eastern Townships generally. Those two varieties are now used almost altogether there for feeding purposes, and especially for ensilage purposes.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** It would make good feed for fattening hogs.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** No doubt, but the result of all experiments in growing that corn and attempting to ripen it, have been to show it will not ripen, as a rule, in this country. It is only in an exceptional season that those varieties will ripen. The result of all experiments of those varieties of corn, both for feeding and ensilage purposes, has been to show they are greatly superior to our native corn, or to that commonly imported from the Western States for those purposes. It would be no invasion of the principle upon which the defenders of the National Policy now proceed, to permit the introduction of these varieties of corn for that purpose. The Minister of Customs has admitted that. While I agree with him as to the difficulty of carrying into effect any such regulation as that referred to in the resolution of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), it would not be difficult for the Government to permit, either by Order in Council or by amendment to the tariff, the importation of these particular varieties which I have mentioned, free of duty. The hon. the Minister of Customs is very much mistaken with regard to the quantity of corn used for seeding. It may be the case in the county he represents that the farmers generally do not use more than five or six bushels, and would only have to pay 75 cents duty, but even that, upon the whole of the county, amounts to a considerable sum. In the county I represent, however, and that which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) represents, where a great many are making experiments in ensilage, a much larger quantity is used by individual farmers, and the tax might be a considerable amount. I see no reason, upon the principle itself upon which the National Policy professes to be founded, why the Government should not consider seriously and thoughtfully the question of permitting the importation of the varieties of corn now largely used for feeding and ensilage purposes free of duty.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I think there is only one or two kinds of corn used for ensilage which are now imported and which cannot be grown in this country: the B. and W. mammoth southern sweet corn, the sorgham and perhaps the red cob ensilage corn. If we could admit these kinds of grain into the country without much trouble it would be of great advantage to the farmers, because it is being largely sown in some parts of the country, and I think, in that case, it would be more largely sown. I have personally had some experience in the last two years in regard to that corn—the mammoth southern sweet. I have obtained it and sown it, and only sowed one bushel to an acre. In the western country, Mr. Pierce, who was the pioneer in introducing that corn, was the first to introduce it, and three years ago he brought in only one car load. I think last year he brought in eight or ten car loads, but that is only one kind of corn. There is a great diversity of opinion as to whether that is superior to many kinds of corn which are grown in the country. If you look at the journal published in Hamilton, and the one published in London, in the interests of agriculture, you will see that there is a great difference of opinion as to the value of the different qualities of corn for ensilage or soiling purposes. The largest extent of ground which is sown for this purpose in Ontario, as far as I know, by any one farmer, is about 40 acres. I believe about three-quarters of a bushel to the acre should be sown, as a general rule, and that would be an additional expense of about 5 cents an acre to the farmer; but, if we sow a bushel or a bushel and a quarter to the acre—because, when sown broadcast, it would have to be sown thicker—it would seem to be a more important tax on the farmers. However, it is found to be a very valuable feed for cattle, and, if it could be brought in free without much difficulty, that would be in harmony with the principle which we have been endeavoring to carry out in connection with the National Policy, viz.: to bring in free of duty what we can-

not raise or make in the country. No doubt, the Minister of Customs will take it into consideration. I do not think millet comes under this class of grains at all, because it ripens in almost every part of the country. I know it does in the counties of Bruce and Grey, and there is no difficulty whatever in ripening millet. The only corn I know of that should be affected in this way is the B. and W. sweet southern corn, and that is sown and is very valuable, and now there is a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on it.

Mr. ROWAND. As a farmer, I desire to express my opinion on this subject, and I am glad to hear that it has been brought before the House. It is very interesting to the farmers in the section of country from which I come. We have not done very much in regard to ensilage yet, but we find that, although Canadian-grown corn may mature in this country, it does not grow as well as we desire. There is the horse-tooth corn, and what is called the southern sweet corn, and those are the only two kinds we have grown for ensilage or green fodder. In the last two seasons the failure of the grass in the months of August and September has caused us to fall back upon green food to supplement the ordinary fodder, and we find that corn is better than turnips for the land. If this corn were admitted free, a greater quantity of it would be grown. As a farmer, I express the opinion of my fellow-farmers that we are anxious to get something that we can grow for food which will be less exhaustive than turnips and mangolds. We can grow corn much better than we can roots, and the roots are not available in the dry season in August and September. We use turnips generally for winter food, but there is a feeling that we must abandon them and substitute corn for them. We can grow an equal amount of corn per acre as we can roots, and with less than half the labor. We have heard from chemists, that two-thirds of an acre of corn is worth more than an acre of roots. We have heard a great deal about economising labor, and about the product of farmers' stuff in this country. We can economise labor, and get greater advantage, if the chemists are correct, and the tests they have made are true, in the way proposed. We can get 30 per cent. more food from corn than we can from turnips, and I can testify that less than one half the labor will produce an acre of corn than that which is required to produce an acre of turnips. This is not a very large matter, and I admit the difficulty of separating corn for seed from corn imported for other purposes, but, if the Minister of Customs can see his way to allow the seed to come in free, it will be a great benefit. It is not with the leading farmers that the difficulty arises. They do not care very much for 5 cents or 10 cents an acre added to the cost of the seed; but it is desirable to get the smaller farmers to follow our example, and the best way to do that is to cheapen the cost of the seed. I hope that can be done without wrenching the National Policy. It must be a very poor policy that will not stand that small wrench. As to the other classes of seed which are mentioned in this motion, I do not think there is much importance in that, if we can get the corn free.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not advocate the raising of turnips and mangolds so that the farmers would have to pick the leaves off them, but I merely referred to them to show the length to which this resolution, if it were carried as it stands, would go.

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

#### After Recess.

Gen. LAURIE. When the House rose at six o'clock, we had just heard a very able speech from the hon. member for West Bruce (Mr. Rowand), a speech which, I think, will commend itself to everybody in this House, a sensible speech on a subject which he thoroughly understands, and

Mr. SPROULE.

concerning which, he was able to speak practically. Now, I believe that if the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) had made his motion and his speech only for the information of the House and the farmers of the country, that alone would have justified him in moving the resolution that he has placed before the House; because I believe that the increased cultivation of corn, as food for cattle, would largely conduce to the interests of our farmers. I shall not follow the hon. member for West Bruce, because I think he has very fully put the subject before the House. I am particularly interested in this question, because I believe I am one of the largest growers of corn in the Maritime Provinces, and I have followed out the practice of storing corn in silos to a larger extent, perhaps, than any other farmer in my neighborhood. But I think several mistakes have been made by speakers who have preceded me, to some of which I will refer. I would call attention particularly to one point, and that is the quantity of seed to be used. We find it necessary, as a rule, to use one and a half to two bushels per acre, instead of from three-quarters to one bushel, as stated by my hon. friend. Then, the corn we find it desirable to use is not such as is produced in western Canada, nor that which is produced in Ohio and Michigan. I studied this whole question of ensilage in the New England States before I introduced it at home, and I was advised to go south for seed corn. When we examine the reasons for that, when we study vegetables and vegetation, we shall find that if we want a plant that will germinate and come to maturity early, we must go north to get it, but if we want a plant that will come to maturity late, we must go south for it. In the case of ensilage we want a plant that will not come to maturity at all; we want a plant that will continue green to the time we harvest it, that continues simply to make stock and forage, that will not make seed, and that will not, as I said, come to maturity at all. For that purpose we have to go south, and for the last ten years, and following the example of my New England tutors, I have done so. I find it necessary to import southern corn from Maryland or Virginia, and I have gone to Baltimore for it. We have found the large white southern horse-tooth corn the only corn suitable for forage and ensilage purposes. I do not say that there cannot be other corn equally suitable, but I do not know of any. I would like to see the Department of Customs make a distinction between corn introduced for seed purposes and corn introduced for food. Personally, as this House is aware, I am in favor of corn for food being introduced free of duty, and I submitted that point to the House, but the House was against me, and that was an end of the question, at least for a time. At the same time I infer from what fell from the Minister of Customs that he may possibly be able, under the provisions of the Act by which they are empowered to deal with such questions as these, to place this article upon the free list, or make such arrangements as will secure its being used without competing with our western grains. The Minister seems to think that is possible, and in that case he could permit it to be introduced on the free list.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the price of that corn you mention?

Gen. LAURIE. We have usually paid a dollar a bushel for it. Now, I agree with my hon. friend from West Bruce that this is not altogether a question for the large farmers. We want to see it more largely introduced among the small farmers, and the concession to them of such a boon as this would encourage them to grow it more largely and would conduce to the benefit of agriculture. I trust, therefore, that the hint thrown out by the Minister of Customs will bear fruit, and that he will see his way to have this article placed on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the debate closes it may not be amiss for me to say a word with reference to the resolution before the House. As has been pointed out by my colleague, the Minister of Customs, the resolution itself is a very indefinite and unsatisfactory one, and, in its present state, I do not see that it could pass at all, or that, if it passed, it would be workable. I think the House has listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion which has arisen on this question, and the ideas that have been put forth by practical farmers and those who have been in the habit of using this corn. After the discussion, I think two things are quite evident: first, the unsatisfactory nature of this resolution; and, secondly, the small amount of duty which is involved on the corn which has been under discussion; that is, if it could be confined entirely to the purpose which the hon. gentleman mentioned, for seed only. From what fell from the lips of hon. gentlemen who have discussed the question, it would appear that this corn is a valuable one for the purposes of silo, and that it is valuable in itself for food purposes as well. I think I may say that the discussion will not be without profit, and it is a matter which is well worth looking into; and if the Minister of Customs, after having looked into it, finds that it is one that he can deal with in justice to all parties concerned, and if it can be confined in that way, I am sure that he and myself will give it all the consideration that we possibly can.

Mr. PLATT. I am very glad indeed to find that the resolution has drawn forth so much information upon the subject from practical farmers. I likewise am pleased to observe the favorable manner in which it has been received by the Minister of Finance, and I trust that the future may prove that he is sincere in his desire to do something in the direction laid down in this resolution. As to the unsatisfactory character of the resolution, I may state that it was purposely made broad in order to cover the whole ground. This, of course, is not to become law, and if the House considers the resolution unsatisfactory I can see no reason why, if there be a disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to consider the question favorably, the House should not go into committee and make such amendments to the resolution as would meet the case and make it workable. I do not think that the argument of its being a small question is one that can at all be raised with success in this House. It may be small at present, but this is only the beginning. Although the Minister of Customs may consider it a small matter, it is not so small in the eyes of the farmers. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs seem to have a strong suspicion that this is not asked for in the interests of the farmer, inasmuch as the farmers have not petitioned for it, and that as it is the work of a politician, therefore it loses importance in their eyes. I took care in my opening remarks to disabuse the House of any such idea as these hon. gentlemen entertain. I can assure the Minister of Customs that I put this question upon the paper without consulting any of my friends on this side of the House. It was placed there by a requisition received from the vice-president of the Creamery Association of Eastern Ontario, and I have received strong and pressing letters in regard to it from farmers of various parts of the country. I am very sure that the unsatisfactory character of the resolution mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite consists, in their eyes, in the difficulty they have in getting round it. It is impossible for the Minister of Customs, with all his ingenuity, to show that it constitutes any attack whatever upon the National Policy. When he states that it is part of a piecemeal attack upon that policy, he states that which he does not know; I am in possession of the facts, and I can assure the House there is no such intention on my part. The Postmaster General, who took part in this debate, seems to think that corn ripened in this

country is all that is necessary for the purpose mentioned. The hon. gentleman must have a very poor idea, indeed, of the farmers in his section, and in other sections, if, when they can secure as good results by using corn ripening here as by importing foreign corn, they will pay \$1 or \$1.25 per bushel for the imported corn, while they can get the home-grown at about half. The Minister of Customs, of course, says it is impracticable, that the proposition cannot be carried out easily. I suppose the interests of the farmer must always give way to the ease and comfort of the Customs Department. We find the Minister has no difficulty in arranging matters in the department when he sees fit to place a tax on goods used by the farmers, but when a proposition is made to remove a tax it is a very difficult matter to carry it into effect; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he cannot see his way clear to make such arrangements in his department as to make it practicable to carry out such a proposition, he might just as well give place to some one who would take hold of the matter and make the Customs Department a success. At all events, it is unfair to the farmers that their interests should be sacrificed to the comfort and ease of the management of the Customs Department. I know there are some matters respecting which it is very difficult to see how they can be managed, but the Minister succeeds in even very small matters indeed to make his department workable. He did not find any difficulty whatever when the duty was imposed on peach baskets; and yet he finds great difficulty in meeting a proposition for the removal of the Customs duties on the articles mentioned in this resolution. With regard to the varieties of seeds that come into question, I may say to hon. gentlemen opposite that I am sufficiently acquainted with the facts to justify me in stating what varieties would be required by the farmers for the purpose indicated. But the farmers are experimenting, and ere long they will come to some conclusion as to which variety is most profitable. The varieties I have mentioned will, during the present season, come under experiment by our farmers, and if it is decided that only one variety should be admitted free, then the House, on going into committee, could name the variety, and the Minister of Customs would have the privilege of moving such amendment as he might think necessary to make the resolution practicable. The Minister of Customs considers this a very small and trifling matter, and because it is a very small and trifling matter, it must be rejected. We have asked large concessions in the interests of the farmer and those have been rejected by hon. gentlemen opposite because they were large, and I suppose if we should propose something that is neither small nor large it would be rejected for a similar reason. There is always a good and sufficient excuse why anything asked in the interests of the farmers should be rejected by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), saw in this a very great inroad into the National Policy. He thought corn introduced for soiling and ensilage purposes could be used for feed, and he told the House, which is a very strange statement for the hon. gentleman to have made, that he would be able to import corn of this character, and sell it to the farmers of his country for pig feed or something of that kind. I do not know how the hon. gentleman could justify such a proposition, for I suppose he would have to go to the Customs house and make some declaration as to the character of his importation; but the same hon. gentleman told us, I think last Session, that some years ago he imported barley from the American side, and shipped it back to the States as Canadian barley, and thereby made a profit. I suppose the hon. gentleman is so apt in commerce, that he could, by some hook or crook, bring grain in for ensilage purposes and sell it for pig feed. But the farmers of this country would find out after a time, that it was rather expensive to pay for such food \$1 or \$1.25 per bushel, when they could obtain the home-grown for a

very much smaller sum, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Finance, as well as the Minister of Customs, seems to look upon this question as one out of which something might perhaps grow for the advantage of the farmer. I wish to state to those hon. gentlemen that the farmers are expecting something at their hands. Last week the farmers of Frontenac met in their institute and passed a resolution, unanimously, in very much the same terms as the motion I have submitted to this House, and the same occurred in the county of Lennox. If this is such a very small matter, I do not understand why the farmers of these counties have taken up this question and passed such resolutions as I have indicated. Farmers of that section of the country suffered very severely from the severe drought of last summer, and they have been put to their wits end to procure food for the present winter. The Minister of Customs gave relief under those trying circumstances by placing a duty upon millet seed. The farmers remember that, and the hon. gentleman might make some restitution for the wrong done the farmers on that occasion by granting free seed for ensilage purposes in the future. I have only to repeat that I cannot understand why, if hon. gentlemen opposite are really anxious that any portion of this resolution should pass, they are unwilling to go into committee and see what would come out of it. What is required to be done for the farmers might as well be done now, and it is no use waiting until next Session. A large quantity of seed is being now imported and a larger quantity will be imported next year, and there is no reason why the farmers should not have the advantage of immediate action on the part of this House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I was very sorry I was not present to hear the entire discussion on this motion, but from the attention I have been able to give to this subject, I consider that the question of ensilage is going to work a revolution among the farmers in this country. During the last few years great strides have been made to that end, and it is eminently in the interests of the farmers that they should give more attention to this subject. The great droughts in the last two seasons have placed the farmers in such a position that they must obtain some means of obtaining more fodder for their cattle during the winter, and everything possible should be done for the farmers' interests. In my own district the drought was so great that nearly all the hay was lost and there was a great scarcity of fodder. The consequence has been that the whole country has almost become denuded of live stock. Thousands of young calves and yearlings have been exported from the country, and it will take us years before we can make up the loss. I have been advising the farmers to look more into the subject of ensilage, because it is by that means they are going to provide against dry summers. This fodder corn which is the subject of the debate can be grown in dry seasons, in fact the dryer the better, and it is such a productive crop that farmers can raise from 25 to 30 tons to the acre, and five tons will keep a cow for 200 days, that is to say, that the crop grown from each acre will support five or six cows. Anyone who looks at the subject in that light will see how much more efficient it will prove as an article of food than hay or straw or any other food, and that it is a cheaper food than any that can otherwise be obtained. If this is the case, I think it is the duty of the Government to assist the farmers and encourage them to introduce this corn and ensilage system, and encourage them in trying to grow the corn, and I repeat that in the next five or ten years there will be a perfect revolution in our system of feeding in that respect. All through Ontario now greater attention is given to dairy farming than ever before, and the dairy products of this country

Mr. PLATT.

as we know have progressed in the last few years by leaps and bounds, until to-day the exportation of animals and their products is ahead of the export of the products of our forests, which for many years stood at the top of the list. If the Minister of Customs and the Government could be induced to admit this corn free of duty they would be doing a great service to the farming community. I understand the Minister of Customs has pointed out some objections to adopting this course, but I think those objections could be overcome. If twines and salt for the use of our fisheries can be introduced free of duty, I think that corn for seeding and grain for fodder purposes could also be introduced free, and a regulation of the department could be made which would guarantee that corn will not be introduced for feeding purposes but simply for seeding. Just as simple a resolution could be made in this respect as is made for the introduction free of duty of other articles for the benefit of our fisheries and ship-building industries. I submit that if the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance will put their heads together, they will be able to devise, within twenty-four hours, a resolution which will meet the object in view of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt).

Mr. McNEILL. This is clearly purely a farmer's question. I take it that the reason why we have a duty on corn to-day is in order to protect our farmers. If the permission to import this special sweet corn free of duty would on the whole be of benefit to the farmer, I have no doubt that those who are in favor of the National Policy, and who have introduced this policy in reference to corn for the purpose of protecting the farmer, would, as a matter of course, readily agree to allow this sweet corn to come in free of duty. The simple question which we have to consider in this House—those who are debating this question, those who are themselves farmers, and those who desire to benefit the farmers—is whether or not the admission of sweet corn free of duty would be a benefit or an injury to the farmers of Canada. There is no doubt, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has said, that the question of ensilage is becoming one of the foremost questions of agriculture. It is indeed likely to revolutionise agriculture, and if the importation of sweet corn free of duty would very much benefit the farmer who is engaged in growing green fodder to be cut down and put in silo, it would no doubt be a good thing for us to put it on the free list. How much would it be likely to benefit the farmers of Canada if we had this policy adopted which my hon. friend (Mr. Platt) has suggested? Suppose a farmer grows, say, to the extent of five acres of sweet corn and sows one bushel of seed to the acre. If he gets his sweet corn free of duty it would make a difference to him of something less than forty cents all told. Five acres for each farmer, as I think my hon. friend for West Bruce (Mr. Rowand) and my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) who have spoken in this debate, will agree, is a very large allowance to make at the present day. I think my hon. friend from West Bruce had probably not more than one or two acres under this crop last year; but we will suppose each farmer grows five acres and then the amount of gain would be less than forty cents for each. If this sweet corn for feeding purposes should come in free of duty, the effect of that upon the farmers of Ontario would be a depreciation in the value of all their coarse grains, and for the sake of a saving of at most forty cents they would have a depreciation in the value of their oats and of all their coarse grains. Therefore, I think that it is a very serious question which we are brought face to face with here to-night. We have not merely to see that it would be a benefit to the farmer if he saved the forty cents, but we have to consider whether in endeavoring to save that forty cents we might not run the risk of injuring the farmer to a greater extent.

I think the hon. the Minister of Customs, who has told us that the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration, and endeavor to discover whether or not this importation of sweet corn free of duty can be safely allowed in the interest of the farmer, is following the course which wisdom would direct.

Mr. CASEY. I have only two or three words to say on this question. It is not one particularly concerning any special locality in Canada but it concerns the whole country. As I understand the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) he does not ask the free admission of any corn or seed which ripens in Canada. Therefore, I think that the admission of any kind of seed grain which is not grown in Canada cannot in any way interfere with the protection which the National Policy is supposed to give Canadian farmers. On that ground it seems to me that all the possible objections that supporters of the National Policy can have to the putting of those articles on the free list, are swept away and it only remains to ask whether this free admission of seed grain would benefit the farmers of Canada. It seems to me perfectly clear that this policy would not hurt the farmers and the only question remaining is would it do them any good? I think that every farmer will answer that question in the affirmative. Nearly every farmer wants to grow corn of different kinds for ensilage, and every year some new kind of corn or forage crop comes into use. It is clear that by the admission of seed grain of a kind which does not grow in this country free of duty would be of immense benefit to the farmers all over, and would be no detriment whatever to the farmers in any particular locality. I cannot see any excuse whatever for refusing to pass the motions put forward by my hon. friends from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) and from Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Unless the members on the other side of the House are going to declare that they will not under any circumstance show a favor to the farmer, even in the case where no other farmer can be injured by the granting of that favor, they must logically support this motion. I think that these plain facts will come home so strongly to the members of the Administration that they will, on mature thought, grant what is asked on this occasion. I cannot conceive how they can do otherwise consistently with their professed principles as supporters of the National Policy, one of the principles of which is to admit free of duty raw material for any industry where it does not come into competition with existing industries in Canada. There can be no pretence that this seed, which is a raw material for the farmer who wishes to feed cattle, does come into competition with any corn grown in Canada, since the motion expressly states that nothing which comes into such competition is to be admitted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Judging from the tone of this discussion, many members of the House appear to think that the passage of this resolution would be considerably in the interest of the farming community. Several members who support the Government have even held that something of this kind is necessary. The hon. Minister of Customs, while giving a *quasi* admission to the truth of this, sets up the idea that it would be impracticable to carry the resolution out. It does seem to me a little singular that when the farmers ask for the adoption of any measure calculated to advance their interests, the objection set up by the Government is that it is impracticable to carry it out. If the manufacturer of corn-starch desires to get free corn for the purpose of manufacturing his product, the Minister of Customs has no difficulty in giving it to him; if the distiller desires free corn for the purpose of making whiskey, the impracticable nature of the thing is at once forgotten by the Minister of Customs; but when the farmer desires free corn, some of the supporters of the Government say it is only a

small matter, and why should the farmers ask it? Well, if it is such a small matter, why should the distiller or the manufacturer of corn-starch require it? And these hon. gentlemen hold up their hands with horror and say that if the farmers require this measure so that they can fatten their cattle, and produce more beef in the country, and ship it out of the country, the difficulty will be that it will lower the price of their coarse grains. I have examined this question to some extent, and I find that the prices of coarse grains always stood at the highest point when we imported the greatest quantity. The price of coarse grains has been very much lower since duties have been imposed on them than it was before. Taking oats, we find that before the duty was imposed in 1875, we exported a large quantity of oats, and we also imported a large quantity; and yet during that year we sold our oats at 43 cents a bushel; in 1876 we sold them at 43 cents, and in 1877 at 35 cents; an average price in those three years of 42 $\frac{2}{3}$  cents a bushel. Hon. gentlemen opposite got into power and placed a duty on oats, saying that they would obtain a higher price to the farmer for his oats. Look at the result: In 1885 we sold them at 37 cents a bushel, a falling off of 11 cents; in 1886 we sold them at 35 cents, a falling off of 13 cents; and in 1887 we sold them at 31 cents, a falling off of 17 cents a bushel, or an average price of 34 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents during those three years; so that the duty has been a great disadvantage to the farmers so far as coarse grains are concerned. This proves that the greatest benefit the Government could do the farmer would be to strike off the duty on these things altogether. The farmers are moving in this question. The farmers of Frontenac had an institute a few weeks ago, at which they asked that the measure now proposed should be given to the farmers to facilitate the fattening of stock; and I see by to-night's paper that the farmers of Lennox have also passed a resolution unanimously asking for the same thing; and if the Minister of Customs is not able to administer the department so as to meet the wishes of this large class and give them free corn, he should resign and allow a man to be placed there who would do so. I think there are gentlemen on this side of the House, and perhaps on the other side also, who could administer that department so as to give relief to this large, influential and important class in the community; but under the present system only the manufacturing classes are considered. When a matter of interest to the farmers of Canada is brought up, hon. gentlemen opposite set up a bugaboo, and say it is an insignificant question, a mean question, although experience shows that the protective policy has been a failure in raising the price of coarse grains or any other grains in the country. We have never known a period in Canada when coarse grains were sold at as low prices as they have been since we have had protection, and it is only natural that it should be so. That policy sets certain restrictions on the trade, and creates difficulties of every kind. I hope this matter will be seriously considered by the Government and the House, and that the Government will see their way to granting this very reasonable, just and proper request—one calculated to do a very great benefit to the farming community, and to bring about a system whereby failures in the crops from dry weather, or anything interfering with the grass production of the country, can be compensated by this system of ensilage which is being so largely adopted by the farmers. In my part of the country the farmers are growing a great deal of corn in this way for the purpose of feeding to their cattle in dry weather; and I think it is the duty of this House to do everything it can to benefit the farmers and increase the general wealth of the country.

Mr. HESSON. I do not think any hon. gentleman should be allowed to get off a speech like that without someone replying to him. He evidently made a bold effort to show that the price of oats had very greatly depreciated in

Canada in consequence of the National Policy. If his speech meant anything, it meant that. If the hon. gentleman had been disposed to give a fair statement of the case, which both sides of the House might naturally expect from him, he would have quoted the price on the American side at the same time as the price in Canada. He left the impression that oats had declined in price under the National Policy from 11 to 15 cents a bushel. He will find that the price of oats is very considerably greater in Canada than in the States, and that ought to go to the country with the hon. gentleman's statement—that oats are selling in Canada at 7 cents a bushel to-day more than in the United States. In Buffalo they are worth 30 and 31 cents per bushel, and in Toronto 37 to 38 cents. Hon. gentlemen will see there is a difference in favor of Canada of 7 cents a bushel. The same remark will apply to Chicago, only the difference will be still more in favor of Canada. If the duty were removed from oats to-day, I would ask whether the same state of affairs would not exist now that existed before, when oats were cheaper in Canada than in the United States. I will not deny that it would be an advantage to the farmers to have admitted free that particular kind of corn which they require for the purpose of ensilage, and if that could be done consistently with protection to coarse grains, I would be strongly in favor of doing it. I feel that that concession ought to be made, but if it cannot be made except at the cost of the coarse grains and corn, it would cost the farmer too much. I am quite in accord with the wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides, if it could be done without injuring the policy that has been adopted of keeping out the American coarse grains, but it would cost the farmer too much to permit 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 bushels of American corn to come in here free, possibly under the guise of coming in as seed. The more you look at this question the more important it becomes, because the enormous product of an acre of ensilage is perhaps more important to the farmer than any other crop he can grow. I believe the Government can by Order in Council manage to permit that to come in free. The hon. the Minister will understand the strong feeling there is on both sides in reference to this question; and it is after all a small concession to make in the interest of the farmers of the country. If that can be done, I hope the Minister will see his way to allowing that special kind of corn which cannot ripen in this country to come in free.

Mr. GILLMOR. I listened with a great deal of alarm to some of the speeches made on this question. The condition of the farming interest must be very bad if the extremes of this Dominion are as bad as hon. gentlemen state they are. Why, in the North-West, pretty near harvest time, the frost comes and strikes the wheat, and more than half the wheat is destroyed; and in the county of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) the drought is so great that the hay crop is all destroyed, and the cattle must be in a state of starvation. Well, I was never but once in that part of the Dominion, and if the cattle are poorer or any more miserable looking now than when I was there, there cannot be much of them left. I live in New Brunswick. I sowed some red eared and horse-tooth corn from which I expected to get a fine crop, but the frost touched it, and nothing under heaven could eat it. Part of my crop was barley and buckwheat, and on account of rains I could not get it housed for eight weeks after it was cut. In the meantime, my buckwheat floated all over 100 acres, and all I could save was what was stopped by the alders on the shore from going out into the Bay of Fundy. I planted an acre of barley too, and the rain came on before I got that in, and the barley and the buckwheat were all mingled together in the treshet. I went over in a boat to try and get my potatoes out, and to put my arm down at whole length before I could seize a stock of that edible, and as to the barley I sailed right over it. It was four feet  
Mr. HESSON.

high, and the water was above that again. I mention these facts to show what condition the country must be in when you find the eastern end and the west and the centre in the condition in which they have been depicted to-night. I am not exaggerating about my crop at any rate, for it had been eight weeks out under the rain. I wish my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) had part of that rain, because then he would have had some hay and I would have had some buckwheat. I do not rise so much to speak about the crops as to refer to what the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has said. The other night, while we were discussing something in which the National Policy was concerned, he represented the National Policy as a most beautiful edifice, and I thought I discovered a tear running down his cheeks when somebody proposed to make a change. Not one brick, he said, was to be taken out of that beautiful structure, but now he wants a change made if it can possibly be done, but it cannot without taking a brick out of that beautiful structure. I tried in my mind to look at that edifice. In the first place I imagined an edifice which sheltered everyone who contributed to build it. But while I was speaking, I thought of the different interests that occupy this edifice. In the upper storey, with the most costly furnishings, I put the sugar interest; and I saw Mr. Drummond there in all his glory, in his purple and fine linen. Then I went over all the different parts of the edifice, and I found the farmers down in the kitchen, or out in the barn, or in the cellars, while the cotton men and the sugar men and the woollen men had all the comfortable apartments. All the others had nothing to shelter them; the frosts in winter nipped them and the rains in summer beat upon them. In regard to this corn matter the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was willing to do something. But he spoke like a man in mourning, and said it would not do to break into the National Policy. If you are going he said, to break into this beautiful structure to let in a few bushels of corn so that the population of Frontenac, when the sun leaves them without hay, will have something to feed their cattle, why not let other things come in free. I have trespassed too long upon your time, but I think this National Policy has proved a complete failure, and it is simply ridiculous to hear folks talk about it in the way they do, that it is going to affect the price of oats, and the price of buckwheat, and the price of barley, and in regard to allowing a few bushels of seed corn, which you cannot grow here, to come in without paying a duty upon it. It will come in in any case. The duty of 7½ cents is not much, and, if the farmers are as rich as they are supposed to be, and as our Conservative friends say they are, they can easily afford to pay that rather than break in upon this great edifice of the National Policy.

Mr. BOWELL. It was not my intention to address the House again on the subject, but, after the discussion which has taken place, I hope my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) will withdraw his motion. I have already stated that the discussion having been confined almost exclusively to the one article of corn, and that of a particular quality which does not ripen in this country, and has not been extended to the other grains and seeds mentioned in the resolution, the subject will receive the attention of the Government, and that has been repeated by my colleague the Finance Minister. I do not hesitate to say that the Government could not accept the resolution in its entirety, but, if the hon. gentleman does not press it to a vote, the matter will receive consideration, and, if the Government find that it will not interfere with other industries which we believe to be in the farmers' interests, it will be dealt with. That is as far as I can go. I congratulate my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) on the facetious manner in which he dealt with the subject,

and still more on the manner in which he repeated almost every argument and every word uttered by the hon. member for Prince Edward. If he was as apt a scholar when he was at school in repeating his lessons as he is in this House, in repeating what others say, I should not be surprised if he stood at the head of his class.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg to say that I was not in the House—

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman says he did not hear the remarks of the hon. member for Prince Edward, I must withdraw my compliment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say I was not in the House when the hon. member spoke.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I suppose it is another illustration of the saying that great minds run in the same channel. I find, by reference to the newspaper, that, on 16th March, at Chicago, oats were quoted at 24 cents, that they were at that amount for the whole month, and that the highest price and the lowest price during the month was 24 cents. In Toronto, to-day, the 18th March, I find that oats continue easy. Light quality are quoted at 33 and 35 cents and the heavy quality at 37 to 39 cents. If the duty were taken off, we would have the market flooded with American oats, and that might satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not speak of the present time, but took the three years comparatively.

Mr. PLATT. I have no disposition to antagonise the hon. gentlemen opposite, or to make them do anything which is not in the interest of the farmer. Personally, I would like to see this principle adopted by the carrying of the resolution, but if the hon. gentleman will promise that these seeds shall come in during the present season free of duty, and not make any indefinite promise in regard to the distant future, I have no objection to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, RICHMOND, N. S.

Mr. FLYNN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and surveys in connection with the L'Ardoise Breakwater, in the County of Richmond.

He said: In regard to this motion, I must go back as far as 17 years ago, when the construction of a breakwater at this place occupied the attention of the Government. At that time, the late Mr. Levesconte represented the County of Richmond, and the people of L'Ardoise were urging the necessity of a breakwater there. The present Minister of Public Works was then in the same position, and he agreed that a breakwater there was necessary, and promised to place an amount of \$30,000 in the Estimates to construct that work. In proof of that, I will read from a letter written at that time by Mr. Levesconte to a gentleman at L'Ardoise. He said:

"I am now happy to inform you that the Minister of Public Works has just come to a point with me on that subject, and has promised to place in the Supplementary Estimates for this year the sum of \$30,000 for that purpose, and that the contracts will be offered to competition as soon as the engineer of this Government can report."

I read that in order to show that the Minister of Public Works was committed to the construction of a breakwater at this point, and, no doubt, if he had continued in office, he would have carried out his promise, but, the Government having resigned in the fall of that year, he was unable to do so. When I came here first in 1874, I found a report in the department from the engineer and a plan of survey in regard to this place. It was estimated that the cost of this work would be about \$60,000, but the chief engineer reported that the work could be built by sections, and the money could be voted for it as the sections were built. The

Minister of Public Works at that time, the present hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), agreed to build a section, and in 1875 a sum of \$10,000 was voted by Parliament; and, in the winter of 1876, a further sum of \$5,000 was voted; and in the following year a section about 400 feet in length was completed. I need not say that the completion of that section was a great accommodation to the people of that district, and to the boats and to the fishermen of that place until 1883, when the top of the breakwater was carried away by one of the heaviest gales which had ever been known on that coast, except the memorable gale of 1873. I think that it was the duty of the Government to see from time to time whether that breakwater, situated as it was in an exposed place, required repairs. We know that the action of the ice, the action of the worm on all those wooden structures, are continually wasting them away, and they continually require repair. I can show that, in this instance, the Government are culpable in not repairing that breakwater when its condition was officially brought to their notice by the engineer of their own department, who told them that the work was getting weak, and unless it was immediately repaired it would be destroyed. Now here is a copy of the report of the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, dated Ottawa, 6th February, 1883. He says:

"During 1876-77, a breakwater 400 feet in length was built by the department at L'Ardoise, Richmond County, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, at a cost of \$10,330. An examination of this structure lately made shows that the portion of the work below the line of half tide has been badly damaged by the sea-worm, and is in a very weakened state, and liable to serious damage at any time by gales or ice. To protect and preserve this work which afford the only shelter for fishing boats and vessels on the L'Ardoise shore, it will be necessary to place about 5,000 cubic yards of heavy stone in the form of slopes all around it, as shown in the plans herewith, the cost of which will amount to \$5,000, and I have to recommend that the work be proceeded with as it is not in fit state to withstand a heavy gale. With respect to any further works at L'Ardoise, I have to refer you to my report of the 14th October, 1873, No. 35,488, which contains a comprehensive scheme of which a part has been executed, for the construction of a harbor of refuge."

Now, here we have the chief engineer of the department bringing to the notice of the Minister the condition of this work in February, 1883, and informing him that, unless it was instantly repaired, it was liable to be carried away at any moment. Sir, the Minister of Public Works did not listen to this notice from his engineer, and the result was that in the autumn of that year the top part of that structure was carried away, and it has not been repaired since. In 1884 the Minister placed \$5,000 in the Estimates for the repair of that work, and that sum was voted by Parliament. Now, before I go any further in this matter, let me say that although this may not be a matter that interests many members of this House, it is a very important one to the people of that town. Now, I believe, according to the Rules of Parliament, at all events, according to common courtesy, when a member is addressing the House, hon. members are supposed to keep quiet and not move about the House. At least that is the rule that I have seen observed in the Provincial Legislature of Nova Scotia, and I think it ought to be observed here. As I was saying in 1884 Parliament voted \$5,000 for the repair of this breakwater, but not a dollar of that sum was expended by the Government. I have been told, unofficially, that the reason the money was not spent, was that it would take \$20,000 to build a structure that would stand. Well, if it did cost \$20,000, or if it cost \$40,000, I still think the Government were bound to build it. I have shown you that fifteen years ago the then Minister of Public Works, now the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) saw the need of building that work, and a sum was placed in the Estimates, and I believe that hon. gentleman would have carried out the work had he remained in power. It is now over five years since this breakwater was damaged, and you have made no effort to repair it. Now, I hold that a public structure like that was of sufficient importance for the Government to keep it in repair.



You have a breakwater at Cow Bay and similar structures in other parts of the Maritime Provinces. They are from time to time damaged or injured by the action of the ice, but the Government does not allow them to go down; they are continually kept in repair, as the Government contracted to do at the time of Confederation. If the Dominion Government had not undertaken this duty they would have been kept in repair by the Local Government, but having come under the control of the Government of the Dominion I say it was their bounden duty to keep them in repair. Sir, I am at a loss to understand why this money that was voted by Parliament, has not been expended. Is it because I, who represent that constituency, sit on the left of the Speaker and vote with the Opposition? Sir, I hope that no such unworthy considerations influence the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, but I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that there is no other reason for the conduct of the Government, when I see, Session after Session, a persistent denial of simple justice and fair play to those counties who are represented in this House by members sitting on the Opposition side of the House. Sir, I remember at the time of Confederation we were told a different story. We were assured that under Confederation a broad and liberal-minded policy would prevail, free from sectional influence. We were told that the leaders of the Federal Government would take a broad view of public questions, and that they would consider the interests of every part of the country. I remember reading at that time a letter written by a distinguished gentleman who now occupies the position of High Commissioner at London, addressed to Earl Carnarvon in 1867. There was no class of people who were urged more strongly than the fishermen of Nova Scotia to enter Confederation, and to whom great promises were made. It was pointed out to them that their harbors were exposed to the Atlantic, that their shipping had not adequate protection, and that if the people entered Confederation the Federal Government would build breakwaters, and give all the marine protection necessary. These arguments were specially addressed to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and they were induced to accept Confederation by means of the promises. I will read to you an extract of the letter from Sir Charles Tupper to Earl Carnarvon:

"No one in the least acquainted with political science can doubt, that just in proportion as you extend the field of enterprise, and the minds of public men are occupied with large and important questions the moral status will be elevated and the intellect exalted above the narrow personal party, sectional and sectarian influences that often detract so much from the character of those upon whom the conduct of public affairs is devolved."

Now, Sir, these were the promises that were held out then, but they have not been fulfilled. We have seen that the enlarged and liberal views spoken of by Sir Charles Tupper, have not characterised the present Government of the Dominion. If a breakwater at that point was necessary at the time it was built, it is much more necessary now, because the population of that locality has increased; having once had the advantage of that breakwater during a certain period, they have now lost that advantage through the destruction of the work. I am asking for the repair of a work that was built by the Government, and I have a right to know what excuse the Minister has to offer, when, on the matter being brought officially to his notice, in 1883, no action was taken, and when at that time the old adage would have proved true "a stitch in time saves nine," and the work could have been carried out at much less cost. There is another important reason why this breakwater should not be allowed to remain any longer in its present condition. If the people of other localities failed to obtain the construction of breakwaters they were at least free from having a very long shoal created there. The situation is easily understood when it is remembered that 400 feet of breakwater was built, and the top part of it at tide water

Mr. FLYNN.

was eaten by sea worms to such an extent that it was carried away, while the remainder remains there as a dangerous shoal. Those acquainted with our coast are aware that during the summer months fog occurs almost every day. Our fishermen have this dangerous ledge to contend with, a ledge formed by the carelessness and lack of attention on the part of the Government in repairing this work. Buoys had to be erected there, and fishing smacks have been lost and lives endangered. If there were nothing else, that fact should induce the Government at once to have this structure repaired. I think if there is any class of our population that deserves the consideration of the Government it is our fishermen. This will be manifest to anyone who knows the hardships to which these men are exposed in their daily toil, the limited period during the twelve months in which they are able to work, because, taking the fishing season as extending from 1st June to 1st November, and excluding stormy days when they are not able to go out, there are not more than five months in which a fisherman can work to provide for his family. Since the breakwater was destroyed at this place, the fishermen have been compelled on the appearance of a southerly or south easterly storm to haul up their boats beyond the action of the sea, and after the storm has subsided they have launched them again, in doing which a day is always lost. Thus it is that the want of this breakwater in a completed and satisfactory state is a very serious loss to the fishermen in prosecuting their calling. I might speak further on this subject, but it is not necessary. The Minister knows that I am not asking for any particular favor. I would not ask for a new structure in that part of the county, for it would be refused; but I may tell the hon. gentleman that it is only right, it is only fair that this structure should be repaired, a structure on which over \$10,000 has been expended and in regard to which the hon. gentleman promised to place \$30,000 in the Estimates, while the leader of the late Government (Mr. Mackenzie) recognising the necessity for the work and having made surveys and obtained plans, determined to carry out the work at a cost of \$60,000. That hon. gentleman constructed 400 feet of the work at a cost of \$ 0,000, a portion of which has been carried away from the neglect of the Department of Public Works, and after it had been officially brought to its notice by the engineer, I hold the Minister responsible for its present condition. But, had this matter never been brought to the notice of the Minister of Public Works, had its present condition resulted from the action of the sea, or from the destructiveness of the sea worm, or from any other cause whatsoever, I maintain that it was the imperative duty of the department, on the condition of the work being reported, to have made the repairs, just as much as it was its duty to make repairs at Cow Bay, or at any other breakwater in the Maritime Provinces, or on any public building erected by the Government out of the money of the taxpayers. I have brought this matter before the House and the Minister, I have discharged my duty to my constituents, and I trust the Minister of Public Works will be animated by a spirit of fair play, and, late though it be, that he will place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates sufficient to place the breakwater in a proper state of repair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may be perfectly true that Mr. Levesconte, I think the hon. gentleman's predecessor in the representation of the county, may have said and written that he had seen me and I had told him I would submit a vote of \$30,000 to my colleagues to be placed in the Estimates. I do not remember the matter at this time, but if Mr. Levesconte says that, no doubt he says what is correct. But in regard to that proposed vote, what happened has happened many times since in regard to a public work, that while the Estimates submitted to the Privy Council included such supplementary estimate, that

estimate remained there. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, admit that the Minister has no right to promise that \$30,000 would be voted; he may say that he will submit to his colleagues that proposition, but he cannot say more. The hon. gentleman, therefore, may be sure I did not, and I do not at any time promise more than that. It appears that, later on—I do not remember to what period the hon. gentleman referred, 1872 I think—in 1876, under the Government of my predecessor in office, there was a vote of \$10,000 taken, and I think the hon. gentleman has said there was another vote of \$5,000 taken the following year, and the wharf was built to the extent of 400 feet. The hon. gentleman finds fault with this Government because that wharf after five or six years was so damaged by the sea worms that a large portion of it was carried away. The difficulty in regard to wharves in that portion of the Dominion is that the sea worms destroy them in five or six years, sometimes in four years, and, therefore, the department has been endeavoring to devise some means by which piers and wharves in that portion of the country might be built to a certain extent out of the reach of the sea worms. The matter was submitted to my chief engineer, and at one or two wharves where there was a sufficiently large sum of money voted, he tried whether by some process, which I cannot now describe, the timber used might be put out of the reach of the sea worms, and he succeeded I think in two instances, but it was a very costly process. I was speaking the other day to the chief engineer as to whether we could not incur that expense in regard to other large works, and thus save them for ten, twelve or fifteen years instead of having to rebuild them every four or five years. We cannot do it in regard to small works, but in regard to large works I think it can be accomplished. This matter is now being investigated by my department. The hon. gentleman said that I did not listen to the representation made by my hon. friend. Well, I am afraid my hon. friend speaks of what he cannot know anything about. He draws his conclusion, because he says that no action apparently has been taken. He says I have not taken any action on that, and that my colleagues after considering the matter have not thought that the matter should proceed further. Of course I am responsible with my colleagues, and I take the responsibility with them, but I think it is a statement against the Minister of Public Works that my hon. friend might have avoided. The hon. gentleman would wish that I should put in the Supplementary Estimates this year an item for the purpose in question. All I can tell him is that I will call the attention of my colleagues to the discussion that took place here this evening. Beyond that I can tell him nothing more, because, of course, we will have to take that into consideration. The hon. gentleman in his motion, to which I think there will be no objection if he only limits it, says that he wants,—

“Copies of all correspondence and surveys in connection with the L'Ardoise Breakwater, in the County of Richmond.”

Perhaps he has forgotten that on the 13th of March, 1888, all papers on this matter were brought down in obedience to an Order of the House of Commons. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should add to his motion for a return of the papers since the 13th of March, 1888.

Mr. FLYNN. Very well. I am perfectly willing that that should be added.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Whatever representation is made to the Government respecting the expenditure of money on breakwaters, or other matters that come under the charge of the Department of Public Works, the Minister is always sure to shield himself under the excuse he has offered to my friend to-night for having neglected assistance to a valuable public work in his county. The hon. Minister has informed us, on more than one occasion, that he always presents these recommendations to his brethren of the Privy

Council with his own views on the subject, and he has told us that on this, as on many previous occasions, that when those applications from his department came out of the Privy Council, he found very often and to his very great regret that many of them are left out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is a most singular coincidence in connection with this hon. gentleman's recommendations that we always find that when those recommendations made by that hon. gentleman to the Privy Council pass through a final examination; that those that come out recommended are recommended for counties which are represented by gentlemen supporting the Administration, and that those which are rejected are thrown out because I must assume they belong to counties, and are not intended to be expended, which are represented by gentlemen on the Opposition side of this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says it is not so. I think he would fail to establish more than perhaps one solitary case during the last ten years, where money has been expended for the county unless it has been represented by gentlemen supporting the Administration to which he belongs. We have had that question fully threshed out on previous occasions and I do not propose to go into it again to-night, but it has been proved here that county after county represented by gentlemen on our side of the House have failed to obtain the slightest appropriation for public works, merely because they were not supporting the Administration of my hon. friend. Take the County of Shelburne for instance; it was represented in this House for a long time by Mr. Robertson, and year after year and Session after Session that hon. member made application to the Government of the day for a needed appropriation of money for his county in the public interest, but these applications were all refused, and not a cent was granted. Time went on and Mr. Robertson was succeeded by the present worthy representative from Shelburne in this House, and the first session we saw that hon. gentleman here, we found a large appropriation of money for that county. I do not mean to say that those works were not required, far from it, but I do say that the same appropriation that had been asked for by the previous member had always been refused until Shelburne returned a member to support the Administration. Take the case of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk). Year after year he has told us in the House that he has made a similar application to the Department of the Minister of Public Works, but year after year he has been refused in the same way. In Queen's County it was the same story, until Queen's returned a member to support the present Administration, and then we found a change and the Government all at once realised the importance of Queen's County and granted an appropriation for that county. Take the County of Antigonish. Antigonish had the misfortune it would seem for a long time to be represented on the Liberal side of the House here, and, of course, the representations made by the former representative of that county went in with the rest before the Privy Council and always came out among those not granted. But time went on and Antigonish was represented by the present hon. Minister of Justice. Then look what a marked change came across the dreams of the Government. The very first year the Minister of Justice took charge of the affairs of Antigonish we found a large appropriation for that county, and each succeeding year it was the same thing. I hold in my hands the return of the Minister of Public Works for last year, and in that County of Antigonish—a fine little agricultural county it is quite true, and deserving I have no doubt of certain expenses, and I am not complaining on that head, but a small county in

comparison to those others to which I have referred, and with not more than half the line of sea coast, and much less in importance so far as regards its commerce and shipping interests—we find in the County of Antigonish figures in this return of the Minister of Public Works of this year for no less than eight appropriations for that county alone. I will not say they are not deserving, because I am not going through them all, but I have received a communication here from a very prominent citizen of Antigonish which, with the permission of the House, I will read :

“ARISAIG—NEW PIER.

“The Minister of Justice by way of gaining votes in the Parish of Arisaig promised large expenditures at Arisaig. The old pier was in pretty good repair, no pretext existed for expending any considerable sum of money on it, so a second pier had to be erected and the old one repaired.

“This new pier finished in the fall of 1887 is 380 feet long, 40 feet broad with an L of 40 feet, and with from 1 to 2 feet of water at its outer end at low tide. The ordinary rise of tide there is from 3 to 4 feet. It is rare to see even a small schooner there. There are neither ships nor shipowners. The inhabitants do not own a single ton of shipping. Almost the only vessel ever seen at Arisaig is a hooker of 15 tons subsidised by the Local Government, which calls or comes to once a week on her route from Pictou to Cape George. The new pier is entirely useless. Arisaig is a farming district; some few of the farmers fish a little; this new pier is of no service to them. It is useless to dredge there. The bottom of the end of the new pier is rock. One storm would throw more sand into the cove than could be dredged in the twelve-month. It is vain to attempt making a harbor at Arisaig, and a harbor there would be of little utility. It is not required.”

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Would the hon. gentleman state what he is reading from?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am reading from a communication sent to me from Antigonish.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You will not give the name, I suppose?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No; I will not give the name.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Hon. members need not be alarmed. They sent me also a sketch of the work. If that expenditure at Arisaig is to be taken as a sample of the expenditure being made at Bayfield Harbor, Bayfield Wharf, Blue Rock, McNair's Cove and Moidart, all in the county of Antigonish, represented by the hon. Minister of Justice, I think the country will find that the Minister of Justice is rather an expensive article. The amount of the expenditure at the different points is not here given. All these may be correct appropriations; I am not saying they are not, for I possess no information on that point myself; I am only drawing the attention of the House to the fact as illustrating the extraordinary circumstance that these recommendations going into the Privy Council from the office of the hon. Minister of Public Works should be so fortunately considered so far as the County of Antigonish is concerned, while Richmond, Guysborough and other counties represented on this side of the House are neglected. No one would venture to say that it is because the Minister of Justice is sitting there to consider these very claims, but it does look singular on the face of it. I will not say that every application has been favorably considered, because we do not know how many more applications the hon. gentleman may have made; but we find that expenditures are going on at eight different points in that comparatively small county, and not one cent can be obtained for the County of Guysborough alongside of it, or for other counties represented on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Would the hon. gentleman mention the eight places?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought I did—Arisaig, Bayfield Harbor, Bayfield Wharf, Blue Rock, McNair's Cove and Moidart—seven places. Now, Sir, it just comes back to the old story again, that the Government think they own

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

not only the revenue, but the whole country, and the public money must all be distributed for the benefit of their own friends. I think it is a degrading position of affairs in this country, when any member of this House should feel that he would be lowering himself to go to the Government for a recommendation for a proper expenditure in this country. But, Sir, I would not think for one moment of going to the Government with a recommendation of an expenditure in my own county, because I know very well the Government would not pay any attention to it. Every member on the Liberal side of the House knows that the Government would pay no attention to any recommendation of that kind from him. As my hon. friend has pointed out, a single breakwater in the County of Yarmouth has been allowed to become ruined for the want of a little money to keep it in repair. There was not a grant for Digby during the time it was represented in the Liberal interest, but when a change took place, there was a breakwater for that county. I say such things are degrading to the country and the Government, because the money belongs to the public, and should be distributed in the public interest. I repeat that all these expenses in the County of Antigonish may be strictly proper; but there are other counties of much more importance, and other points where expenses are much more required; and I say that the Government cannot properly defend such an expenditure as this and deny the applications made from counties right alongside of it; and the hon. Minister of Public Works will have to tell that tale over again a good many times before he makes this side of the House believe it is not the settled policy of the Administration to ignore every proposition which emanates from this side of the House, no matter how much it may be in the public interest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection that the hon. member for Halifax should doubt what the hon. Minister of Public Works says. I do not suppose it is his practice or his policy to give much credit to explanations made on this side of the House, however apparent their truthfulness may be. But I do object to the statements he has made with reference to my own county. I will ask him to listen while I read a list of the works—I am not aware of any others—which he says figured in the Estimates of last year. Arisaig, Bayfield Harbor, Bayfield Wharf, McNair's Cove, Moidart and Blue Rock. I think I have included all the hon. gentleman named, and if there are any others, I shall be glad to have him name them now. We know how many times the hon. gentleman told the House that these were eight public works, whereas by his own tally the number is six. He did not require to add two to the number to make the list so imposing; and even to make up six, he made the works at Bayfield Harbor and Bayfield Wharf two works, whereas the wharf and the harbor are one.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No, they are not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been a breakwater under construction for a number of years for the purpose of affording shelter to Bayfield Wharf, and the wharf would be utterly useless without the breakwater. The great work which he speaks of in connection with the wharf was putting in some ballast and making some temporary repairs while the work on the breakwater was going on. But the hon. gentleman said that these might be very proper works—the five of them which he made eight; but he took the pains to make further statements to the House regarding them which, if they were true, indicated that these were not proper public works. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman stating at any time what works are being done, but I do object to his making to this House statements with regard to the requirements for these works, and the reasons for their being made, which are absolutely contrary to the facts in every particular. The hon. gentleman read from a letter something about Arisaig,

and the reason I asked him to give the name of his correspondent, was that otherwise it would go upon *Hansard* and into the press, and into the hon. gentleman's telegrams in his own paper, as if he were making these statements on his own responsibility instead of on the responsibility of an anonymous correspondent, who, I venture to say if his name were given, would be known to be a liar wherever the man himself was known. The statement that I secured votes in the district of Arissig by promising the people there a public work is absolutely untrue in every particular. I made the statement with regard to the public works which then required repair, as I did with regard to other works of the kind, when alluding to them, such as any other hon. gentleman would make under similar circumstances, that I would make proper representations to the Government and see that the interests of my constituents were attended to as far as possible. So far from its being true that in no sense was there necessity for a public work there, that there were neither ships nor shipowners there, and that the new pier was entirely useless, the Arisaig pier is the only landing and shipping place on about twenty miles of a dangerous coast, where a boat of any size, even a fishing boat, bringing or receiving produce, can land its cargo or receive any produce. It is the only pier where the inhabitants can be supplied with fuel, and is the only possible place of shelter in that twenty miles of coast. The new pier that was built there—the old one had become useless and so weak as to be shaken with every gust of wind that blew, and it threatened dissolution at any moment—was for the purpose of protecting the little harbor from being filled with sand; and everyone who has gone near the premises knows that it simply requires to complete that useful work, that the dredging shall be done inside of the old pier and the new pier, and a very useful harbor for shipping and boats will be formed. Last summer when I went there, after this expenditure had been made, I found it was a place of refuge for 30 or 40 fishing boats and that a large fishing interest had sprung up there. I do not hold myself in any degree reprehensible for urging, as strongly as I could, upon my colleagues the necessity of giving some kind of shelter to the fishermen on that exposed coast, but I do object to the reason and to the necessity for that expenditure being misrepresented in the grossest way that any facts could be misrepresented before the House.

Mr. KIRK. I am glad this discussion has come up under the motion of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn). This is a question which is of great interest to a great many people in the Maritime Provinces, especially to the people of those counties represented by members of the Opposition. It is generally believed, in the Maritime Provinces at least, and the Government and their friends take care to leave that impression, that unless the people elect members who support the Government, there can be no money voted for their counties. Why, Sir Charles Tupper, in a public speech at Antigonish, in 1882, in opposition to the late member, told the people publicly that they could not expect any money from the Government for public works, because they did not send a Government supporter here to represent them. That is perfectly understood all over Nova Scotia. With regard to these breakwaters which have been built in Antigonish I know very little. I know nothing at all of the utility of the works, but that money has been expended on six or seven public works in the county is true. Last year's report of public works shows that to be a fact. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has said there were seven. If he includes the expenditure on the post office he is correct. Hon. gentlemen will remember well that last year \$600 were voted for the purpose of improving the post office in Antigonish. That money may have been expended or not, but I do know that in the report of the Minister of Public Works there is a statement of what was done on the post office

last year. This proves the statement of the hon. member for Halifax to be not so far wrong after all, but to be a fact perfectly correct. The hon. the Minister of Justice says that the Bayfield Wharf and the Bayfield Breakwater were not two different works. Perhaps they were. But let us see what the Minister of Public Works says in his report:

"Bayfield, Antigonish County, is on the southern shore of St. George's Bay, and a harbor is formed by an island and an outlying reef. The construction of a further length of breakwater commenced in 1886-87 was continued, and at the close of this year was about three-fifths completed."

Now, what does he say about the wharf:

"The wharf is on the western side of Bayfield harbor, one quarter of a mile to the south of the breakwater, is 402 feet in length and varies in width from 22 to 50 feet."

The grant made was intended to improve the one harbor, yet there are two works which I believe are under two contracts. Therefore, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was right when he said there was an expenditure on seven public works in Antigonish County. We know that it has been the practice of this Government to ignore counties represented by members of the Opposition and not spend a dollar in them, and it does seem rather strange that the Minister will try to take credit for acting fairly in regard to those counties. I remember distinctly the late member for Antigonish making motions in this House and pressing upon the Government the necessity of expending money even to keep the breakwaters in repair, and they refused to do anything. The hon. the Minister of Justice has said, in answer to the charge that there were two breakwaters at Arisaig, an old one and a new one, that the old one was useless. But why is it useless? I have heard the late member for Antigonish in this House urging with all his force the Minister of Public Works to expend money there and prevent the harbor becoming useless.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An expenditure entirely unnecessary, according to the hon. member.

Mr. KIRK. As I said when I commenced, I know nothing at all about the necessity for those breakwaters, but I do know that when Mr. Judge McIsaac represented that county, not one dollar was expended there towards either repairing or building a breakwater, although he pressed upon the Government continually, in this House and out of it, the necessity of keeping in repair the breakwater at Arisaig, which was being swept away, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, by the action of the sea, and it only required a few thousand dollars to keep it from being swept away altogether. And the Minister of Justice comes now and says it was actually useless and was rendered useless in consequence of the Government carrying out the policy which they are pursuing towards the Opposition members of the House. Now it is found necessary to build a new wharf at a very large cost to the people of this Dominion. I have said that the Government refused, at the request of the late member for Antigonish, either to repair this Arisaig breakwater, or to build a new one, but, when they had a member supporting the Government, a member of the Government, they did not repair the breakwaters in that county, but they swept them away and built new ones. I do not begrudge the people of the county one dollar that they received, but Antigonish is a small county. It is one of the best agricultural counties for its size—I believe the best agricultural county—in the Province of Nova Scotia, but it has not much sea front. Guysborough has twice the sea front of Antigonish, but it cannot get a dollar for a breakwater or a harbor. I have stacks of letters in my possession acknowledging the receipt of my applications, but that is all. I have been pressing for the expenditure of money in my county, but no money has come yet, and I suppose it will not come until we have a change a Government, as I hope we soon will have. Is that the way to use

the people of this country? Does the money paid into the Treasury belong to the Tory party or the Government of this country? Have not the people I represent as much right to a portion of that money as the people of any other county? I think they have, and I think the Ministers will find out that the people of those counties who have been robbed of their rights in this way will not be coerced into voting for them. The members of the Government have tried to bribe them without success, and now they are trying to coerce them, but they will find that those people are made of different stuff and will not be coerced into voting for a Government of this kind under such treatment as they receive. I have been pressing for some consideration in this matter, because I believe I have some right to ask for it. I do not go on my knees to the Government, and I do not intend to. I do not beg for the rights to which my county is entitled, but I press for its just rights and for whatever money it is entitled to, and the Government are acting dishonestly in retaining that money. I have asked time and again for money to erect a breakwater at Indian Harbor, where a breakwater is much needed; for a breakwater at New Harbor also, but no money can be got for either place. I have pressed for money to build a small canal, three-quarters of a mile long, between two harbors, which, according to the Government engineer, would only cost \$6,000, but I cannot get that. I have not given it up in regard to that canal, because I hope the Government will put an amount for that work in the Supplementary Estimates this year. I have numerous breakwaters and other things to ask money for in my county, but for two years I have given up everything but this canal, and surely I ought to get that small sum. An hon. gentleman says I would get it if I voted for the Government, but I cannot do that. I will vote, as I have always done, for any proper measure the Government brings down, but I am not going to sacrifice my principles for the sake of a small breakwater or a canal. I have also asked in connection with other members for a better service between the ports on the coast of the Atlantic and the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at Port Mulgrave; but, instead of obtaining that, I find that the usual grant has been reduced this year by \$1,000. That is the way in which the Counties of Guysborough and Richmond have been served, those counties being the most interested in that improved service. I hope the Government are not lost to all sense of decency, but will do a modicum of justice to the Counties of Richmond and Guysborough in the expenditure of the public moneys.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). My hon. friends from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) and Richmond (Mr. Flynn) complain that sufficient amounts are not placed in the Estimates for harbor improvements and breakwaters on the coasts of those counties. I beg to assure my hon. friends, that, if the County of Antigonish and the County of Inverness and the counties bordering on the Northumberland Straits were so amply provided by nature with harbors as are the Counties of Richmond and Guysborough, there would not be much necessity for improvements in the way of harbors and breakwaters in those counties. It is well known that, from the borders of Pictou County all round the coast of Antigonish, which is much more extensive, taking the whole coast, than the coast of Richmond and Guysborough taken together, there is not a single harbor which will admit of ordinary vessels entering. It is therefore not unreasonable that the Minister of Justice would secure a fair proportion of the expenditures for such services in his county.

Mr. KIRK. He takes it all.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). My hon. friend knows well that the coast of Inverness requires public improvements of this kind, and I have no hesitation in saying in

Mr. KIRK.

this House, as I would state in the county I represent, that if Inverness were so well provided by nature with harbors as the Counties of Guysborough and Richmond, I would never have asked for a vote in this House for any such service. Any person who knows the counties along the southern shore of Nova Scotia must know that they are studded with harbors from end to end of the Province; whereas those bordering on the Northumberland Straits have none. But as reference has been made to corrupt practices in connection with the voting of money for public works, I think it would be pardonable on my part to refer to a very important public work in my own county, which was trifled with during the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. I refer to one of the most important works in the Province of Nova Scotia. It was under the consideration of this House in 1878. Attention was called to the necessity of that work by Mr. Tupper, who then represented the County of Cumberland, in the following language:—

“Mr. TUPPER said he would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works if the Government had arrived at any conclusion with reference to a work of considerable importance in Nova Scotia, which had been under the consideration of the late Government, and which had been brought to the notice of this Government from time to time. He referred to the closing of the Port Hood harbor, Cape Breton.

“Mr. MACKENZIE said he was fully aware of the importance of this work in question. At present there was great danger of this harbor being still more seriously injured owing to the action of the sea. Mr. Pailey's lowest estimate for a substantial work, however, \$360,000, and owing to the state of the finances, this amount could not at present be spared. If \$10,000 or \$12,600 would be of any utility, however, this might be voted. This work was rather required for general than for local convenience.”

After him spoke Mr. Macdonald, who then represented the county. He said:

“This improvement was urgently needed in the interest of the shipping, provincial and American, that frequented the Gulf of St. Lawrence.”

He concluded by saying:

“He hoped that the Government would turn attention to this work at once. It was one that could not be constructed piecemeal; but he thought a small grant of \$20,000 or so would be sufficient this season in order that the work would be initiated before another year elapsed. Although the contract might not be entered into till late in the season, it was desirable to procure such material as was necessary.”

This was in 1878, shortly before the general election. Mr. Mackenzie said:

“The Government would have no hesitation at all about a grant such as the hon. gentleman had named; but he feared that it would be utterly impossible to do anything with so small a sum. What he proposed was to have his plans, which were almost complete, and advertise to get tenders and see minimum sum for which it could be built, then they would know exactly where they stood at the next Session of Parliament. He feared that a grant of \$10,000 or \$20,000 would be practically useless, because it would be impossible to expend that amount with advantage unless that work were continued. Any attempt to build this by sections would be a failure. It would require to be carried on extensively at once, in order to avoid the damage from winter in an exposed condition of that kind. However, he would consult the engineer of the department before the Supplementary Estimates were brought down.”

After this discussion in the House, and before the vote of \$10,000 was placed in the Estimates of that year, advertisements were circulated shortly before the general election, and plans were shown and tenders asked for the closing of Port Hood Harbor, which would cost \$350,000, according to the report of the engineer at that time. The plan and specifications for the closing of the northern entrance into the Port Hood Harbor, as the public were misled to believe, were deposited in the office of the Collector of Customs, in Port Hood, on Friday before the election, which was the second or third day after nomination. Particular care was taken that the plan and specifications should not be placed there before the general election, because those who would examine them would find there, not the plan and specifications for the purpose of closing the northern entrance into Port Hood Harbor at all, but a plan asking for the construction of a small breakwater at Port Hood

Island. The deception was unquestionably for the purpose of securing the election of my opponent at that time. If the Government of the day were sincere, after tenders were asked for and the money voted, it was certain that the contract would have been awarded. A few days before the election and after tenders were in, the Government refused to award the contract because they had accomplished just what they desired, that was the return of a supporter in Parliament. Now, I ask seriously, which is the most honest course, to place a sum in the Estimates just on the eve of an election—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the date when the tenders were in?

Mr. CAMERON. I cannot tell the date, but it was between nomination and election day, in 1878.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Government were out of power?

Mr. CAMERON. The Government were not out of power before the general election, and the Government were not out of power when the last of the tenders were in. The Government were not out of power until I myself, as the correspondence will show, asked the Minister of Public Works to award the contract before he left the Department of Public Works. But they left the work in that state, having accomplished their object, and it has been left there without any money having been expended upon it. Sir, this was a deception of the grossest kind practiced upon the County of Inverness for the purpose of securing a supporter from that county. It is a custom of people, and I think we can hardly help it, to judge others by themselves. Those who practice such deception as that for the purpose of securing elections, are those who are likely to suspect that others pursue a similar course; but after all, it is not a proper criterion to go by in order to arrive at a correct judgment.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT—THE 15TH BATTALION.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BURDETT. I have a motion that I would like to put in.

Mr. MITCHELL. As next Monday is a holiday, and this is the only private day that we shall get this week, I think the hon. Minister ought to give us a few minutes longer. I do not think this a proper way to carry on the business of this House. It is the only private night we shall have to take up this business. I have three or four motions here, and I want to pay proper tribute to the way hon. gentlemen opposite have dealt with those motions, and the hon. gentleman should be allowed to proceed. I think the House at all events might sit another hour.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before making this motion I asked the leader of the Opposition whether he would agree to it, and I gave him as the reason that the House would sit late to-morrow in accordance with the understanding arrived at the other day that we would sit the discussion out, and, in order that we may sit as little after midnight as possible, I thought it desirable that we should adjourn to-night at a reasonable hour. I hope the hon. gentleman will agree to this, but, of course, we are in the hands of the House.

Mr. BURDETT. The reason I desire to move this motion now is that I shall not be here the next day when such motions are reached. I will undertake to discuss it as briefly as possibly. I beg to move for:

Return of all correspondence between the Government and the officers or men of the 15th Battalion, respecting aid to construct a drill shed at Belleville, and for any reports made to the Government respecting the desirability of granting such aid.

The object of this motion is to point out the necessity as well as the justice of placing a grant in the Supplementary Estimates to aid in the construction of a drill shed at Belleville. I submit that so long as the volunteer and militia system is maintained, and considered desirable in the interests of the country, we should have proper buildings for drilling purposes, and these should be placed at the principal centres in the Dominion, such as Belleville. The battalion is located there, it being a central point in Ontario easy of access by water or rail, and could in case of need be called together in a few hours, and is thus ready for service within the shortest possible time. If it is right and proper that volunteer system should be maintained, drill sheds and the proper buildings for the storing of arms and equipments should be constructed at places like Belleville. Moreover, the spirit shown by the volunteers of Belleville and vicinity should be encouraged by any Government which desires to create a patriotic spirit in the country. I will briefly state what this battalion has done, and why they ask this grant. The battalion was formed in 1863 under the command of Colonel Ponton, an old British officer, who brought the battalion up to a great state of efficiency and strength. On his retirement the command was given to Colonel Campbell, a brother of Sir Alexander Campbell. On his decease the command was given to the present Colonel Lazier. Were it not for some recent occurrences I would not trouble the House with this motion. Last Session when I brought this matter before the attention of the Government, I was kindly told to wait and see the Estimates. At the beginning of this Session I placed a question on the paper asking if a sum would be placed in the Estimates for this purpose, and I was again told to wait and see the Estimates. The answer was more clear than it was satisfying, but, subsequently, I saw a short article in the *Mail*, which indicated that a grant would be made. I am not aware that the *Mail* at the present time is the mouthpiece of the Government; some time ago that was more clear than it is now. They may be only sailing in different ships and in the end may come into the same harbor. However honest and reliable newspapers generally are, we may be sometimes disappointed in their articles; and, therefore, not relying on the *Mail*, I bring the question before the House and ask for this appropriation. The Belleville battalion has shown itself worthy of being specially noticed by the Government. In 1866 they were called to the front, and they went to Prescott and served there with great efficiency and success. The Minister of Customs, on that occasion, campaigned with the others, and with glory. In regard to their conduct in the North-West, great stress has been laid by speakers on the advisability and utility of efficient men guarding the supplies, and keeping open communication with the front. That is, no doubt, a very proper and honorable service, but when a call was made for men to go to the North-West, among the very first to answer that call was No. 1 Company of the 15th Battalion, in whose behalf I am speaking. They joined the Midland Battalion, and the hardships they endured can be better imagined than described; at all events, when the day of trial came, that battalion was in the front at Batoche. The Midland Battalion was there, and No. 1 Company of the 15th Battalion were at the front and reached Batoche's house as quickly as any one. They were first in battle on that occasion. It is to their valor, it is to their courage, because it is to the men who made that charge and to nobody else that the credit is due in my humble judgment. They rushed forward and they put an end to the rebellion. What might have been the result? How much more treasure and how many more lives might have been lost, had not those men rushed forward as they did and virtually put an end to and stamped out this rebellion, we do not know and we can only guess or imagine. At any rate they were there and their breasts were decorated with bullets while others

got theirs decorated with the order of knighthood. I claim that the men who presented their breasts to the bullets of the enemy are not to be ignored either in or out of Parliament, when they make a just claim for a grant of a few thousand dollars upon the Government. After they have done what they did, and endured what they did, and fought as they did, and won as they did, they ought to be reasonably provided for. If they are not to have any shelter under which to drill, and in which to keep their arms, what encouragement is there for young men to join the volunteers of this country? What encouragement is there for them to maintain the volunteer system if no facility is given to men of this class, and of this character? I am told that they have been knocking at the door of the Treasury here for some years for assistance in this direction. Feeling that the Government would in the end yield, they have gone to work themselves and built a drill shed; they have purchased the ground, and have taken the land in the name of trustees ready to deed it to the Government when they receive the grant. The volunteers have gone about for subscriptions, and they put their hands in their own pockets in order to build this drill shed, and they are now largely in debt for this fine building, which has cost them many thousands of dollars. I submit that those volunteers are coming forward with a just and an honest claim, and with a claim which, I believe, this Government will now acknowledge. I want to inform the Government that this is not a dead or a dying claim, this claim is going to live as long as I live, until it is satisfied. It is going to be pressed as long as I can press it, until we receive a reasonable assurance in the way of a reasonable grant. I believe that, when the Government fully understand this, after I have in a humble way explained it to the Ministers of the Crown, they will see the necessity of making grants of this kind to battalions of this character, in cities of this importance and situated as it is, if they wish to maintain our military system as it at present exists. In my judgment it is false economy if they do not do so. If the arms and accoutrements of the volunteers are to be scattered about and kept here and there they become spoiled and useless to a very great extent. In the event of a sudden call to arms it takes the men a long time to get ready, and even then many of their arms are found useless or past repair. I say that in building accommodation for the volunteers it is not only a useful way to expend public money, but it is an economical way as well. I strongly insist that the Government may consider this matter in a favorable light, and that when I come to see the Supplementary Estimates I will see at least a sum of \$10,000 or \$15,000 appropriated to assist those men in wiping off the debt that they have contracted, in paying for the large, commodious and fine building which they have erected, and which they will be obliged to pay for out of their own pockets, and by the little subscriptions they have collected, unless this Government comes to their aid. I think the Minister of Customs, who has always aided as far as he could the volunteers of this city and the County of Hastings, can bear witness to what I have said in their favor and of their conduct in the past. I have not had such intimate relations with the volunteers as that hon. gentleman; in fact I believe he is one of the oldest Belleville volunteers, having belonged to the early Rifle Brigade, and the Government in making this grant would not only be honoring the battalion but honoring as well a distinguished colleague in the Ministry. It is hardly a right thing that a Government like this, a Government which has got money to spend as we are told upon breakwaters and nearly everything else, should allow their volunteers, who have fought and won their battles, to go about with their hats in their hands begging for a few dollars to enable them to build a place in which they can drill. If we are going to leave them during winter and summer without any covering but

**Mr. BURDITT.**

the skies above them, the volunteers will now know it, and our military system will fail, and our battalions in many instances will disband. I ask earnestly, and I ask hopefully, that the Government will make this grant. I believe that if the Minister of Militia were in his place he would at once accede to it, but I am satisfied that when it is represented to him by his colleagues he will give us a reasonable grant for this purpose. If the Government do so, the benefit will accrue to this country from the valor of the volunteers should any disturbance ever occur again in Canada.

**Mr. BOWELL.** All that the hon. gentleman has said in reference to the valor and the services of the 15th Battalion is quite correct, and he might have, in all truth, applied the same remarks to the other Belleville and County Battalion, the 49th. The hon. gentleman could not with all his eloquence have said more in praise of the services and the worth of those battalions than they deserve. They have shown their valor in the field when they gave their time and risked their lives in the services of their country. There can be no possible objection to bringing down the papers to which the hon. gentleman refers. Having said this much, I can tell him that the claims of that battalion, and of the parties who have invested their money in the construction of a drill shed, have already been fully brought before the Minister of Militia by his colleague from Belleville who, I have no doubt, will second his efforts in support of this object. The claims of that battalion have not been forgotten in the past, nor do I think they will be forgotten in the future. But, unfortunately for the city in which he and myself reside, when I am out of official life, that city has not done as many other towns and cities of smaller size have, in voting sums of money to assist in the construction of drill sheds. If I am not misinformed Brantford has appropriated for such a purpose \$10,000 to aid their volunteer force. It has not been very creditable to our town that they have refused to give one dollar, so far, to aid in the construction of a drill shed to cover the volunteers who have done so much for their country as the 15th and 49th Battalions of the county of Hastings have done. The policy of the Government in the past has been, in most cases, where either the land has been provided by the city, or an appropriation has been made by the city and county for the construction of a drill shed, to come forward and aid them; and I doubt not that the Government would have done the same thing in the case of Belleville had the same spirit been displayed in the city to which we both belong. I hope, however, for the sake of the officers and the privates belonging to the battalions, and the private citizens who have come forward and put their hands in their pockets to assist in the construction of this shed, that the corporation will do its share in the future, and in all probability the Government might aid them in relieving them of their debt. However, that is a matter that must be for the future; and, although my hon. friend has some fears of Supplementary Estimates, he may not be, or he may be, disappointed when they come down. This I can assure him, the claims of the battalions will receive the fullest consideration which the Government can give to a question of this kind.

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** I think my hon. friend has made out a case favorable to the officers and men belonging to that regiment; they at any rate have manifested a good spirit; I was not aware of the position the municipality had taken in reference to the matter. I can understand the difficulty the Government have in determining grants if they have many claims coming in. The hon. Minister has mentioned the city of Brantford, and is cognisant of the fact, I believe, that there is an application from that city for a grant for a drill shed. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works is also cognisant of it, and I judge from what he has said that he is favorable to it, although there is a place called a

Council where it must be decided. However, I would like to state that some twenty-one years ago the city of Brantford granted the use of a public square for a drill shed, and I think, gave a considerable amount towards its construction; I think it cost the Government only \$2,500 or \$3,000; I am speaking from memory and subject to correction. The lease expires in April, the city wants the ground, and insists on the removal of the drill shed, which is a very unsightly building; so that the battalion will be left without a drill shed at all. I cannot say that the battalion has seen active service, but it is known to the Militia Department, that it is commanded by officers who have shown the best possible spirit; and it will be disastrous to the regiment, I think, if the Government should not see their way to supplement the grant already made by the city, towards it, of \$10,000. I make these remarks to emphasise the nature of this battalion's claim, and the necessity of its being given serious consideration before the Estimates come down, and not by any means to throw any obstacle in the way of my hon. friend who moves for his regiment. Whatever may be said, so long as we have this militia system, everyone must know that the officers commanding the force are men who serve their country at very great loss and expense to themselves. I think this has been shown in the case of the officers of the hon. gentleman's battalion, and I am sure it is so with the officers in my own city. I, therefore, take this opportunity to state what is known to one or two Ministers in reference to the officers of that regiment, in hopes that it will strengthen their claim when it comes to be considered in the full council.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to lay on the Table the return to the Address moved by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). There may be some other communications, more or less regular, to be received. If there are any, they will be brought down, but I thought it best not to delay these papers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They should be printed at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, they will be printed if that is wanted. I do not know that they can be printed in time for the discussion.

Mr. LAURIER. It should be printed in time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will look over the return before the order is made. I do not think there is much necessity for it, but I will be guided by my hon. friend. If he says it should be printed, it will be.

### LEGISLATION EXPENSES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House, tomorrow, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that there shall be granted to Her Majesty, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, an annual sum sufficient to enable Her Majesty to pay the estimated amount of sessional allowances awarded by law to Senators and members of the House of Commons; and that all moneys expended for such purpose shall be expended and accounted for in like manner as moneys are expended and accounted for in respect of the contingent expenses of the House of Commons under the Act respecting the House of Commons as amended by any subsequent Act.

Motion agreed to.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to bring to the notice of the House and the Government, a matter which I consider of very great importance at the present time, as it affects the action which may be taken on a Bill now before the House (No. 68) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1885, a sum of money was granted for the construction of a road—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman to leave this matter over till to-morrow. This is a Government day, and we are under a sort of arrangement to conclude the debate on the Budget to-night.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Certainly.

### SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker leave the Chair, and the House go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. COOKBURN. In view of the fact that it has been arranged that this debate should close this evening, and also in view of the fact that this debate has already been protracted to a considerable length and a number of gentlemen desire to speak on the subject, the observations which I have to make will be as brief as possible. I had not intended to deal with any statistics on this occasion, as I think we must all agree that the House has been fairly flooded with figures and statistics, and we have had a supply of them *usque ad nauseam*; but, in view of the extraordinary statements of the hon. member who preceded me, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), I think it is necessary that I should call attention to some of the misstatements contained in his address. He starts out by stating that he is a farmer, and that he represents the farmer, and has the farmer's interests at heart. He poses as the representative of the agricultural interests, and he tells us that his heart is fairly wrung—when he sees the farmers, not indeed actually begging from door to door, but in the miserable plight to which they are reduced. I am not a farmer, but I have enough sympathy with the farmers of Canada to unite with them in the feeling of woe depicted by the hon. gentleman if the position to which they have been reduced is such as he states; but I shall endeavor to show the hon. gentleman that some of the statements he has adduced as to the miserable condition of the farming population exist only in his own fervid imagination. I think, in view of the hon. gentleman's position in the agricultural community, he should have been more careful in the statements he has made in regard to the condition of the farmers. I can imagine that, if he warmed up as he did the other evening in this House, before the agricultural audiences which he has been in the habit of addressing, the honest farmers must have left the meeting under the impression that they were indeed a badly-treated people, though they had no idea before that that they were suffering in that way. After such a speech as that of the hon. gentleman, they must have found that they were under a load of burdens, grievous to be borne, and that they were suffering, to an extent, which they never understood before. As long as the hon. gentleman contented himself with the old stale arguments of blue ruin and agri-



cultural depression, I was contented to leave him alone, but when he descended to particulars, I felt it necessary to say something in answer to him. He tells us that not every well-to-do farmer, but "every ordinary farmer" pays to-day \$29.50 per annum in duty on agricultural implements. He says that he went to the Experimental Farm at Ottawa to ascertain the prices paid for the implements, and he went to the Auditor General's Report and got the prices there, so that they must be correct. He gives us the duty on two ploughs, two harrows, cultivator, gang-plough, bob-sleigh, drill, scuffler, roller, and so forth. These, he says, are the ordinary requisites of the ordinary farmer, and he finds that on these implements, the farmer pays a duty of \$295. He gives ten years for the life of these implements, and adds \$3 a year for the duty on the article of twine, thus making the total duty \$32.50 a year. I think, last year, it was allowed by both parties in this House that the number of farmers in this country was between 600,000 and 650,000. If I take the number of farmers at 600,000, and multiply \$32.50 by that number, I find that the duty paid by the farmers each year on agricultural implements is no less than \$19,500,000. The whole revenue from Customs is only some \$22,000,000. God be thanked that our farmers are so very wealthy, that in these items alone, they can pay nearly the total amount of the Customs duties of the whole Dominion. Not content with that, the hon. gentleman says that the annual duty on clothing and groceries of ordinary farmers is still more. Let us see then what this poor, down-trodden farmer has to pay on his clothing and groceries. We find that the duty on clothes for a family of five persons, as he says, amounts to \$39; on a barrel of sugar, \$8.50; coal oil, 10 gallons, \$1.24; rice, corn, starch, spice, soda and raisins, \$2; and so on, so that \$54.84 duty upon clothing and groceries for the house, and \$32.50 on implements, amount to \$83.34 during the year, according to his statement. When I multiply that by the number of farmers, I find a total of \$50,000,000. Under these circumstances I call on the hon. gentleman to impeach the Minister of Customs, I call on him to impeach the Minister of Finance, and to demand what they have done with the surplus \$23,000,000 which have been paid by the agriculturists of this country. Can it be that we have here in the Conservative party a body of men, whose Minister of Finance has been able to wring the vast sum of \$23,000,000 from the horny handed sons of toil and dispose of it without the knowledge of any one? It is possible that there may be some secret explanation of this, and I would call on the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), for once in his life to soar above the minutiae of details in which he revels and endeavor to solve this mystery. Then there is the question of the balance of trade. The hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) tells us: there is a balance of trade, as determined by the exports and imports, against us for the period 1881 to 1888 of no less than \$166,420,104. Now, if the country has been able to suffer this supposed loss of \$166,000,000 in eight years and still stand in the proud position it occupies to-day, all I have to say is that we have the grandest and the most wonderful Government that ever directed a country's affairs. Can it be that these \$23,000,000, to which I referred to a moment ago, were surreptitiously sent over in gold to help to offset this wonderful balance of trade, which the hon. member for North Wellington cannot understand. The hon. gentleman is still away in the backwoods of political science of over fifty years ago and wants to settle the accounts of the country on the principle of the simple balance of exports and imports. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) then says: Look at twine. The farmer pays \$3 a year duty on twine. I turned up the Blue Books Report Trade and Commerce, and I found twines of all kinds paid a duty of \$15,904.14, or 2½ cents per farmer. I take these 600,000 farmers and credit each with \$3 apiece, and I get \$1,800,000,

Mr. COCKBURN.

or more than enough to pay one-sixth of the annual interest of the national debt. Then he comes to sugar, and he asks, Why should not the farmer sweeten his poor cup of tea with a little sugar? Will we refuse him that comfort, or will we deny that the poor lone widow, after a day's hard labor, is entitled to put in her cup of tea a solitary morsel of sugar. I find the duty paid on sugar to be \$3,433,333, but my hon. friend says every farmer pays \$8.50 per annum duties, so that the farmers pay \$5,100,000. Again must I call on the Minister of Finance to answer what he has done with this surplus balance of \$1,666,666 which has been paid by the poor farmer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has handed it to the refiners.

Mr. COCKBURN. Then I come to coal oil. What is the duty on coal oil? I find the duty collected was \$325,656, but we have 600,000 farmers, all gushing with patriotism, who, the hon. gentleman said, are paying a duty of \$1.24 apiece per annum, or \$744,000, thus giving us a surplus of \$118,344. Why, in these three articles alone, of twine, sugar, and coal oil, there is a surplus of \$3,870,107. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of our analysing statements of that kind any longer? They may do for the backwoods constituencies of hon. gentlemen opposite. They may do for people who have been duped by their false statements, but they will not do to bring up before a house like this, where we have the means at our disposal for refuting such statements. But I have no doubt, despite the flat contradictions these statements have received, and received from authorities which cannot be gainsaid, the same old stories will be repeated again and again as if they had never been nailed on the floor of this House. Then the hon. gentleman says, Look at the exports for 1878 to the United States of \$37,300,000, and of only \$33,600,000 to Great Britain, showing an excess in favor of the United States of \$3,700,000. Why, within a moment after these words had passed from his lips he told us that the exports to the United States in 1888 were, not \$37,000,000, but \$42,572,065, and that those to Great Britain were not \$33,600,000 but \$40,084,964, and he told us this because he wanted to prove a different story. He told us that in 1878 our exports to the United States were \$25,245,000, and in 1888, \$42,572,000, showing an increase of \$17,327,000, or an increase of 75 per cent., while just before that our exports to the United States were \$37,000,000 in 1888, or \$5,000,000 less than his last statement. But what do \$5,000,000 matter to a man like this? His great agricultural soul soars far above figures—millions or billions are alike to him. He told us that in 1878 we exported to Great Britain \$46,000,000, and in 1888, \$40,000,000, showing a decrease of \$6,000,000, or 15 per cent., and this, he says, proves conclusively that the United States is our natural market and that our trade with that country is increasing. I thought it right to examine one or two points in connection with the United States being our natural market. The hon. gentleman took up the items of hides and wool, and I thought it best to find out what was the real state of the trade with reference to these items. I hold in my hand a letter from one of the largest dealers in the Dominion, a man whose word, I think, will be taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, inasmuch as he has always been a constant supporter of their policy and a steady enemy of the present Government. I refer to Mr. John Hallam, of Toronto. He says:

"Now allow me to state, that we do not import one single pound of wool which is the produce of the United States. It is quite clear that the United States is not entitled to this part of the trade, as all the wool is grown in other countries and shipped to the United States in bond, then bought by our dealers and manufacturers from wool merchants in Boston, New York and Philadelphia. In these cities there are a number of very large wool concerns, which import largely from Africa, South America, England and Australia; they sell what they

can to their own merchants, and then offer the balance to Canadian dealers and manufacturers.

"Under the head of Hides and Skins the figures from United States are also misleading; seven-tenths, if not more, of all the hides imported into this country are South America stock and are usually bought in Boston or New York, and are sold by the pound, except sheepskins with wool on, which are usually sold by the piece, but we import very few sheepskins in this country, and when we do they are not the produce of the United States but of Africa, Australia, Buenos Ayres, or Monte Video."

We must thus credit, not to the trade of the United States, but to the trade with foreign countries in those two items alone of hides and wool, no less a sum than \$1,743,000. In the matter of lumber alone I am credibly informed that we ship by the United States, through Boston, from 50,000,000 to 70,000,000 feet of spruce for the South American market. Hence hon. gentlemen opposite will understand, perhaps, the reason why the policy has been brought forward by the Government to subsidise steamship lines to foster that foreign trade which we see has already assumed so large proportions. I may tell my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), with reference to the farming population, that I find from returns just made that, in 1868, Canada exported to the United States 61 per cent of her farm produce, and to Great Britain 34½ per cent. But 20 years later the exact reverse took place, because we then shipped in 1887 to the United States only 35 per cent., and to Great Britain 60 per cent. In fact, if anyone will look at the tables which have been prepared by Mr. Johnson, he will find that the trade in farm produce during the last 20 years is steadily increasing with Great Britain, and steadily decreasing with the United States. Our friends tell us, Look at the United States, look at the State of New York. Well, I live in Ontario, but I know the State of New York, and I find that the official returns given by the State authorities of New York show that three-fourths of their farms are under mortgage, that 1-20, or 75,000 farmers are hopelessly in debt, that the decrease in land value in ten years from 1870 to 1880 was nearly as much as our whole national debt, or \$216,000,000; whereas the increase in land values in Ontario in four years from 1882 was \$66,750,000. I find by the Ontario statistics of the total value of real estate, that the mortgages held by the Land Companies amount to \$30,400,000, or only 6½ per cent. of the actual value of the property, or considerably less than one-half of the value of the farm implements and live stock alone. Then in New York State, with a population of 5,000,000, equal to that of the Dominion, there are, say, 1,000,000 wage earners, who pay per head \$20 per year, or 4 per cent. on the enormous sum of \$500,000,000, for the support of paupers. This is the report given Mr. Ford of the Congressional Investigation Committee. In fact, we are told to look to the United States for everything. I am afraid that our friends, in looking to the United States, are simply looking to a matter of dollars and cents; they are confounding a plutocracy with an aristocracy—a plutocracy that will be, and has already become a curse to that country; a plutocracy whose names are not emblazoned in the glorious records of its country, but whose names are written in the defalcations and crimes of the police and other courts; a plutocracy whose names have never been associated with struggles for their country's liberties, but simply with struggles for its boodle; a plutocracy whose names are connected with no efforts to broaden the liberties of the people, who have never wrung from any Parliament a Magna Charta, but whose whole contest seems to have been for railway charters; a plutocracy which seeks to become master of every industry, which seeks to control the price of even the bread of the people, of the sugar that sweetens their tea, of the very light that lights them on their way, and which seeks to control the very coffins in which they are to lie. Why, Sir, look at that plutocracy, and you will find none of the kind relations that exist in

this country between landlord and tenant, or that exist in Great Britain between landlord and tenant; and you will find that they ignore all political duties, sneer at those who attempt honestly to discharge them, and in their effrontery they have even gone so far as almost to drive the people of the United States into what we can only call one vast system of communism. But I wish to speak more particularly with reference to the resolution brought forward by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The resolution reads:

"That in the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States, for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith."

He here alleges two distinct grounds on which he bases his motion; first, the present condition of affairs, and second, the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States. Let us briefly examine these. I am free to confess that, after the clear and lucid statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and the able addresses of those who followed in his support, I am at a loss to see why, in the present condition of affairs, we should be justified in reversing the policy under which, during the last ten years, Canada has prospered to so unexampled a degree. I can only regret that during the last three consecutive Sessions so much valuable time has been wasted in the reiteration of arguments and statements, which, again and again, have received their emphatic condemnation from the electors at the polls. The constant and increasing efforts on the part of the Opposition to effect the most radical changes in our commercial and political relations, naturally tend to frighten capital. Capital, gentlemen, is always shy, and is ready to take flight at the least alarm. A mere flash of the electric wires, or a mere mote on the political horizon, may, in a few hours, or a few minutes, effect the transfer of millions of capital from here to New York or to London. Such being the case, I ask why it is that, year after year, we are asked to make these radical changes in the conditions under which it is able to protect itself. I feel that unless we have a time of rest, unless we feel that we are to have for years to come the same beneficent policy pursued that has produced such good effects during the last ten years, we shall experience troubles that we little calculate on now. If any person really and impartially desires to ascertain the present condition of affairs, I can refer him to a tribunal, composed of the keenest, the shrewdest, the best informed men to be found in the world, to men who have no direct or immediate interest in Canada, to men to whom Canada is merely a commercial or financial asset, who look upon all these matters with a cold and calculating eye, whose business it is to become thoroughly acquainted with the internal and external resources of every country in the world—need I tell you that I refer to the capitalists of Europe, to the men constituting the Royal Exchange, or the Stock Exchange at London. These men, when asked by Canada for a loan of 4 million dollars, tendered her 12 millions, and they offered the money at a less rate of interest than they ever offered money to any other Province, the lowest rate, either comparatively or positively, at which a loan has ever been effected by a colony. Sir, I am perfectly willing, apart from all political squabbles, to pin my faith to the calm and steady belief of those men who back their belief by the offer of 12 million dollars. As to the recent action of the House of Representatives, let us see, first, what that action really was, and secondly, why it should become expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain "on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity" with them. I may, in passing, state that action of a similar character to the

joint resolution of Mr. Hitt, of Illinois, was taken over a century ago, and that the following offer was incorporated as article XI of the Federation of the thirteen states, in the year 1777, and has been standing since that time. The following is the offer:—

"Canada acceding to this confederation and joining in the measure of the United States, shall be admitted into and entitled to all the advantages of this union, but no other colony except on agreement of nine states; and in the address drawn up in French to the inhabitants of Canada—who then stood loyally by the Crown of Great Britain, as they were ever since (Mr. Dickinson says), 'Your Province is the only link wanting to complete the bright and strong chain of union.'"

In reply to the address drawn up in French at the time they stated they were loyal to the Crown of old England, as they have remained ever since, and as I am persuaded they will remain. These were the events of 1777, and the offer as stated is still open to hon. gentlemen opposite. I must say that I prefer the open, downright honesty of such an offer as this to the underhand attempt to entrap Canada into negotiations with the United States under false pretences. Perhaps the word "false" may appear to be a strong term and it may be unparliamentary; but let me read the words of the joint resolution of Mr. Hitt, and then hon. gentlemen will see whether I am justified or not in using such a term. The joint resolution is in these terms:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue tariff, like internal duties to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties on trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts, in a commercial union; and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

Mr. Speaker, there is not a word here about that hybrid monstrosity, unrestricted reciprocity. Let me read also Mr. Hitt's own explanation of commercial union, as given by him only a fortnight ago when speaking to the resolution. He said:

"What is commercial union with Canada? It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties, or taxes to be levied upon goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of custom houses on the north by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada, abolishing their custom houses along the same line by which they collect duties upon goods we send into Canada, and leaving intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada as it is between the States. The line of custom-houses would follow the sea and include both countries. The internal-revenue systems of taxes on liquors and tobacco in the two countries would also have to be made uniform in both countries. The proceeds of taxation thus collected would be equitably divided, and the fairest way would seem to be in proportion to population."

And then further on he says:

"Undoubtedly they (the Canadians) in being subjected to the same tariff with us, would in all fairness be consulted as to its provisions; but we, sixty millions, would in all fairness generally have the prevailing voice in determining what the rates should be. The particular methods in which questions of detail should be treated need not now be discussed."

No, Mr. Speaker, I think they had better not. We had better first be inveigled into the net and then we shall feel, in all its force, the "prevailing voice of the people" who, in "all fairness," have overreached us in almost every transaction, who cheated us by false maps out of the State of Maine, dishonestly pocketed millions of dollars in connection with the Alabama award, and who recently applauded the infamous threat of the Retaliation Bill by a President who had, only a few days before, declared publicly that Canada had done everything that was fair, just and honorable. This Bill of Mr. Hitt calls for commercial union, not for unrestricted reciprocity; that is a mongrel which no self-respecting citizen of the United States would for a moment tolerate. Well do I recollect, Sir, during my recent pleasant visit to Washington, when casually introducing this resolution

Mr. COCKBURN.

into an assembly of gentlemen there, I was asked: "Do you imagine we are such fools as to keep a back door three thousand miles long open to you to flood us with British goods?" I said: "Gentlemen, no doubt we shall be able to arrange everything honorably, so as to protect you against an onslaught of British and foreign goods." They looked at me. There was first a look of inquiry, and then a look of pity stole over their faces, and I could read the impressions passing through their minds: "Poor fellow, there is something wrong with his head." The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in defending his friend the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, said:

"It is not commercial union that is advocated by my hon. friend, it is not commercial union that is asked for by this resolution, but unrestricted reciprocity, and unrestricted reciprocity would leave in our hands the entire control of our own tariff, except in so far as relating to imports and exports between this country and the United States. They"—

That is to say, Messrs. Hitt and Butterworth.

"—are truly patriotic in their efforts to promote the interests, not only of the United States, but the interests of the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths upon the continent of North America."

Now, if it is unrestricted reciprocity with entire control of our own tariff, with the preceding modifications, and not commercial union, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) desires, why does he base his motion on the recent action of Mr. Hitt, and of the United States Congress, when Mr. Hitt emphatically tells him that all the Custom houses in the north would be abolished, that the Custom houses would follow the sea and include both countries. It suggests to my mind a little incident that occurred in this Chamber this morning. I asked the member for West Toronto, if he had a copy of the Toronto directory at hand. He replied, he had not. An Irishman, sitting at his right hand turned round and, with that wit for which his countrymen are famous, offered me a copy of the Quebec directory, asking if that would not suit. I think the two cases are very much on a par. One party asks for commercial union and the other offers unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the course of his address, also said:

"The feeling in the United States, I saw it evinced in Washington when I visited there, is an unmistakable desire on the part of American public men to cultivate friendly relations with Canada, to impress upon Canadians who visit their capital, their desire to treat us fairly and in a friendly spirit, and to show that they are ready to enter into a reciprocity treaty on a fair and equitable basis. There can be no doubt we can get it if we desire it, and the assertion that we cannot get it is not borne out by the facts."

I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, if the terms of Mr. Hitt's resolution and the explanations I have read to this House are such as to confirm the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the United States are ready for a reciprocity treaty, however great we may acknowledge to be their kindness and hospitality to Canadians visiting their capital. But, happily, we are not left to decide this question solely by the words of the joint resolution and the subsequent explanation of Mr. Hitt; we have the public declarations of Senator Sherman, the leader of the Republican party in the Senate, to this effect, that if we wish to trade with the people of the United States on equal terms, we must join them politically and bear all their burdens as citizens of the United States; and that no uncertain sound may be given out in this matter, a few months ago, while addressing his constituents in Maine, the present able Secretary of State—the actual head of 60,000,000 of people—said:

"You pay your taxes in Maine; you pay your taxes in the United States; you yield obedience; you owe allegiance; you observe the laws, you live under the flag. You stand ready to fight for the national union, as you have already fought. Beyond the frontier, across that river, our neighbors choose another Government, another allegiance. They are subjects of Queen Victoria, they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to

do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and the actual cash remuneration of American markets. (Great applause.) They cannot have both at the same time. If they come with us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, and who have no part nor lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for a Democratic congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have."

We have seen within the last few weeks in the large daily journals spread broadcast over the land, from New York, Chicago and other large centres, maps in which our fair Dominion is parcelled out as so many states, and I have had sent to me to-day a large print from one of the New York papers in which the glorious old flag of England is represented as being trampled under foot and the flag of the stars and stripes has, forsooth, been hoisted. Here you see on one side stand the Prince of Wales and other members of the Royal family, while on the other side stand President Harrison, Vice-President Morton, and the other members of the Cabinet. This and similar representations on the part of the American papers are simply attempts to familiarise their readers with the annexation of our great Dominion. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they are prepared to pay their taxes to the United States? To whom do they owe their allegiance? Whose laws do they observe? Under which flag do they live? They have taken the oath to be loyal to our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, and I ask, in the name of common sense, if loyalty can lead to language such as we have heard from hon. members on the opposite side of this House? I say if a man is truly loyal and should find that his words are unfairly construed into such a shape as to be considered disloyal to England by sixty millions of people in America, it is time for him to alter his course, and try to observe the oath which he took at the Table before he was allowed to occupy a seat in the House. I ask such men, are you subjects of the Queen? Are you loyal to Her Majesty? Do you wish to live under the old British flag? Or do you wish to register yourselves under the stars and stripes? Already have you done too much to lead people to think that you wish to pursue that course? Come out like men, and say in a straightforward way, as Mr. Blaine said, that when you go in for unrestricted reciprocity you go in for annexation to the United States. One would think the declaration of Mr. Blaine explicit enough to set at rest all hopes of our having unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, unless we deserted the British flag for the stars and stripes, and so we are treated by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to a picture of the easy conquest of Canada, as follows:—

"In case of war with the United States, England would be utterly unable to place an armed force upon the frontier between these two countries, adequate to the defence of Canada. The United States, with no greater exertion than was put forth in the rebellion of 1861 to 1864, could place in the field an army of 3,000,000 men, and it is folly to talk of England being able to cope with such a force, in British North America, so far from her base of operations."

Mr. Speaker, my recent visit to Washington led me to very different conclusions from those of my friend. I know we shall never get unrestricted reciprocity, but I know also that the people of the United States will never knowingly provoke us to war, or wantonly commence war upon us, and that for very good reasons. The Republican and Democratic parties are so very nearly equal in numerical strength that they cannot afford to pursue a policy leading to the forcible annexation of Canada, for, in that event, their action would serve to consolidate Canada, and when it entered the Union, under the title of eight or nine new states, these new states would, for some time, at least so long as they smarted under the sense of defeat, vote for

89

the opposite or Democratic ticket. Indeed, they would temporarily hold the balance of power between the conflicting parties, and for similar reasons we may rest assured that the Democratic party will not, with their eyes open, force us into the arms of the Republican party. We may, therefore, bear with equanimity the hon. member's threat of the invasion of Canada by 3,000,000 of stalwart Yankees. The United States know too well what has been the cost to Germany of the forcible annexation of Alsace-Lorraine; to England, of Ireland; and to Russia, of Poland; and we have ample proofs in the manner in which they reconstructed the Southern States after the surrender of General Lee that they do not wish to hold any territory subject to conquest. If ever Canada becomes part of the Union, it will do so by its own free will and consent. I can only say that I sincerely hope that I, for one, shall never live to see that day, and I hope, Sir, also that I am expressing the not uncharitable hope that gentlemen on either side of the House will never live to see it either. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that England will not object to our forming a commercial treaty with the United States. Why, Sir, what does such a treaty involve? It involves a common tariff; it involves a common commercial law and a common court of appeal for the interpretation of that commercial law; it involves a power behind to enforce the decisions of that court; it involves, I almost think, power on the part of Canada to make peace with a nation at war with England. And what is England to do? England the mother from whose loins we have sprung; the mother of arts and civilisation; the mother who has nursed us so tenderly in our infancy, who has stood by us in many a hard battle. What is she to receive? She is to be treated as a foreign power; she is to assume all the responsibilities of a parent; she is to guarantee us from invasion, to protect our trade, and to assure us at the same time all the rights and privileges of British citizenship; and yet she is not to utter a word of control or even of remonstrance. Why, the whole proposition of commercial union is simply too absurd, unless political union is to accompany or follow it in the near future. In short, Sir, the United States cannot grant us unrestricted reciprocity, as such action will be in direct violation of the numerous commercial treaties that country has already made with foreign nations under the most-favored-nation clause. Hon. gentlemen opposite will tell me that that matters not, that the United States would trample under foot those treaties and obligations. Well, Sir, I tell you that if the United States are prepared to break their word with a foreign power, if they are prepared to trample their honor in the dust, we are not prepared to associate ourselves with them. But finally, Mr. Speaker, Canada is not for sale. We love our country dearly, Sir; we are proud of its past, we are hopeful of its future; and come weal or come woe, we are determined, with God's help, to work out our own destiny, and we refuse—aye, indignantly, scornfully refuse—to exchange the proud title of citizen of the great British Empire for that of any other nationality under heaven.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor as far as possible to emulate the good example which the hon. gentleman has just set in one respect—I shall endeavor to be brief in the remarks I have to make to the House, and to recognise that at this late stage of the debate it would not be proper to submit very large masses of figures or to occupy very much of the time of the House. Sir, we have had a speech from the hon. gentleman the larger part of which consisted in expressions of his loyalty. Sir, I am not going to challenge the hon. gentleman's loyalty, but I notice that in this instance, as in many others, those who are too prone to flaunt their loyalty in the face of the country are very often found wanting when the time comes for putting their loyalty to the test.

Sir, he has charged the Reform party with disloyalty. His idea of loyalty seems to be loyalty to the particular policy which the hon. gentleman now at the head of affairs has promulgated. Sir, we are loyal; and the hon. gentleman forgets that in charging with disloyalty a party which represents one-half of the population of Canada, he is charging those who sent us here with disloyalty. But Sir, we are not disloyal; we are loyal to the Queen of Canada; we believe in promoting such a policy as will advance Canada's interests; and it is not by shouting loyalty, by professing allegiance to the flag, and by repeating eloquent statements that people are ready to die for their country—it is not by such expressions that we shall be enabled to ascertain whether a man is really loyal or not—whether he is advocating a policy best calculated to promote the best interests of that part of the Empire in which his lot is cast. I do not yield to the hon. gentleman in my loyalty to the Queen; but I will give the answer which was given in the House of Lords by a gentleman who was taunted with disloyalty. He said that while he was loyal to Her Majesty the Queen, it did not follow that he was bound to be loyal to her man servant and her maid-servant, to her ox and her ass. So what the hon. gentleman desires to be understood as loyalty is not loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, but loyalty to the policy which he supports, and which was advocated and promulgated a few years ago by the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, even though the result of it might be to sever our connection with Great Britain. The hon. gentleman remembers the phrase, that they were prepared to support the National Policy, and if the National Policy in its effects would weaken the tie that bound us to the mother country, so much the worse for British connection. That was the cry, and the hon. gentleman is prepared to support that policy now; and I doubt not that if it ever came to the test, his allegiance to his party would be found superior to his allegiance to his Queen. The hon. gentleman made one reference, and one only, to that branch of the question which we are discussing, comprised under what we call the Budget, which, as I understand it, deals with the condition of the affairs of the country. That reference was to a statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) with regard to the taxes paid by the farmers of this country. I have not examined in minute detail the statements submitted by that hon. gentleman to the House. But I will undertake to say that in a matter relating to the farmers of the country, and the taxes paid by them, 99 out of every 100 would prefer the carefully prepared statement made by my hon. friend to the jocular reply made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The hon. member for South Huron is in the position of a man who knows what he is talking about, and we know that statements made by such a man are generally to be preferred to the haphazard statements of those who have not a practical knowledge of the question. The hon. gentleman thought he scored a great point when he alleged that the total taxes paid by the farmers, amounting to \$28,000,000, were not to be found in the Treasury of the country, and he called on the Minister of Finance to produce the funds that were in default. It is all very well to trifle, and the hon. gentleman can afford to trifle, with the statement of great import made by the hon. member for South Huron; but the hon. member for Huron represents that class that pays these taxes. My hon. friend did not say that they were paid into the exchequer of the country; if they had been, this country would be so much richer, and the evil so much less; but what he said was that this \$28,000,000 had been abstracted from the pockets of the farmers and transferred to the pockets of the manufacturers—that while the farmers lost, the exchequer did not benefit; and while the hon. gentleman was able to prove that a statement my hon. friend never made was not true, he failed to show

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

that there was the slightest inaccuracy in the statement he did make, that the farmers paid, on the several articles the hon. gentleman mentioned, and in the proportions he mentioned, every dollar he alleged. I do not intend to go into this trade question at very great length, but coming from the Maritime Provinces I propose to discuss for a few moments the phase of the subject which bears more pertinently on that part of the Dominion than on the western part. I want to call the attention of the House to the statements which have been made with reference to the interprovincial trade, and more particularly to statements made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when addressing the House with reference to this line of railway by means of which the interprovincial trade is carried on. That hon. gentleman made a violent and fierce attack upon my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and with that attack I have nothing to do. I have no doubt my hon. friend felt very deeply the severe castigation which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave him; but I was surprised and I was sorry that, in the heat of his argument, the hon. Minister should have allowed himself to use figures ostensibly taken from the blue-books of this country but which were very inaccurate. I wish to read the statement which the hon. gentleman made on that occasion. He charged that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was a deadly enemy to the Maritime Provinces, that he was always saying something adverse to their interests, that he had made an error in telling this House that there had been an enormous deficit in the working of the Intercolonial Railway last year—a deficit larger than it ought to have been by many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and larger than it was in the year his party was in power. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries challenged that statement, and denied its truth, and said he was prepared to prove by figures that my hon. friend was far astray, and that the deficit on the working of the Intercolonial to-day was greatly less than it was when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had charge of the finances of this country. In order that I may not be charged with having in the slightest degree misrepresented that gentleman, let me read to you what he said as reported in *Hansard*:

"The facts are that, in 1878, Government railways, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway, consisted of 913 miles, whereas in 1888, they consisted of 1,185 miles. The facts show that the traffic carried in 1878, was 561,633 tons, while in 1888, owing to the expansion of our internal trade, as pointed out by the Finance Minister, it amounted to 1,348,426 tons. Now, I ask the House again to note that the principle enunciated by the hon. gentleman is that when there is a loss on working that road, it is due to political corruption. In 1878 the loss on working the smaller system and carrying a much smaller quantity of traffic, was \$716,083, whereas in 1887-88 the loss was only half, being \$363,043. The hon. gentleman has unwittingly given me an opportunity to testify to the marked success in the management of that road and the economy practiced under the present Administration, as contrasted with its management under the Administration of which the hon. gentleman was a member."

That is the statement which the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made with regard to the carrying power of the Intercolonial and its earnings in 1878, as compared with its mileage and earnings in 1888, and this statement was greeted with vociferous cheering by his friends behind him. I think that the hon. gentleman claimed that it was unanswerable. I am here to tell the hon. gentleman that I examined his statement, that I examined the blue-books and that I cannot find the slightest shadow of foundation for the figures the hon. gentleman has given. The hon. gentleman is hundreds of thousands of dollars astray as regards the loss on the working on the Intercolonial in 1878. He must have let his imagination run away with him, but I hope it was not for the mere purpose of eliciting a few plaudits from his friends behind him. I do not believe he is capable of that, and I cannot understand how he could have allowed himself, for the mere purpose of making a

point in a debate, to fall into such a grievous error. True, there was a larger mileage in 1888 than in 1878, but what deduction should be drawn from that? Should we infer from that that the loss should be greater? Not at all. If the Intercolonial, which was incomplete in its connections in 1878, has since been completed in its connections, its working should show a larger surplus in its favor in 1888, when it had all its connections completed, than in 1878, when it was incomplete. What are the facts? I find that the hon. gentleman, in the first place, when he gave the loss upon the Intercolonial Railway, said he was giving it upon both Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railways, but he omitted the loss upon the Prince Edward Island Railway, altogether, in 1888; but when he came to give the loss in 1878, he added the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island lines together. Let us look at the statements carefully. In the year 1878, the total mileage of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways was 952 miles. The capital expenditure on both was \$39,500,984; the working expenditure, \$1,832,873. The earnings that year were \$1,514,846, showing a deficit in 1878, on the working of the road, of \$318,026. The hon. gentleman has told the House it was \$716,000. He was only \$400,000 astray. During that year, an arrangement was made by the Government, by which the sum of \$543,000, which had been spent the previous year, should be charged over a number of years, and \$200,000 was to be charged to 1878. These sums hon. gentlemen now charge to capital account. I have given the figures without adding that \$200,000, because it was not expended in that year, and had nothing to do with the working of the road for that year. Suppose you put in the \$200,000, and add the money which was not spent, and which—according to the system of bookkeeping inaugurated by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was leading the Government—was to be charged to that year, you would then have only \$518,000 as the loss upon the year's working instead of \$716,000, as stated by the hon. gentleman. Now, if you add to that the loss upon the working of the road, the interest upon the capital invested in that road—and I have calculated it at four per cent., one half below what it should be—the total loss on the Intercolonial Railway since 1878 was \$1,918,000. Adding the loss in the working expenses and the interest on the capital expenditure paid in the construction of the road, the loss will approach very nearly \$2,000,000. We will see what it was in 1888. The hon. gentleman says they made such great improvements, and mind you, he says, whilst the loss was so much in 1878 and so much less in 1888, that shows less political corruption under our regime than under yours. If the reverse were the case the hon. gentleman must necessarily acknowledge more political corruption under his Government than under the previous one. In 1888, the mileage of the Intercolonial had increased to 1,110 miles. The capital expenditure, leaving out the Eastern Extension of the road altogether—because I did not take that into account in the statement of the expenditure, in other years—but including the Prince Edward Island, was \$48,887,153, or an increase in those years of \$9,337,000 upon the capital expenditure. Hon. gentlemen know well that from Session to Session, capital expenditure—sums of hundreds of thousands of dollars have been charged by hon. gentlemen opposite to capital expenditure, which should have been charged to mere working expenses. Sums which were charged by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when they were in power, in regard to works of a similar character, to working expenses, are now charged to capital. The gross expenditure in 1888 of these two roads amounted to \$3,506,081; the earnings were \$3,076,146, leaving a deficit during that year of \$430,935 upon the working of that system of railway. The hon. gentleman stated, when he addressed the House, that the loss in that year was only

\$343,000, so that he is more than \$80,000 astray on that one point. Take then the deficit in 1878 at \$318,026, and the deficit in 1888 at \$430,935, and you have an increase in the deficit of \$112,908 under the Government of these hon. gentleman compared with the previous Administration. And this is notwithstanding the fact that they have a completed road, running in all directions, with connections everywhere. If you add to the actual deficit in the working expenses of the road the interest upon the capital employed in its construction of over \$48,000,000, at 4 per cent., you make a total loss on the Intercolonial roads, of \$2,306,421, or an increase in the loss in 1888 over that in 1878 of nearly half a million of money, or, to be accurate, \$463,395. That is the result of the working of the Intercolonial Railway under the management of the hon. gentlemen. That is the amount which it has cost the country more than it cost under the economical management of the Government of my hon. friend from East York, and those figures are the most damning evidence of the mismanagement and corruption which exists in every branch of that road, centering in that centre of corruption, Moncton, and extending all over the line. It is known that the road is run as a political road, run in the interests of the political party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, run not to develop the resources of this country, but run to put money in the pockets of the Spring Hill Mines shareholders at the cost of the farming community of this country. I wish hon. gentlemen, when they reflect on these figures, to remark that I do not charge one dollar in the statement of these sums which we say is improperly charged to capital account, and should be charged to working expenses. We take it simply as they have charged it, to working expenses, and, on that ground alone, there is a deficit during last year in the running expenses alone of over \$430,000. What is the hon. gentleman doing now? He speaks of the increased tonnage carried over that road. Why is there an increased tonnage? Do they pretend to say that they are carrying coal and other stuff at paying rates? Not at all. They are charging paying rates, according to their estimate, for everything the farmer has to carry, but, when they carry the coal of the Spring Hill Mines, they are charging only three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile, instead of three-fourths of a cent, which is a paying rate.

Mr. TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman advocate the raising of that rate?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I advocate that, if you reduce the rates on the Intercolonial Railway in the interests of one class of the community, you must reduce the rates as far as the farmer is concerned in the same proportion. This only accentuates still more the difference between the policies of the two parties. We are determined, and always have been determined, that the public works and the public policy of this country shall be so conducted as that it shall bring about the best results to the whole farming and commercial interests of the country. These gentlemen say: No, our policy shall be devoted to enriching a particular class, to granting favors to that class in order that they may become rich, at the expense of whom? At the expense of the great tax-paying class of the country. That is the difference between the policies of the two parties. It comes again to the classes against the masses. We are for the masses; they are for the classes; and this is a very good instance of the difference. It is most interesting, when you consider this question of the Intercolonial Railway, to review for a little while the policy of the present Government in regard to that road. We have had for a little while the hon. gentleman the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who represents the county of Pictou, through which county a branch of the Intercolonial Railway runs. When the last general election took place, my hon. friend

did not feel very secure in his seat. Just before that election took place, the hon. gentleman's friends introduced a Bill into this Parliament to authorise the expenditure of a large sum of money to build a branch of the Intercolonial Railway through his county, in order to save the hon. gentleman's seat. What is the fact? The Intercolonial Railway runs from the town of Truro to Fisher's Landing, which is just opposite Pictou and the terminus of the boats from Prince Edward Island. The then Minister of Railways introduced a Bill to run a line from Stellarton, on the Intercolonial, to the town of Pictou, one mile from Fisher's Landing. That Bill was introduced on the 9th April, 1886. The Minister of Railways told us that the distance would be 18 miles, and that the cost of the branch would be \$300,000. When that Bill was introduced, I combated it. I said it was not run in the right place, if they were going to build it at all, and further, that, from information I had received from those who understood the character of the country through which the road was to run, it could not be built for anything like the money. The Minister of Railways told us then—and I am now using his own words—that we did not know what we were talking about. I asked, if they had had surveys made or proper estimates, and they did not answer and could not tell. They passed that Bill through the House, and pledged the country to its construction, stating that it would only cost \$300,000, though they had not taken the ordinary precaution to have surveys made or to ascertain what it would really cost. Well, now we have had surveys, and we find, although you are not through the expenditure yet, that already this road has cost \$535,603; and it will cost upwards of \$600,000. And for what? In order to build a line to compete with our own line, and running for its whole distance nearly parallel with it, a line 14 miles in length to reach the town of Pictou. Does the hon. gentleman hope that this line is going to pay or that it is going to develop any trade? Not at all. I believe it was introduced from the estimable view, from a Tory standpoint, of securing the seat of the hon. gentleman from Pictou. I desire to show the House, by some other illustrations, the absolute recklessness with which the Government of the day have proceeded in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, in building branch lines everywhere. In 1882, they determined to build a branch at St. Charles. It was to be 15 miles long, and we were told it would cost \$536,000; and one half of the sum that was appropriated was for the cost of a steam ferry to carry the cars from the wharf across to Quebec. One of the inducements tendered to this House to induce it to vote that money, in 1882, viz, the steam ferry, never has been constructed, not a dollar has been laid out upon it. In 1883 the Minister of Railways came down and stated that the steam ferry was practically abandoned, but he wanted the House to grant him \$130,000 more to build the St. Charles Branch. The House having voted \$536,000 the previous year had to finish the work, and they gave the Minister the money. Sir, he gave the House to understand then—for I have turned up the *Hansard* and looked at his words—that the money he was asking was sufficient to enable them to finish the road. The other day we put a question across the House and asked what the St. Charles Branch cost, and that road, which was estimated to cost \$336,000—\$200,000 besides was voted for the steam ferry which never was built—under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite, has cost this country \$1,375,890, for a length of fifteen miles. Sir, the hon. gentleman came down a few years ago stating that the Government had a great scheme for the construction of another road, another branch of the Intercolonial Railway, but this time it was not to elect the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) it was to elect the High Commissioner, and the hon. gentleman who is now Governor of Nova Scotia. Well,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

they came down and wanted to build a road, and I want to charge here that Parliament has not been honestly dealt with in the statements submitted to it to induce it to vote money for the construction of that road; I want to charge, not only that they have voted in ignorance, but that they have voted under direct misrepresentation—for I say there was a misrepresentation—it was on a misstatement of the facts of the case that this House was induced to vote this money. Now, Sir, what is this Oxford and New Glasgow road?—this road running from Oxford to New Glasgow, a distance, I suppose, of some 70 odd miles—I am speaking generally. In 1882 Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Minister of Railways, proposed to this House that they should vote a subsidy of \$224,000 to a company which was going to construct that road. The road was called the Montreal and European Short Line, and it was to be built by the end of 1883. When Sir Charles Tupper moved this House to vote that subsidy he declared solemnly that he had looked into the matter very carefully, and he pledged himself to the country that the proposed subsidy of \$3,200 per mile would enable that road to be built. Sir, the hon. gentleman was very positive in his assurances. He was asked time and again, was he perfectly certain that the money would do it—because the House was pledging itself to a very large expense; and he pledged himself he was certain he had taken every precaution, and hon. gentlemen know the positiveness with which he can make assurances. Well, in the summer of 1883, that company that the hon. gentleman had assured himself in 1882 was going to construct this road with \$3,200 a mile, burst up and became bankrupt, and the road stopped. In 1885, this House was asked to vote \$125,000 to pay unpaid claims of sub-contractors and workmen on that road. The House voted the money, and in 1886, just before the general election, when it was necessary to capture votes in Cumberland and Colchester Counties, they came down and got another \$25,000 to pay the balance of some claims which the hon. gentleman presented to the House. Well, after paying all this money, the road was not built. But in 1887, just before the election, the Government proposed a resolution to construct that road as a Government work, stating the supposed cost to be a million dollars in addition to the appropriation already made, and making the total sum to be paid by this country one million and a quarter of dollars. On what statement was this House induced to vote that money? The House was induced to assent to that on the positive and reiterated assertion, not only of Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Minister of Railways, but of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the distance between Oxford and New Glasgow would be shortened from 40 to 45 miles. Not once, not twice, but four or five times, during the debate, in answer to questions put upon this side of the House by those who had reason to believe that the statement was incorrect, the hon. gentleman repeated it over and over again; and this House, on the solemn assertion of the hon. gentleman, and under the full belief that they were voting money for the construction of a road which would shorten the great Intercolonial Railway down to the sea by 45 miles, voted that million and a quarter of dollars. Well, Sir, last Session a vote of \$750,000 was passed, and when the then Minister of Railways proposed it, I asked him: "Do you persist in the statement that it is going to shorten the line by 45 miles?" The hon. gentleman said he did not know. I said to him: I was informed that it would not shorten it four miles. The hon. gentleman said he did not know, but that he would bring down the papers. Now, what is the fact? The distance from Oxford to Truro, upon the present line is 46 miles, and from Truro to New Glasgow 43 miles, making in all 87 miles. We have a fully equipped road, paid for, running between those two places. This road from Oxford to New Glasgow is a parallel

road. The distance is: Oxford Junction to Brown's Point, 72 miles; from Brown's Point to New Glasgow, 15, making 87 miles, or a saving of two miles alone on the length of this road, for which this country has been asked to pay a million and a quarter of money. Sir, hon. gentlemen talk about Nova Scotia sending a contingent to support the present Government. Do they think that it was because the people of Nova Scotia believe in their policy? The hon. gentleman knows better. He knows they have secured a network of roads all over these counties; he knows that they have expended millions in the past four years in the construction of those roads—and I have mentioned to you one at an expenditure of a million and a quarter, for a road parallel to our existing roads, and not shortening the distance more than a nominal quantity—for the purpose of spreading money through the district to elect men to support the present Government. Why, Sir, do I make such statements as I have made—for they cannot be contradicted, I challenge contradiction—but to open the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite? They saw this great European line that was going to be constructed with the object of shortening the distance 45 miles. Hon. gentlemen had dust thrown in their eyes. The distance was not shortened, but they were voting money to build parallel lines to their own road. Sir, it was the same way with another expenditure they wanted us to make, the Chignecto Ship Railway. In the first place, a commissioner was appointed to consider the feasibility of constructing the canal from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. That commissioner reported that the canal could be constructed for five or six millions, and I believe that the Government for a moment did entertain the idea that it was possible to construct it. But on examination it was found that it would cost over ten million dollars and the project was abandoned. Afterwards they decided to go on with this ship railway scheme, and Sir Charles Tupper came down here and induced the House to agree to a subsidy of \$150,000 a year for 21 years. Subsequently we extended the time and altered the terms to \$175,000 for 20 years, or in other words, the credit of this country has been pledged to the tune of three and a half millions of money for the construction of the Chignecto Ship Railway, and mind, the Maritime Provinces are charged with that expense as if it was some benefit conferred upon them. Well, Sir, I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever discovered a practical shipping man in the Maritime Provinces who did not denounce this scheme as a fraud. What benefit is that going to be? What ships are going to carry on trade between St. John and the Gulf of St. Lawrence? The hon. gentleman knows that the whole thing is done that the Government may have the expenditure of so much more money, and the hon. gentleman has never yet been able to find a practical ship-master or ship-owner who was not prepared to denounce the whole thing as a fraud. That is where the money goes, and we in the Maritime Provinces thoroughly understand it, and by letting this light in we can better understand the enormous deficits that annually occur in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I will now leave that branch of the case, and will refer for a few moments to some statements made by the hon. gentleman with respect to the commercial prosperity of the country. Sir, I am not going to present many facts or figures to the House, but I will submit a few figures, and I do so because they show to my mind that the charge made on this side of the House of reckless extravagance on the part of the Government, has not been made without adequate foundation. Sir, we have had Estimates brought down by the Finance Minister this year showing that he intends to tax the people to the tune of \$31,025,000; \$23,900,000 he expects to obtain from Customs, and \$7,125,000 from Excise. In 1878, the total taxes taken from the people were \$17,841,000 and if you add the deficit of that year \$1,128,000 you find the

taxes required to carry on the Government of the country amounted to \$18,969,000, and yet hon. gentlemen to-day require \$12,000,000 of extra taxes for the coming year. They told us then when we went to the electors that too much money was being expended in administering public affairs, and yet this year they require \$12,000,000 more. They have raised the duty on goods entered for consumption from 14.03 per cent. in 1878 to 21.57 per cent. in 1888, and have raised the expenditure from \$24,455,381 to \$36,718,494 last year, or an increase of over \$12,000,000. These facts are sufficient to satisfy me that they require some more explanation than has been given by hon. gentlemen opposite. Shouts of loyalty are not going to answer figures of that character. But let us see whether the condition of affairs in the Maritime Provinces is as satisfactory as hon. gentlemen opposite contend. We have had most rosy pictures painted by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and other hon. members of the commercial prosperity of that and other portions of the Dominion. I was astounded at the hon. gentleman's statements. Has the hon. gentleman been in St. John? Does he think there is commercial prosperity there?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance is the only one who can find it. I have been there, and I have been told by gentlemen resident there that the very opposite is the case, that there is commercial atrophy, that commercial depression exists there as it exists in the other commercial cities of the Maritime Provinces. Does the hon. gentleman find it in Halifax? Does he find it in Charlottetown? Has the value of real estate increased in those centres? Are our warehouses filled with goods as was the case formerly? Are our ship-building and ship-owning interests increasing year by year? The report of the Minister of Marine did not contain this year the annual statement of the tonnage built and the tonnage on the registry books of this country; but I was enabled by his kindness on making personal application to him to obtain the figures, and I will trouble the House for a moment in regard to this matter of shipping in the Maritime Provinces. I find, in 1888, there were upon the registry books of the Dominion on 31st December, 7,142 vessels, of the tonnage of 1,089,642; in 1887, 7,173 vessels, of the tonnage of 1,130,247 tons, or a decline of 40,604 tons in one year. Let me compare 1878 with 1888. In 1878 we had 7,469 vessels, of the tonnage of 1,383,015; in 1888 7,142 vessels, of the tonnage of 1,089,642, or a decline of 293,373 tons. Estimating the tonnage value at \$30 per ton, the loss in the value of shipping owned by Canada in ten years is \$3,801,190. In 1878 we built 106,796 tons of shipping which, at \$45 per ton, gave \$4,815,000. This year we built the paltry tonnage of 22,693 tons, of a value of \$1,021,000, or a loss in the production of shipping in 1888, as compared with 1878, of \$3,790,000. Do these figures show nothing; does the hon. gentleman pretend that these particular interests have increased in value or have improved, or have they gone back? Let the hon. gentleman point out the branches in which prosperity prevails in the Maritime Provinces. It is true that one or two more sugar refineries have been established; but I doubt if that is any great benefit to the community, and I think many people who thought they would be a benefit are now beginning very much to doubt whether such is the case or not. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) drew a parallel between the prosperity of the Maritime Provinces and the prosperity of the State of Maine. He said that the Maritime Provinces were more prosperous in some respects than was the State of Maine. Well, I have this to say with regard to the comparison the hon. gentleman made, that I do not think it is a fair one in this regard: I claim that the Maritime



Provinces are more fruitful, that their resources—either mineral, agricultural or fishing—are greater and more valuable than those of the State of Maine, and that, accordingly, they should be more prosperous. When you consider the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces, the wonderful mining industries, the fertility of the soil of Prince Edward Island, and the Annapolis Valley, and other parts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, we should, with such rich Provinces, and Provinces so favored by nature, have improved and progressed more rapidly than the State of Maine. But the fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman took good care only to make a comparison in some respects. I am not going to allege that the State of Maine is improving more than are the Maritime Provinces, but I will give the hon. gentleman one item that he may think over. Hon. gentlemen opposite have alleged that the savings banks deposits afford an index of prosperity; I am not going to say whether that is a true index or a false one, but hon. gentlemen opposite have always adopted it, and I suppose they are prepared to adopt it in this instance. I find in the State of Maine in 1886-87, the amount deposited in the savings banks of that State was \$37,215,071, or \$57 for every man, woman and child in the State of Maine, while in the entire Dominion of Canada, if you choose to put the population at 5,000,000, the whole amount was \$40,832,000, in both the Dominion savings banks and the Post Office savings banks, or \$8 for every man, woman and child in Canada as against \$57 in the State of Maine. I am not adopting the argument that the amount of deposits in the savings banks is an evidence of the prosperity of the country; but hon. gentlemen opposite never cease to adopt and proclaim it. I give them that fact in answer to the figures the hon. gentleman has quoted with reference to the relative prosperity of the State of Maine and the Maritime Provinces. We have had the statement made here from time to time, that this country is very prosperous and gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House have said that we are so prosperous and so happy and so contented that we do not want any change at all. Let us go to the North-West for a moment and see the condition of things there. The other day the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) gave us a most glowing account of that country and of its possibilities.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman opposite from Regina gave us the same account of the undeveloped resources of that country, and he pictured what the future was going to bring forth. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk told me that he was going to give me a shot across the floor of the House and I waited very patiently for the shot to come, but the only shot that he gave us was the statement that some firm in Ontario had sold \$30,000 worth of buggies to Prince Edward Island. I do not see anything in that, but I want to ask the hon. gentleman how much Ontario bought from Prince Edward Island in return? What we are interested in in the Maritime Provinces is to know how to dispose of our surplus products. We are looking for a market and we do not find it in Canada, and that is why we support the policy embodied in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). In this great North-West with its magnificent resources of all kinds and descriptions, its wonderful climate, its illimitable possibilities, to use the words of my hon. friend opposite, how is it that it does not improve? What is the reason it does not fill out with population? I am prepared to accept fully and unreservedly the statement the hon. gentleman has made, for I believe that Canada has in that great North-West a wonderful possession. I believe, Sir, its resources can hardly be exaggerated in the English language. I believe they are great and vast. I believe its climate is fine but I want to know why,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

in the name of common sense, with this railway running through that territory and with all its wonderful resources, that population is not going in there? I want to know also why it is that when population goes in there it does not stay? We, on this side of the House, have charged that this sad result is in a large measure due to the false policy the Government of this country adopted a few years ago. They had grand opportunities as has been pointed out time and time again with which to lay the foundations of a great country, if they had proceeded as they ought to have proceeded with prudence and caution. But they proceeded with absolute recklessness, and it is on record to this day, and I do not think that any hon. member will deny it, that the manner in which they attempted to open up the country has proved a failure, and that their policy was based on false lines. They wanted to make this fine country the great hunting ground of the capitalists and the speculators, while we on the other hand wanted to make it the home of the millions. I understand that there are only 118,000 white people in the whole of Manitoba and the North-West by the last census taken. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me what is the cause of this failure? It is not because of want of natural advantages in the country, and it is not because of the climate, for both are all that can be desired. Then it must be the fault of the Government. It is not many years ago since they brought about by their misgovernment, a rebellion in that country, which cost us some six or eight millions of money, and which threw back the country eight or ten years, if not more. What do I find to-day? They talk about the policy of this Government developing that country, but I will take a picture of its present position from their own blue-book—and, remember, I am not going to hazard any statement of my own, because I would be told by hon. gentlemen opposite that I was decrying the country—but I take the statement published by the Government itself, and spread broadcast over the world, which is to the effect that the emigrants they are paying to bring into that country are leaving it by the thousands, if we can believe the statement of their own agent and representative. What says the agent at Winnipeg, Mr. Graham, in his report to the Government Emigration Office, which, to give it greater prominence, they embody in the report of the Minister of Agriculture, and circulate all through this country as well as abroad. He says:

"Many will be surprised to learn, that the number of actual settlers, in our Province and Territories, has not been as large as expected, neither has the amount of wealth brought in by those who have come, been as considerable as that of former years. This may appear strange, when we consider the many efforts that were put forth by the different organisations, to induce immigration to the Province and neighboring Territories, but it is nevertheless a fact, that, out of the many thousands who left the Mother Country, ostensibly for the North-West, a large number of them found occupation and homes on the Pacific coast, and, I regret to say, a large majority of these are on the American side.

"I came in contact with great numbers of people, who were, as they said, pushing through to British Columbia, having been advised by British and continental steamship and transportation agents, that work and opportunities for investment were never greater than during the present year. On arriving at Vancouver, a very active thriving young town, but, owing to its comparatively recent origin capable of supplying employment to a limited number, hundreds of these people were disappointed, and sooner than remain there in idleness, took the steamboat for Port Townsend, Seattle, Tacoma and other points in Washington Territory, Oregon, Arizona, and Northern California. During a visit to these territories, I saw hundreds of people, that I had met while they were en route through Winnipeg, many of them old Canadian residents, and others new arrivals direct from Europe. When I questioned them why they went over to the American, instead of remaining on the Canadian side, their reply was, in substance, what I have already stated, namely, that on their arrival at Vancouver and Victoria, they found the demand for labor limited, the facilities for active agriculture, with small capital, few, and, not caring to return, they went farther west, as they found it cost less money to do so. I took a keen interest in this matter, and interviewed the pursers of the local steamboats from whom I gathered information that would lead me to believe that the steamboats plying between Vancouver, Victoria, San Francisco and the American ports at the head of Puget Sound, carried very little less than ten thousand immigrants, most of whom left Europe with the intention of remaining in British possessions.

"Strenuous efforts have been made both by myself and staffs as well as others who are interested in immigration, to cause these people to remain but they preferred to follow out their own plans.

"I merely mention this as an illustration of the fast increasing difficulties attending the efforts of your agents to aid in the successful settlement of the large area of vacant lands in this Province and adjoining Territories."

Sir, that is a sad page in Canadian history, and I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they would be giving more evidence of their patriotism if they devoted their energies to determine why it is that such a sad state of facts exist, rather than by pouring out torrents of vituperation at hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. That policy of theirs with regard to the Opposition is child's play. The day has gone by when you can make the electorate believe that those thousands of people fly from this country because of any statement made by the members of the Opposition. It is nonsense, it is not true, and it is opposed to the facts, as your own agent reports them. There is something wrong in the political management of the North-West and it has been wrong for the last 10 years. You have tried to make the North-West the happy hunting ground of the boodler, and the result is you have driven the settlers out of the country. You have brought about a civil war which, as I have said, has retarded the country for ten or twelve years, perhaps, and you have squandered millions of money in paying the cost of that war, which ought to be paid properly out of your own pockets. Sir, I believe that if a more liberal policy to the North-West were adopted, a policy which would allow its great resources to be developed—if the policy proclaimed by the hon. member for East York (Mr Mackenzie), when he was in power, had been continued by hon. gentlemen opposite—instead of there being only 100,000 people in the North-West to-day, you would have had nearly, if not fully, half a million. Hon. gentlemen crow and cheer, but let them place their finger on any phase of their policy connected with populating the North-West or developing its resources, which will redound to their credit. It is a sad chapter in the history of the North-West, and I believe it will not be written in proper lines until the Liberal party come into power. Now, before I sit down, I want to say one word with reference to the amendment submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Last year, Sir, a similar amendment embodying the policy of the Liberal party, was submitted to the House; and I notice, this year, somewhat of a change in the language and the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the proposition. Last year, Sir, the burden of their song was that we could not get what we asked, and there was no use in our asking for it. This year they say, they do not want it. We have had speeches made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and other hon. gentlemen opposite, proving what? Proving that this country would be better off without extended trade with the United States, that we had better trade among ourselves, that we had better swap jack-knives and we will get rich, and that we do not want to extend our trade beyond the border at all. These gentlemen prophesy dire effects from the policy we propose, and they tell us that we are all wrong as to the blessings which occurred to this country under the old Reciprocity Treaty. They devoted themselves for hours to minimising the blessings that flowed over this country during the period that free trade in natural products existed between Canada and the United States; and they said: Even if you do get reciprocity, you need not expect that the good times will come again. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), who, I regret to see, is not in his place, stated that the fact that men's views differed very widely depended very much on whether they were supporting or opposing the Govern-

ment. Sir, it is true; and there never was a more notable instance of that than is afforded by the hon. gentleman himself. I think I remember when he supported a policy and a party almost diametrically opposed to the policy and the party he supports now. He takes a most roseate view of the condition of affairs in the country to-day; and why should he not? He is president and the largest shareholder in a railway running from Shediac to Cape Tormentine, which has been subsidised by the Government to the extent of \$113,000, and it is no wonder that he takes a roseate view of the country with that subsidy in his pocket; but the people who have not the subsidy do not take the same roseate view. He says our condition is sufficiently prosperous, and we should not desire any change; and he threatens, and so does the hon. member for Kent, an exodus of loyalists, if we bring about a commercial union with the United States. These gentlemen are so loyal that they do not want to remain in this country an hour after commercial union is brought about. I do not think the country would suffer; there is not one of them that would not go to the United States to-morrow if he could better his condition. Hundreds of thousands of our people, unfortunately, have gone to the United States to better their condition; they are going every day, and we propose a policy embodied in the resolution before the House—for a disloyal purpose? Not at all; but for the purpose of bringing about commercial prosperity in the country, and keeping our people at home. But Sir, it does not at all follow, because these gentlemen are so very strong in their denunciation of our policy to-day, that they will not whip round and support that policy if they get the word of command from their leader. We have had instances of more extraordinary changes than that. I remember, last year, when we were discussing the statutory offer made to the United States, and when it was contended that in trees and fruits which had been admitted free of duty by the United States, we should reciprocate under the statutory offer, a debate arose in this House; and what did we hear? We heard hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing that policy with more vigor than they denounce unrestricted reciprocity to-day; and we heard their sentiments cheered to the echo by their friends behind them; even Ministers rose in their places and said that it was preposterous. I remember very well a speech made by no less a person than the Minister of Justice, in which he denounced the proposition as almost a disloyal one. I will read to you from *Hansard* what he said—I am quoting from his speech on page 492. This speech was made in answer to a proposition, emanating from this side of the House, that this country should reciprocate to the same measure as the United States had gone under the statutory offer:

"Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of this as being a statutory offer, an offer on the part of this Parliament which involves a breach of faith if this Government should fail to carry it out to the full extent. Does the hon. gentleman mean to contend—because his argument goes that far—that this statutory offer—not only including the clause which has been brought to the notice of the House, because what is called the statutory offer embraces half-a-dozen other offers, and looks to the admission of free fish, coal and various other products into the United States—does the hon. gentleman mean to contend that it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Canada, even as to that part of the statutory offer, to decline to allow the United States to say: 'You have made that offer; we will take portions of it, and enact those which please us, and which appear favorable to our people, and we will shut the door in the faces of your people in respect to all the other portions?' I can only say that, in my humble judgment, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, it would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada."

Sir, one week or a fortnight afterwards the hon. gentleman came down, as a member of a Government, tendering to this House the very policy to adopt which he had declared a week before, amid the plaudits of his followers, would be a betrayal of the interests of the people of Canada. I do not at all fear that because the hon. gentleman was fierce and loud in his denunciations of our policy to-day, he may not

be one of the loudest advocates of it if he gets the word of command. We know that it has been so in the past, and history will probably repeat itself. The hon. gentleman, as I said, attempted to minimise the effects which flowed over this country from the old Reciprocity Treaty; and one after another hon. gentlemen declared that the enormous increase in the trade between Canada and the States was due, to a very large extent if not altogether, to the civil war which prevailed in the United States; and they said, there is no civil war now, and it does not follow, because you had an enormous increase in your trade before, that if you have reciprocity again you will have a similar increase. But the hon. gentleman ought to know that for the first eight years under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 there was no civil war in the United States at all, and that the trade between this country and the United States during those eight years leaped up by bounds from the pitiful sum of \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000 at which it stood when the treaty began to the sum of \$84,000,000 when the treaty expired. We were told by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Hon. George Brown was a patriot and that we would do well to imitate his example. Well, I find the Hon. George Brown was the man who attempted to negotiate a treaty with the United States to bring about reciprocity of trade, not only in the articles to which the old Reciprocity Treaty extended, but in one hundred and twenty other articles besides, and in advocating that treaty, the Hon. George Brown who is now held up as a patriot—and I may remark in passing that all Liberal statesmen are canonised as patriots by the Tories after they die, though denounced during life—the Hon. George Brown called attention to the advancement and the prosperity of this country, during the existence of the old treaty, in the following words—I am now quoting from his memorandum:—

“The grand fact remains that under the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the aggregate interchange of commodities between the Republic and the Provinces to promote which the treaty was concluded, rose from an annual average of \$13,230,763 in the previous eight years to \$33,492,754 gold currency in the first year of its existence; to \$42,942,754 gold currency in the second year of its existence, to \$50,339,770 gold, in its third year; and to no less a sum than \$84,070,955 at war prices, in its 13th year.”

Why, there was no war during the first three years of the existence of the treaty, and the traffic had risen from \$14,000,000 to \$50,000,000 in that space of time; yet the hon. gentleman dares to say that we cannot hope for a recurrence of that prosperity or an increase similar to the increase then. Perhaps not to the same extent, but no doubt when one looks at the occasion of that increase of tariff, when one looks at the enormous increase of population to-day compared with then, one must conclude that if we could have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, prosperity would flow over this country in a ratio equal at least to that during the existence of the old Reciprocity Treaty. It is of no use for hon. gentlemen to state to those who were alive at the time, and remember the prosperity that existed between 1854 and 1866, that free trade relations will not bring about prosperity to the people of this country. Why, in the Maritime Provinces he would be laughed at. I can remember, when, in the little Province from which I come, during the existence of the treaty, every creek and harbor was filled with small vessels to carry away the produce of the Island to its best market, and bring back the cheap goods we required. The barter and exchange was profitable to us and to those with whom we exchanged, and the same result will take place to-morrow under similar circumstances. And the same rule which applied to the Island will be found applicable to all the Provinces of the Dominion. I have no doubt about the rapid development of the North-West, if the barriers which restrict its trade with the country lying to the south were removed. I have no doubt that the prosperity of Ontario would be duplicated if it could get freer trade with the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

United States, and the same effect no doubt would be felt by the Province of Quebec and the others. What are we told by hon. gentlemen opposite? We are told, you are not likely to get this. Why? Because Mr. W. H. Murray—Adirondack Murray, as he is popularly called—has published a pamphlet in which he says the people of the United States do not want reciprocity but want political union. Who is Mr. Murray? Is he a representative of the people? Is he responsible to the people? Is he authorised by the people of the United States to speak for them? No; it is absurd for the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), and four or five others, to quote the *ipse dixit* or opinion of Mr. Murray, a private citizen, as representing the opinion of the American people. He is in no sense a representative man. If we want to know further whether it is possible or probable we may get free trade relations with the United States, we must go to those who hold responsible positions in the Legislature of that country and in the presidential Cabinet. We know what the late Secretary of State said. His letter has been quoted time and again, this year and last. He said he was in favor of freer interchange of products between Canada and the United States, and that his intention was not in any way to affect the political independence of Canada. He wanted free trade unrestricted. He did not propose that our political freedom or independence should be altered or endangered, but he wanted a freer interchange of products between both countries. And why do we not get it? Why was he not able to carry that out? Let me give you the answer, not in my own words, but in those of the High Commissioner. If you had not driven the people of the United States to the mood in which they were when Sir Charles Tupper went down to try and carry out the offer that Mr. Bayard made him, you might have had that offer carried out, if not to the full extent, in a modified degree. But Sir Charles said we could not carry it out. Why? Because our policy towards the people of the United States, instead of being a kindly considered policy calculated to develop kindly feelings, had driven that country to desperation. They were in no mood for a treaty; and much as Sir Charles desired to promote this unrestricted reciprocity scheme, we were powerless in the face of 60,000,000 irritated people.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mr. Bayard say that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sir Charles said what I am going to read to you, and the hon. gentleman will see whether I have not quoted him fairly.

Mr. FOSTER. What did Mr. Bayard say?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am pointing out what Sir Charles said. He said:

“They said, secondly, that not only was that the case, but such was the expression of public men in regard to Canada, and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen, that if to-morrow any relaxation of the commerce of the United States was made by an Act of Congress, it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operations, so as to deny us its advantage. But they say our policy is proclaimed on the housetops, you will read it in the President's speech, you will see it everywhere, our policy is as far as we can to make the natural products that come into the country free, and what lies in the way of that policy is this irritation connected with the fishery question. If we can solve that, if we can take that out of the way, you will find at once that our own independent policy, the policy of the United States on this question of commercial intercourse will be such as to produce the most intimate commercial relations again with the Dominion of Canada.”

When you can remove the irritation which these gentlemen opposite, by their mad, insensate and insane policy, have created during the last ten years, the result will be to produce the most intimate commercial relations between Canada and the United States. I do not suppose that Sir Charles Tupper came here retailing that which was not true, and if we did not succeed, these hon. gentlemen can charge the want of success to their own policy and to the results of that policy in producing ill-feeling and irritation

among the American people. We are to-day differently situated and occupy a different position from that we occupied last year. We were making, then, a proposal to the people of the United States. Up to that time there had been no response, at any rate from the legislature of that country. Congress had not expressed its views on the matter, but since then Congress has reciprocated and passed a resolution which hon. gentlemen correctly call Mr. Hitt's commercial union resolution. Although the lines upon which Mr. Hitt would like to proceed are altogether different from the lines on which we would like to proceed, the end which he seeks to obtain—unrestricted freedom of commercial intercourse—is the same end as that which we are seeking. The means are different, but the end is the same. If two great legislatures like the Legislature of this Dominion and the Congress of the United States have the common view of obtaining that which would be a boon to the people of the two great countries, and only differ as to the means, what would be the course that any onlooker would say was a reasonable one to take? It would be that those two countries should send commissioners to meet and consider the situation, and consider whether any course could be adopted which would solve the difficulties existing between them. Perhaps, if our resolution were adopted, and commissioners were sent to Washington to meet commissioners appointed by the United States, having the same end in view, our scheme in its entirety might not be adopted, and it is possible that their scheme in its entirety might not be adopted; but what I charge the hon. gentleman with is that they are opposed to the end and not simply to the means; that they are opposed to the obtaining of reciprocity at all because that may damage the special interests that they have been put into power to protect. They will not even appoint commissioners to find a way by which the great object we have can be obtained as between the two countries. Mr. Hitt, in bringing forward his resolution, and referring to the resolution which was lost in this House last Session but was supported by 67 members, said:

"It is time we gave some assurance that such powerful movement of such immense consequences interests our people, and will be considered in as liberal and practical a spirit on our side."

It may be that, in the absence of negotiation and in the absence of means to thoroughly understand our view of that matter, they have adopted a policy of commercial union. Is it fixed for all time that they will not modify that view, that they will not adopt the views which we have in favor of unrestricted reciprocity as against commercial union? This country has not heard, and it will not hear, from hon. gentleman on the other side one word in favor of, or in sympathy with, the end which we seek to obtain, or in favor of any other reciprocity than a reciprocity which the hon. gentlemen themselves say can never be obtained. Therefore, I charge them with being opposed to any freer trade relations with the United States, because they think these freer trade relations will interfere with, or perhaps hamper some of the special interests which they have to advance. Representing, as I do, a district of 60,000 people, I am in favor of this resolution with both hands, and a large majority in my Province will support it and will vote for it at the next election. The people of Prince Edward Island know very well that, if that is adopted, commercial prosperity will take the place of the commercial atrophy which now exists throughout that Province.

Mr. MADILL. I shall only deal with one remark which has been made by my hon. friend on the other side (Mr. Davies), leaving the questions of the Intercolonial Railway and other matters of that kind to be dealt with by the members from the far East. I was struck very much with the remark that he made, that he would place very few

facts and figures before the House, and I must compliment him on having kept his word, as he has made up for the want of facts by a great number of figures and assertions. As some seventy speeches have been delivered in this House, last Session, on this question, followed by a large number during the present Session, the arguments *pro* and *con* are pretty well exhausted, but, as I did not contribute to the septuagint version of last Session, I trust the House will bear with me for a short time while I refer to some points but lightly touched on by previous speakers. The term unrestricted reciprocity seems a misnomer, for although not restricted to natural products, it is the most restricted reciprocity possible—free trade restricted to the United States, with a tariff barrier against the rest of the world. I see virtually no distinction between "commercial union" and "unrestricted reciprocity" as to results. With commercial union, our tariff would be fixed at Washington, at the dictation of Americans, and on the same basis as their tariff against Great Britain and the rest of the world. Our people would be subjugated to the dictates of a foreign power, and the ties which bind us to the mother land would be severed. Unrestricted reciprocity would have the same effect, for although in that case, Canadians would arrange the tariff, that tariff would have to be as high as the tariff of the United States, otherwise the United States would have none of it. They are too astute not to understand that if our tariff against foreign goods was even 5 or 10 per cent. lower than theirs, foreign goods would seek Canadian ports and replace American goods in Canada, or pass over with Canadian goods into the United States free of duty to the loss of United States revenue, and they would not tolerate that for one moment. The principle adopted by our American neighbors is that we cannot have commercial reciprocity without political union. In Senator Sherman's interview published in the *Toronto Globe* of 3rd December last, he says:

"I studied the proposal of commercial reciprocity only to be convinced that it was illusory and impracticable."

And he goes on to say:

"It is of no use to discuss the theoretical advantages of Reciprocity. The American people won't have it and the question may just as well be dismissed at once. Political union is another thing."

And he goes on to discuss the benefits of political union. That is the position of the American people, and, although they may be encouraged by some of the speeches made in this House by our friends opposite, I feel satisfied that a Canadian national spirit with love for the motherland is stronger in the hearts of the Canadian people than ever. The Americans threatened to punish Canada with a retaliatory measure because the Senate of the United States rejected a treaty which the President declared honorable. And the only effect those threats had was to stir up the national spirit, and Canada became a nation in a day. The United States has been always hostile to Great Britain and to Canada, and jealous of our progress in making a great nation on their northern border. The United States have always been hostile to Canada and our progress has been so rapid that they are jealous of the great nation to the north of them on this continent. They have always been hostile and aggressive. They wanted Florida and they took it, Louisiana and Alaska they annexed, California and Mexico they conquered and Texas they stole. They wanted the State of Maine and they swindled us out of it by a false map. In 1775 they attempted to capture Canada and again in 1812 and were defeated both times. In 1812 Canada had only a population of 100,000, the United States 10,000,000, yet the Americans after three and a-half years effort to capture us gave it up as a bad job. With unrestricted reciprocity—a preference for the United States—a discrimination against England, the ties which bind us to Great Britain would necessarily be broken. We would not have her protection and the moment the

United States Government desired to break up any business relations with Canada we would be helpless, alone and unprotected, and there could be no other result than annexation, or a political union, and Canada would be blotted from the lists of nations. Would it not be preferable to extend our trade to nations producing products that we need and do not raise ourselves; and who require our goods in exchange and place no tariff against us? The United States produce similar goods as Canada, so that the 60,000,000, our Reform friends speak of, would be simply rivals in our market. England does not produce sufficient in breadstuffs to support her people. She must import—she exports goods so cheap that the United States dare not allow them into the country, and so shuts them out by a high tariff. The United States produce a large surplus of breadstuffs as we do in Canada, and such surplus must find its way to the English market, the market of the world. If then you allow American breadstuffs to come into Canada free, our already over-stocked market will be glutted, and we would be forced to export the more; so that as producers of similar products the 60,000,000 of people would be rivals in our market, and our farmers would suffer by it. We have heard so many speeches in this House derogatory to Canada, and in praise of the United States, that it is an interesting subject for examination to dispose of the declarations of our friends opposite as to the ruinous condition of Canadians as compared with the people of the United States, and the gloomy pictures drawn respecting our own country and our abject dependence on the United States for commercial union, as advocated by the hon. member for South Middlesex, unrestricted reciprocity as contended for by the hon. member for South Oxford, or the doctrine of veiled annexation preached on the floor of this House by the hon. member for North Norfolk. So many speeches have been made, arguments advanced and proofs given by members on this side of the House, that I shall not take up the time of the House on that subject; sufficient to say that I wish now to say a few words in reference to the prosperity of Canada, in opposition to the declarations made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Our prosperity is attested by our numerous and valuable public works, our assets of 45 millions in reduction of our gross public debt, the increase of exports of animals and their products of over 10 millions in ten years, the increase from half a million to 5½ millions on our cattle exported to Great Britain in ten years. The increase of our exports on wheat and flour from 3,181,187 bushels in 1877 to 7,141,191 bushels in 1887. Our exports in apples increasing from \$195,573 in 1877 to \$846,795 in 1887. Peas from \$1,479,945 in 1877 to \$2,358,019 in 1887. Cheese, from \$3,742,604 in 1877 to \$7,096,658 in 1887. A decrease on money borrowed from chartered banks from \$4 45 in 1877 on every \$100 to \$1.61 in 1887. A decrease in amount of business failures from \$25,523,000 in 1877 and \$23,908,000 in 1878 to \$16,311,745 in 1887, a decrease of 9 millions from 1877, or over 6 millions from 1878. An increase of \$12,000,000 on issue of bank notes and 4½ millions of Dominion notes from 1877 to 1887. An increase in the peoples' deposits from \$66,503,757 in 1878 to \$107,154,483 in 1887, or an increase of \$40,650,726. An increase of 9½ millions in savings' branches, building societies and loan companies. An increase of over 36½ millions in deposits in savings banks by the people from 1878 to 1887. An increase of over 3 millions in money orders, and so on, give a complete answer to the statements made by our opponents respecting our status. In population also we compare more than favorably when contrasted with the New England States to the south. From a statement published in the *St. Johns Telegraph* of 22nd November, 1881, then under the control of the late Mr. Elder, an able writer and a sound Reformer, we glean the following:—

Mr. MADILL,

	1830-3.	1881.	Increase in 50 Years.
Maine .....	1,953,717	4,010,025	2,056,369
N-w Hampshire.....			
Vermont.....			
Massachusetts.....			
Connecticut.....			
Rhode Island.....	1,865,215	4,141,424	3,076,209
Ontario.....			
Quebec.....			
New Brunswick.....			
Nova Scotia.....			
Prince Edward Island.....			

Whilst the New England doubled their population in fifty years, the older Provinces of Canada have nearly quadrupled theirs. Take Maine as against the Maritime Provinces:

	1830-1.	1880-1.	Increase in 50 Years.	Per Cent.
Maine .....	399,455	618,436	218,981	62
Maritime Province.....	275,379	869,195	584,116	212

Or exclude Prince Edward Island, and take twenty years.

	1860-1.	1880-1.	Increase in 20 Years.	Per Cent.
Maine .....	628,279	648,436	20,157	3
N. Brunswick & Nova Scotia	582,940	761,714	178,774	30

Maine, which had 45,000 more people than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in 20 years had 113,000 less. Dropping Ontario, let us compare Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, the States that lie immediately on our borders, soil and climate are similar to ours, with Quebec and the Maritime Provinces:

	1830-1.	1880-1.	Increase in 50 Years.
3 New England States.....	919,435	1,327,713	378,278
4 Canadian Provinces.....	828,513	2,227,964	1,399,451

While the increase of population in three New England States on our borders in 50 years has been only 38 per cent., the increase in the four Provinces was 169 per cent. Figures like these require no comment.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MADILL. Mr. Speaker, our opponents are continually speaking about the magnitude of our debt and encumbrances. Let us make a comparison with the States who have enjoyed the alleged benefits of commercial union with each other. We find the lands of the Dominion encumbered to the amount of \$81,000,000 or 9 per cent. whilst it is:

In Ohio.....	\$761,000,000
Illinois.....	620,000,000
Michigan.....	350,000,000
Dakota, with 600,000 inhabitants.....	45,000,000
Iowa.....	351,000,000
Kansas.....	200,000,000
Minnesota.....	175,000,000
New York.....	35 per cent.
10 states encumbered to the extent of 3,422,000,000 and an approximate estimate at 9 billions for the United States.	

Now, let us compare the products and prices as obtain in Canada and the United States. The Province of Ontario compares favorably in cereals with the United States. Take fall wheat for the years 1885 and 1886 and the net result has been as follows: The average price has been 77½ per bushel in the Province of Ontario, and the average product has been 22¼ bushels per acre. During the same period in the United States the average price was 72.9 instead of 77½ cents and the product 11¼ as compared with 22.4 or 9.17 in favor of the Canadian as compared with the American farmer. Take barley, during same two years in

Ontario the average was 53.2 cents and the average product 27.1, and in the States the price averaged 56 cents, but the product was only 22 or a difference of 2.11 in favor of the Ontario farmer. In oats, in Ontario, an average of 36 bushels per acre, at 31.7 cents per bushel as against 26.55 bushels at 25.33 cents, on the other side of the line; therefore both in quantity and in price the average is in favor of the home farmer. In rye, the quantity with us is 16.2 bushels per acre as compared with 12 on the other side, or 25 per cent. more in our favor, and the price with us was 53.7 cents while that on the other side is 57.9 cents, a result favorable to us to the extent of \$1.80 per acre, compared with the other side. In corn our product is not large, but our product is 66½ bushels per acre to 24 on the other side, and the price 27 cents on our side against 24 cents on the other side, meaning \$10 per acre in our favor. There can be no comparison in peas as they are not grown to any considerable extent on the other side. Hay averaged \$9.77 per ton in Canada and in the United States \$8.71, showing a difference in favor of the Canadians of \$1.06 per ton. Potatoes 43 cents in Ontario and 44.7 cents per bushel in the United States, the average product here 123 bushels to the acre; in the United States only 77 bushels—the difference in our favor being the enormous favor of \$24.40 per acre. But compare the prices in Ontario with New York and Michigan. Wheat is \$20 per acre in Ontario, in Michigan it is \$16.17, in New York \$14.76. Rye, \$8.96 in Ontario, \$6.67 in Michigan, \$7.37 in New York. Barley, \$15.27 in Ontario, \$13.98 in Michigan, \$15.62 in New York. Potatoes, \$51.27 in Ontario, \$29.53 in Michigan, \$25.20 in New York. Hay \$14.12 in Ontario, \$12.85 in Michigan, \$13.39 in New York. Corn, \$17.86 in Ontario, \$11.00 in Michigan, \$17.00 in New York. In fact there is not a single article for those years of which the value to the farmer was not greater in the Province of Ontario than it was in the neighboring States of New York and Michigan, according to the returns of those two States. Now let us examine the benefit that would accrue to the Canadian farmers from unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union by the abolition of duties on American produce imported into Canada. And here let me say that if it is done for the purpose of giving our own people what our opponents call the cheaper goods of the manufacturers of the United States, don't you think they should be in favor of extending the same principle to British goods that are made so cheap that the manufacturers of the United States dare not allow them in their country but keep them out by an adverse tariff—the highest in the world—so that we would get not only the cheap goods of the States but the still cheaper goods of England? But no; they lay down a principle and chase the devil around the stump to avoid it. Our opponents continually compare the energy business enterprise of Yankees and Canadians to the detriment of the latter. The United States has been filled up and settled, and even wealth and capital went into that country from the whole civilised and uncivilised world at the time when Canada had no special advantages to offer, no great North-West, no help to settle her country by railway speed, and still we compare favorably with our cousins over the border in energy, purchasing power and business capacity. Take the volume of trade of both countries for the year 1887:

United States Imports .....	\$683,418,980
do Exports .....	725,733,263
Total .....	<u>1,409,152,243</u>

Divide that sum by the population, 60,000,000, and we find that the United States average \$22.00 per head of their population. Now, take the volume of trade for Canada for the same year :

Imports .....	\$112,892,236
Exports .....	89,515,811
Total .....	<u>202,408,047</u>

Take our population at 5,000,000, or \$40 per head of the population, that so far as business energy, capacity and purchasing power is concerned, we stand man for man nearly one hundred per cent. ahead of our American cousins. Now let us examine the benefits that would accrue to Canadian farmers by the abolition of import duties from the United States. The Americans exported in 1887, \$523,073,774 of agricultural products, of which \$184,000,000 was domestic merchandise, over and above what they consumed. With such a showing what chance would our farmers in that market already glutted with a surplus of the very products our farmers have to sell? Now what was the trade of our farmers in 1887 with the Americans, on animals and their products? We exported to the United States \$7,291,369, and of agricultural products, \$7,956,248. Taking the population of Canada at 5,000,000, or 1,000,000 families, or 600,000 farmers as the gentlemen opposite say, the whole trade of each farmer would be about \$25, less \$6.25 duty or \$18.75 per farmer, not profit but the whole of his trade out of which he makes either his profit or has a loss; but \$2,669,000 worth already goes in free of duty and a large portion of this trade would cease as American similar products would come into Canada on the duty being taken off. And for this are we to give up our present advantages and break up the ties which bind us to the mother land? This is not the sale of a birthright, but the sale of a nation for a mess of pottage. If the United States retaliate against us we are not at their mercy. We can find other channels and other markets in the mother country, in the colonies of the Empire, or in foreign countries. In trading with countries that produce goods required by us and which countries require our products in exchange, it is to the mutual advantage of both. For example, take those articles which we to so large an extent export to the United States, barley, cheese, butter, horses and other animals, eggs, poultry and apples. Great Britain imports of these \$133,000,000 worth and Canada now supplies but \$15,000,000, leaving as free a market to the Canadian as to the foreign farmer of \$118,000,000 worth a year. Of barley Great Britain imports 33,200,000 bushels, Russia supplies one-half and Canada supplied 7,000 bushels. The Dominion raises 23,000,000 bushel, consumes about 14,000,000 bushels of barley, leaving 9,000,000 bushels for export each year, nearly all of which goes to the United States. Why is this? Simply because England uses and requires two-rowed barley for brewing purposes, and Canadian farmers grow six-rowed for the United States market; and Russia, France, Norway, Sweden, Germany and Roumania supply the English market. The United States require 11,000,000 bushels more than they produce, and England 33,000,000 bushels, and our farmers, by raising two-rowed barley (as two-rowed and six-rowed barley cannot be mixed for malting purposes), could have entrance into a market three times as large as that of the United States. As the price in England is one-third higher for two-rowed barley than for six-rowed in the States, and two-rowed barley is more prolific than six-rowed, the product in Canada, averaging 26 bushels to the acre, as against nine bushels per acre in Russia. Of eggs Great Britain imports \$91,000,000 worth, but Canada sends her not a dozen. Of horses, Great Britain imports \$1,000,000 per year, Canada only supplies \$53,000 worth—and so on with other articles. Canada is not at the mercy of the United States; Canada is a prosperous country—the brightest gem in Britain's Crown,—a country larger than the United States, with illimitable resources; with untilled millions of acres, capable of relieving Europe of her burdened millions, with

her Provinces united into one grand confederation, banded together by an iron band from ocean to ocean, under the flag and protection of the greatest empire the world has ever seen. Canadians, if true to themselves, have before them a glorious future. I will leave this subject after reading a despatch to the *New York Tribune* of 8th February, copied into the March number of *Massey's Illustrated Journal*, whose proprietor is certainly not unfriendly to gentlemen opposite. It says:

"Instances are constantly cropping up which, in themselves, refute the statements made by chronic grumblers, that farmers in Ontario are worse off than their brethren in the States. Last month we referred to the great distress existing amongst the farming population in Dakota, and now it seems that the farmers in New Jersey are in a very bad way. A despatch to the *New York Tribune*, of 8th February, says: 'Many of the best and oldest say they cannot make both ends meet, and that the outlook is not encouraging. Many farmers have made assignments, and others are in the hands of the sheriff. To add to their discomfiture, the tomato crop, which has been their main stay, has proved disastrous, both as to quantity and price. For two seasons the farmers have tried to form a trust. Last year they were indifferent, and but few could be persuaded to enter the combination to demand a higher price from the canning factories, and now the second season's meeting for that purpose has proved a dismal failure. They say they will make their own sales for whatever they can get. The canners are consequently jubilant, and are contracting with small farmers for \$6 per ton and less, this being even a lower figure than was obtained last year.' With a fine soil and excellent climate it is difficult to understand why New Jersey farmers should be in such a sorry plight, when it is also taken into consideration that they have a market of 60,000,000 at their command. The condition of farmers in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin and other states is not much better than that of the farmers of New Jersey. In view of these facts well may we ask: What's the matter with Ontario?"

Our friends on the other side are continually crying out against what they term the extravagance of the present Government and the increase in the public debt, and promise retrenchment and economy if they succeed in carrying a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, so as to avoid to some extent recourse to direct taxation. We know what to expect from those gentlemen, when we consider their extravagance and want of economy during the five years they were in power. Let us compare the increase in the public debt under each régime:

The net public debt.....	\$236,000,000
Deducting provincial debts assumed.....	106,000,000

	\$130,000,000
Of which in 5 years under Reform régime it was increased..	40,000,000
In 16 years under the Conservative régime.....	90,000,000

That is, at the rate of 8 millions per year under hon. gentlemen opposite, and 5½ millions per annum under the Conservative. And when you come to compare the public works constructed by the present Government with the St. Francis Locks, the Kaminitiquia jobs and the Neebing Hotel, a standing or falling monument in the wilderness to-day of Reform economy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is worth to-day five times the sum paid for it.

Mr. MADILL. It is occupied by the rats and the bats.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are using it now.

Mr. MADILL. Therefore we may know, what to expect in the shape of retrenchment at their hands. But they excuse their increase of the public debt on the ground that they were carrying out the contracts made by their predecessors, but as they cancelled contracts, made and retendered on their own responsibility, they cannot evade the charge. Therefore unrestricted reciprocity would bring us face to face with direct taxation. And although, of late, our friends opposite seem to avoid saying much about it; is it not the policy of the party and their organ up to last Saturday? Why, only in July last, before the Privy Council in the Ontario lands case, the hon. member for West Durham, the ex-leader and the ablest member of the Opposition, expressed his conviction in these words:

"These revenues are mainly provided from one potential and two actual sources. The actual sources are the Dominion subsidy and the

Mr. MADILL.

revenues from the lands. The potential source is the power of direct taxation—a power which was not expected to be much exercised, which it was thought would not be required, and which, in fact, has hardly been used; partly from an ignorant impatience of direct taxation, and partly from an uninformed conviction, that whatever the Province could secure by Dominion subsidy would be clear gain to the Province.

Surely his convictions must be very strong for direct taxation when he calls the impatience of those not in favor of it as ignorant, and their convictions uninformed. In the *Globe* of 14th August, 1888, we find also an article in favor of direct taxation. Commenting upon this article, the *Monetary Times* says:

"The price of land in the old settlements of Ontario, except in the neighborhood of the cities, when not retrograde is stationary. Under any circumstances it would be equally preposterous and unjust to talk of throwing all the taxes of the country on the land, in the actual condition of things, it is little short of insanity."

Upon this the *Globe* says:

"About the greatest nonsense that can be talked on the taxation question is to say that the placing of all the taxes on the land would increase the burdens of the farmer. The farmer is beginning to understand that, under our indirect taxation system, there is stolen from him by the Government, and by Government authorised monopolies, about three or four times as much money per annum as any Government would dare to impose were the taxation direct, and collected in cash from the landowner. No class of the community would be more advantaged than the farmer by direct taxation imposed upon the land only."

That is the view of their leading organ up to last Saturday. Now, what does the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) say on this question? The hon. leader of the Opposition says he is only the follower of the hon. member for South Oxford on this question; and as the follower leads the leader, the policy imposed on the leader by the follower must with be accepted by him. It is with all due respect for the leader of the Opposition, the old story of the tail wagging the dog. The hon. member for South Oxford says:

"We will suppose, for argument's sake, that we have to face this bugbear of direct transaction—direct taxation—be it remembered, not for all our revenue—but a trifling portion of it alone. Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House in that connection to certain important facts. First of all, no man who has paid any attention to this subject will, I think, dare to deny the fact, which I think is recognised by every political economist, that direct taxation properly levied takes a great deal less out of the pockets of the people than indirect taxation, levied as our system of indirect taxation is levied now. Sir, I desire to say that in my judgment, we ought not. I do not think this Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fisherman, on the miners, on the lumberman, on all the great producing classes in this community. I shall be prepared to prove in some detail at the proper time and place, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hardworking industrious thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it (although I doubt greatly whether you need with proper economy have recourse to it) that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable well to do, moneyed classes must be made to pay their fair proportion—no more should be asked—to the burdens of the country."

Now, why all these declarations, declamations, special pleading and arguments of the leaders of the Opposition, and their late organ, if not to pave the way for direct taxation, which would as they know be hand-in-hand with their scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, and certainly is part of their policy? Now, as I represent an agricultural constituency, I wish to consider this question from the farmer's standpoint. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the farmers pay more taxes under the present system of indirect taxation, but considerably less. Nearly everything a farmer eats, uses or wears is untaxed. He raises his own wheat, he has it ground into flour; his own wife makes his bread; he raises his own butter, his own beef and his own pork; his tea and his coffee come in free; he raises his own milk, makes his own cheese, raises his own sheep, and his own wool with which he makes his own clothes; and even on the lower grades of sugar used by the farmer, the mechanic or the workingman, there is a lower tax than there was before the introduction of the National Policy. The

farmer wishes no such thing as direct taxation, which would tell unfairly on him. By unrestricted reciprocity the duties would be taken off exports from the United States into Canada, a loss to our revenue of over \$7,000,000 per annum, whilst a large quantity of American goods would under a free tariff take the place of and reduce the importation of the \$20,000,000 worth of British and foreign goods to at least one-half; so that our revenue would suffer to the extent of \$15,000,000 or more, and this would have to be met by direct taxation. The economy cry of our opponents in the light and memory of the years of their administration is only a "will-of-the-wisp." Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why the greater portion of the taxes under a system of direct taxation would bear unduly on the farmer. The millions worth of exempted property would bear no share of this assessment. It would rest on income and assessable real estate. Take the case of two men, A. and B. Each has a sum of \$5,000. A. invests his \$5,000, at, say, 6 per cent. interest. B. invests his \$5,000 in a farm. The assessor comes around and asks A. what his income is. A. answers \$5,000 at 6 per cent. means an income of \$300 per annum. The assessor says I cannot assess you at all, because income is exempt up to \$400. He goes to B. and says: I must assess you at the actual cash value of your farm, and as you paid \$5,000 cash for it I must assess you at \$5,000. The collector comes around and has no claim against A., but goes to B. the farmer and says the rate of taxation is 7 mills on the dollar (a low average), and his assessment of \$5,000 at 7 mills means \$35. So the farmer pays \$35 direct tax and his neighbor equally wealthy, pays nothing. But an hon. member—of North Norfolk, I think—said they would get at the rich man by taxing over \$1,000, and it would not be so heavy on men of moderate means. But it would be more disastrous to the farmer, because a farmer with a farm worth \$14,000 in that case would pay a tax on it of \$98, whilst the money lender's income on \$14,000 at 6 per cent. would be \$840 and exempt. So that direct taxation would be disastrous to the farmers, and they will have none of it. And unrestricted reciprocity will not be supported by the farmers who think and consider the question from a farmers' standpoint. But we could make no such commercial bargain with the United States and remain a part of the British Empire, for under the treaty between Britain and Germany now in force German goods are to go into the colonies of Britain on the same terms as the goods of any foreign nation and would be exported into Canada on the same terms as the United States goods. But this is only another of the many cries of our friends of the Opposition, whenever one fails another cry is raised, until at last the list being exhausted they are forced to take up and adopt the bantling of unrestricted reciprocity. They have adopted to be discarded successively: free trade, revenue tariff, French domination, incidental protection, commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, and remind us of the words of Tennyson:

"An infant crying in the night,  
An infant crying for the light,  
And with no language but a cry."

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not intend to trouble the House at any length, but it seems necessary in this debate that every person should say something. I suppose the reason is obvious. If we do not the local papers in our constituencies will put us down as dumb dogs. It is therefore necessary every man should rise to speak whether he can throw any new light on the important resolution before us or not. I am sure that I am candid, and that I cannot be found fault with on the score of lacking that quality. I have two objections to unrestricted reciprocity, against which I have not yet heard any good reasons. One is that, in my opinion, if unrestricted reciprocity was granted to us by the United States, it would tend to weaken if not dis-

solve altogether the bonds with the mother country. That, to my mind, is such a strong objection that whatever arguments hon. gentlemen opposite bring to show that, from a financial standpoint, it would be beneficial to the country, I would never allow that consideration to weigh against my strong feeling towards the mother land. The other objection is that if the proposition is a sound one, it will in the end lead to annexation, and instead of building up upon this northern continent a country of our own, a Greater Britain, we would become simply outlying States under the Union, and that possibility no lover of his country can contemplate with any pride whatever. It struck me, to place this matter in a practical view, that if this resolution were adopted it would necessarily lessen the bonds binding us to the mother country in this way: Supposing we had unrestricted reciprocity, there is no doubt that our tariff would require to be as low as the tariff of the United States. If that were not the case all goods coming in from countries in Europe would come to Canada if we had a lower tariff than the United States, and then find their way by smuggling into the United States. Therefore I think it is a reasonable proposition, which cannot be controverted, that, should we have unrestricted reciprocity with our neighbors, our tariff against foreign imported goods must be the same as theirs. What would be the result? We know very well now that the port of New York has quietly absorbed all the trade of the other Atlantic ports or nearly so, and we have had, according to the Trade and Navigation Reports for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888, 438 vessels carrying 378,157 tons of freight coming in from Great Britain to the ports of Quebec and Montreal. We had, during the same period, 440 vessels carrying from Canada 456,420 tons of freight for Great Britain. There is an immense trade that we are gradually building up between our St. Lawrence ports and Great Britain. I imagine that were we to have unrestricted reciprocity there would be no reason why vessels should come out from British ports to Montreal and Quebec when they would not bring to us the goods they do now, because I apprehend that, were we to have this policy in this country, our imports from England would very materially decline. In that case, they could not send out their ships to Montreal and Quebec, for the sake of taking home, simply cattle and horses, and other things which we export. It would not be profitable to send ships to a country where they would have only a cargo one way. In order to make it pay, they must have a cargo both ways; and, if England did not supply us with manufactured goods, as she does, she would not send us those ships and take our cattle and other products. Therefore, our trade would find its way to the port of New York, and the magnificent trade which is growing up between our ports and Liverpool would soon come to an end. It seems to me that there would be no object for England any longer to send cargoes and ships to the St. Lawrence ports, and they would naturally go to New York and that would absorb our trade. From a Canadian point, I think that is a great argument against unrestricted reciprocity. I am assuming that a large trade would be developed with the United States, but I am doing that for the sake of argument. There are two sides to that question, but, assuming that we would benefit to a great extent by that trade with our neighbors, we would lose a great deal more than we would gain, and the question is whether we are gradually to drift into becoming a part of the Union, or to remain as we are, growing up as a nation by ourselves, developing our trade and extending it, as the Government may see fit in the interests of Canada, or to throw ourselves into the hands of the United States and build up a wall against the mother country. For these reasons I shall vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).



Mr. SEMPLE. Although a great deal has been said on this question, and a great many figures have been given, and such as I will quote relate exclusively to the trade of the country, and the subject is a wide one and has not yet been exhausted, I do not intend to trouble the House with many figures. Facts deduced from figures taken from blue-books and other reliable sources are more important than deductions from fancy. I address you as a representative of a farming constituency, and, having been engaged in the sale of grain and other farm products for 35 years, I have had every opportunity of knowing from experience the state of the markets for that period of time. Perhaps it may not be amiss for me to state the cause of the prosperity of the country. It is true this country has been very prosperous some years ago, but prosperity does not exist at present in the rural parts of the country, and those who speak of great prosperity existing at the present time represent the towns and cities, but I am sorry to say this prosperity is not experienced in the rural parts of the country. That prosperity was caused by the industry, self-denial and perseverance of the people of this country. I am speaking of the prosperity of western Ontario. In regard to the other parts of the Dominion, such as New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the representatives of those Provinces can speak for themselves; but the reason why Ontario prospered so rapidly was due in the past to the industry and the hard work of the farmers, who went into the country and cleared the land, and made the roads and bridges, and did everything that was necessary until they made the country what it is today, and I think its appearance now is a monument to those who went in there and preceded us. Previous to 1854, the foundation had been laid for prosperity. But we had not attained it owing to the restrictions on our trade; but after that time it took a great advance, when that eminent statesman, Lord Elgin, then Governor General of Canada, originated the idea of free trade in natural products with the United States, and through his efforts what is known as the Reciprocity Treaty, which caused so much prosperity in Canada, was put in operation. To show this fact, I will read a few figures showing how quickly the immense trade established with our neighbors in the United States was secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. The following were our exports to the United States for the years mentioned:—

1850 .....	\$ 5,644,462
1854 .....	8,931,904
1855 .....	15,136,734
1856 .....	21,310,430
1857 .....	22,124,295
1858 .....	15,806,579
1859 .....	19,747,551
1860 .....	23,851,381
1861 .....	24,331,335
1862 .....	19,829,253
1863 .....	24,021,264
1864 .....	38,922,015
1865 .....	36,176,977
1866 .....	54,704,959

That shows an increase from \$3,931,904 in 1854 to \$54,704,959 in 1866. That was an enormous increase in exports in a few years. We received that amount of money, and the reason was that the United States was at that time our best market; the people there were the best customers we had for what we had to sell; and, in the year following the abrogation of the treaty, we received from the United States \$21,100,781 less than we did in 1866, the last year of the treaty. These figures are taken from Johnson's statistics, prepared by an officer of the Government, and no doubt they are reliable and cannot be refuted; and they testify to the prosperity of this country during the sixteen years this treaty was in operation. Those who have seen the prosperity of this country during the time that treaty was in operation would like to see the same

Mr. SEMPLE.

occur again. There are only two conditions to be fulfilled to have unrestricted trade with the United States. The first is that the United States are favorable to a trade arrangement with us, and the second, that the people of this country are favorable to that trade arrangement. Last year the hon. Finance Minister told us that while the idea of unrestricted reciprocity would not be entertained or even discussed, he had not met a statesman, or any man of importance in either of the two parties of the United States, but would hold up both hands for commercial union. So you see they admit the principle; and Mr. Hitt's resolution is in the same direction. We are told by some hon. gentlemen in the House in regard to the subject of Imperial Federation, that once the principle is conceded, it will be easy to arrange the details; so that if the main question is conceded regarding our trade between this country and the United States, I do not think there is anything that will prevent us from having unrestricted trade carried out. The resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is in the direction of finding out the feeling of the people in both countries, and if arrangements can be arrived at beneficial to the trade of both countries. The resolution reads as follows:—

"Resolved that in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain upon what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity therewith."

Now, extracts have been read from papers of the United States expressing the opinion that the outcome of unrestricted reciprocity would be annexation. Several hon. gentlemen have referred to a statement made by a Mr. Murray, of Boston. It appears that his address has been sent round this country in order to post hon. gentlemen opposite on the great subject. But he appears to have no official capacity whatever; he represents himself only. No doubt his lectures have been very fluent, and made to suit the crowd, and his great object is to say something that will please the people; but, so far from having any political weight, his opinions have none whatever. Now, I will read you an extract from a speech by a celebrated statesman and orator in Great Britain, touching in a few words both on the subject of Imperial federation, our relations with the United States, and our relations with the mother country. This gentleman says:

"Now there was a rather lively and plucky nobleman (Lord Roseberry) who had recently been making speeches on two subjects—one the reform of the House of Lords, and the other on Imperial Federation. These, as a contractor would say, were two very long jobs—(laughter)—and as to the former no doubt opinion would grow, and some good might be done some day, but as to Imperial Federation he thought the whole scheme impossible, and no better than a dream. If they were in the extreme east of the Dominion of Canada with their back to the Atlantic, and looked straight across the continent to the Pacific they would have an imaginary line of near 3,000 miles in length: on the right, the north, they would have five millions of Canadians, and on the south they would have 60,000,000 of the population of the United States. Now, what had these people done? The 60,000,000 of the population of the United States had built up along the whole length of this 3,000 miles a wall, not of brick or of stone, but of Acts of Congress, and they called it by the general name of "tariff," and on the other side, the 5,000,000 of Canadians had built a wall also of the same length, and pretty nearly of the same height, and they called that also "tariff;" but these walls were there for the purpose of intercepting commerce between the 60,000,000 on the south and the 5,000,000 on the north, and the 5,000,000 on the north had done another thing. They had turned a corner, and run their tariff on the eastern coast of the continent northward, and thus have done their best also, to a large extent, to shut out commerce with the mother country. That was a fair statement of the unwisdom of our kinsmen on the other side of the Atlantic. But this system—as systems so stupid and foolish generally did—failed to give satisfaction. On the northern side of the country the Canadians complained that they were shut out from free commerce with the 60,000,000 of neighbors in the south, and of course some persons in the south complained that they were shut out by this tariff barrier from the trade they might have with the millions of the Canadian population, and the Canadians said that their trade was blocked and, in point of fact, they were very badly treated, and that they could not buy things they would like to buy and cannot sell things they would like to sell. They neither buy nor sell with freedom, and they

were greatly dissatisfied, and they wished those barriers to be thrown down. Well, that was a very sensible wish, and he was perfectly certain that whatever arguments might be laid against them they will be thrown down. (Cheers.) He had no belief in this scheme of federation, but had the greatest possible belief in the great future of those colonies and in their future also. He hoped there would be strengthened the amicable connection with this country. Might they not hope for the highest and noblest federation to be established among us? Under different Governments it might be; but united by race, by sympathy, by freedom of industry, and by communion of interests, and by perpetual peace, they might help to lead the world to that better time which we longed for and which we believe in (Cheers.)"

Now, Sir, those were the words of the Hon. John Bright, a gentleman who understands our position exactly. Prices of oats and wheat have been quoted at the prices paid in Toronto, Buffalo and Chicago, to prove that they are lower in the United States than this country. We make no claim to gain in those articles, therefore there can be no argument as far as those gains are concerned. I will now read a quotation from Sir Lyon Playfair to show that the contentions of advocates of the National Policy making a home market is not a fact, as far as the staple articles farmers have to sell is concerned, and that policy does not increase the price of articles of which we have a surplus. He said:

"Not many years ago the freight from New York to Liverpool was 12 cents to 15 cents per bushel, while now it is from 5 cents to 7 cents, and owing to extreme competition the inland freights have undergone even greater reduction, and similar reductions have taken place all over the world, the effect of these changes has been to destroy local markets and to consolidate all into one market, that is the world."

Coming from so high an authority, that disposes of the talk about a local market for the staple articles that farmers have to sell. We make no claim for an increased price for wheat, oats and peas. Our contention is that under unrestricted reciprocity a large gain would accrue to the farmers of the country from the sale of their horses, barley, lean cattle, sheep, poultry, hay, potatoes, hides and skins, and wool—for these, the only market worthy of a name, is the United States, and the amount of these articles our farmers have to dispose of, does not depress the market for these things in the United States or reduce the price. In 1887-88 the following amounts and produce were exported:—

Product.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
		\$	\$
Horses, No.....	19,925	2,402,371	480,474
Barley, bush.....	2,360,521	6,498,317	936,052
Lean Cattle, No.....	40,047	648,178	129,635
Sheep, No.....	353,991	1,027,410	205,482
Poultry.....		122,222	24,444
Hay, tons.....	84,068	800,068	168,136
Potatoes, bush.....	2,486,441	957,570	372,966
Hides and Skins.....		515,220	101,044
Wool, lb.....	3,334,601	614,214	122,842
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>13,575,570</b>	<b>2,541,075</b>

The grain, cattle and other articles were sent to the distributing points in the United States and \$2,541,075 was paid in duty before the market was reached. Without duty the same price would have been paid, and this large sum would have gone into the pockets of the farmers of the country and have been distributed among the manufacturers and merchants of the country. In making the quotation from Sir Lyon Playfair, the argument adduced that the United States raising the large amount of grain would flood the markets of the country is disposed of by an examination of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1878. These will still further dispel the delusion:

EXPORTED from Canada, 1878.

Article.	Per Bushel.	—	—
	\$ cts.	\$	\$
Barley.....	0 59	7,267,399	4,315,739
Indian Corn.....	0 78	655	517
Oats.....	0 41	2,240,062	959,985
Peas.....	0 82	2,420,044	1,934,101
Wheat.....	1 24	4,393,635	5,376,195

Besides other articles, making a total of \$18,008,751.

EXPORTED, not the Produce of Canada.

Article.	Per Bushel.	—	—
	\$ cts.	\$	\$
Indian Corn.....	0 87	3,996,945	2,677,772
Wheat.....	1 51	4,115,700	6,254,933
<b>Total.....</b>			<b>8,933,705</b>

On the wheat a gain of 27 cents per bushel, \$1,111,240 being the profit made by dealers in handling wheat. It would take a long time to hurt the country by such transactions. The value of the corn was 7 cents per bushel, and the peas 82 cents, being 15 cents per bushel more for peas than corn, and it has often been found to be an advantage to the farmer when corn came into this country free to sell oats and peas and buy corn. A shrewd farmer informed me he had bought corn at 47 cents per bushel and sold his oats at 50 cents per bushel. This, to the farmer I have mentioned, was a great advantage, as he always feeds a large number of cattle for the British market. But raising wheat for export need give the Ontario farmers little concern. The total of wheat exported from the Dominion in 1887-88 was of the value of \$1,878,195; of oats, \$58,185, or a total of \$1,936,380. While of eggs there were exported \$2,119,844 worth, or \$183,464 obtained more for eggs than wheat and oats. Eggs have increased wonderfully in the last ten years under unrestricted trade in that article.—

	Value.
1878.....	\$ 664,574
1887-88.....	2,119,844

Gain in ten years.....\$1,455,270

Where the farmers have made a great gain in the last ten years is in the export of animals and products:

	Value.
1878.....	\$14,019,764
1888.....	25,620,369

An increase of.....\$11,601,512

There is more need now than in 1878 for corn to come into Canada free, as more peas and oats could then be sold and corn could be got any time from the large granaries in the United States. There need be no dread of direct taxation, as predicted. In 1878 the idea of the Government of the day was to stop all imports coming into this country. If that had been done as it was intended there would be nothing but direct taxation; but the goods were never stopped coming in. If the farmers of the country were prosperous they would be able to buy more goods and pay more duty on the goods imported. It has been said farmers pay very little duty or indirect taxation; then I would like to know what class of the community pay the largest amount of the \$22,000,000 of duty received from customs and excise. The farmers are the most numerous class in the community, and I think they pay by far the largest

part of this amount, besides the amount they have to pay to the manufacturers, who arrange their prices to be the same as goods manufactured outside of Canada, with the duty added, and it would make very little difference to them whether they paid that tax to the tax gatherer or to the Custom house officer. Under our present high system of taxation everything that the farmers use or consume has to pay a heavy duty. When the duty was put on iron the manufacturers met in conclave and decreed an advance of from ten to twenty per cent. on the articles they manufactured, and everything that is made of iron or steel and which is used by the farmers has to pay this heavy tax and has to come out of their profits. The farmer's reaping machine, mowing machine, plows, harrows, cutters, axes, spades, shovels, hoes and scythes, and everything he uses or handles. An increased price has to be paid for wire to fence the farm, for stoves to warm the house in the winter, and nails and building material, besides the enhanced price paid for sugar, cottons, woollens, coffee, raisins and other articles—everything he can use and everything that he handles is heavily taxed. Another question was touched on to-night which is of the utmost importance to the Province of Ontario: that is the policy of constructing and subsidising railways adopted by the Government. We were asked last year to vote, \$750,000 for the construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, and this year we shall be asked to vote \$300,000 more, making \$1,050,000 for this railway. Last year we also voted \$800,000 for the construction of the Cape Breton Railway, and this year we will be asked for \$700,000 more, making \$1,500,000, or \$2,550,000 for these two railways. I believe that this policy of constructing and subsidising railways in the Provinces is against the solemn compact entered into at Confederation. I cannot see what right the Dominion Government has to construct or subsidise those provincial railways, and it seems to me like plunder to take the money from the pockets of the people of Ontario to build railroads in other Provinces which the people of Ontario receive no benefit from whatever, after having built their own railway with funds purely provincial. The small amount of aid given by the Dominion Government in subsidies was only an excuse for the purpose of extracting more money to be given the other Provinces. It is unjust that the people of Ontario should be called upon to pay larger sums than any other Province for the construction and subsidising of railroads which they will never see, although they hear of them and feel the expense they are to them. I notice also in a return which I moved for in the House last Session, that since 1880 the large sum of \$16,385,565 was voted as subsidies to railways. The Provinces of the Dominion received out of this sum \$12,538,765, and Ontario's share of that was only \$3,846,800. It has been shown by an excellent authority, who was capable to deal with figures, that Ontario pays half of the direct taxation of this country, and when we see that it does not receive one-third of the money invested in these roads we are able to realise the injustice of this policy in the construction and subsidising of railways. The construction of the two railways I have mentioned is an outrage on the Province of Ontario, and it is really amazing that the members from Ontario have said so little about matters which affect the taxation of that Province. Ontario has been termed the milch cow of the Dominion, and I believe that is the case; but I am sorry to say that our Conservative friends from that Province are so wrapped up in the bonds of partyism that they do not care for anything in particular, so long as the present Government is in power. As several gentlemen wish to speak in this debate I do not care to be tedious to the House by prolonging my remarks, and I shall therefore close.

Mr. SIMPSON.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late period of the debate I shall confine the remarks which I intend to make as closely as possible to the question which is under discussion. On the motion that you, Mr. Speaker, should leave the Chair, there was a motion moved in amendment by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that in the light of a resolution that has been passed by the House of Representatives, declaring in favor of commercial union with Canada, immediate measures should be taken to bring about unrestricted free trade between this country and the States. I was curious to know what meaning the gentlemen on the other side put upon unrestricted free trade. We had them coming forward last year for unrestricted reciprocal interchange of manufactures and natural products, and a short time previously they were engaged in advocating commercial union. But the Opposition dropped commercial union because the history of all countries shows that commercial union means a Zollverein for the purpose of interchange of commodities between different nations, and the result of all Zollvereins or commercial Unions of that kind, tends to a political union. Gentlemen opposite found that that policy was an unpopular one throughout the country, and they changed then to unrestricted Reciprocity or the interchange of commodities between the two countries having a common tariff as against all other countries. The meaning which those gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have put on unrestricted trade relations with the United States, I find to-night is the same meaning as they put on unrestricted reciprocity. I can only use the arguments advanced by the member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and the member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), who showed that if unrestricted reciprocity means anything it must mean commercial union. If you have unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries there must be a similarity of tariffs against other countries. This would make it the same as commercial union, because if you have not a similarity of tariffs one of the countries which has the fixing of its own tariff might admit articles at a lesser rate than the other party to the arrangement. For that reason two nations agreeing or trying to agree upon a commercial interchange of commodities between them, unless they did something that no private individuals would do, would insist upon some fundamental basis by which the benefits which were expected to accrue would inure after the arrangement. Let us see what the result would be if we had the fixing of our own tariff. In the United States the iron industries are protected to the very highest extent with a duty of from \$6 to \$17 per ton upon iron. Suppose we wanted to introduce into this country steel rails, upon which, if my memory serves me rightly, there is a duty of \$16 a ton in the United States, and instead of taking them from the United States we chose to take them from the British Isles, and were to put a duty upon them of \$2 a ton, which we have the right to do, according to the meaning these hon. gentlemen put upon unrestricted reciprocity? The result would be that we would buy our rails from Great Britain and prevent an interchange in that commodity, at any rate, with the United States. Would not the United States, in making a bargain with us, simply state, if you are to have unrestricted trade relations with us, you must have a reciprocal tariff? A reciprocal tariff means commercial union; and as the hon. member for Northumberland and other hon. gentlemen opposite admit, commercial union would finally end in the political union of the two countries. Let us look at the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who does not conceive his proclivities; the statement of Goldwin Smith, who is the author of that scheme; the statement of every gentleman of note on the other side, who admit that the effect of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union will be an assimilation of the two coun-

tries politically and otherwise. Goldwin Smith, in his speech in East Northumberland, said: "I am not a politician, I do not care what the gentlemen call the measure at present before the country, but I call it commercial union; there is no difference, and no intelligent man in the country can draw a distinction between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union; I am in favor of commercial union, because the effect of it will be the union politically of the two great Anglo-Saxon nations that inhabit this continent." And do not the American people give the same meaning to it? Hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of always raising the loyalty cry when this proposition is brought before the people. We simply tell the people the effect of the policy they propose. We know that the great mass of the supporters of hon. gentleman opposite are loyal, and we appeal to their loyalty and show them that this proposition would have an effect contrary to their wishes. Is that not a legitimate argument to use? I know the loyalty of my countrymen, who are the backbone of the party opposite, both in intelligence and in support, is no lip loyalty. When they joined the Empire, they had no mental reservation; it was with their hearts, and every vote they give throughout the country will be one for its perpetuation; and we have only to point out to them that the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite will have a contrary effect in order to leave these gentlemen without a following. They have seen this themselves. The first proposition they introduced for the consideration of the people was commercial union. It did not go down. Then they changed it to unrestricted reciprocity. That was a failure too. It is now unrestricted trade relations with the United States. That will be dropped, silently dropped, too, Mr. Speaker, and the next thing we will hear of will be an interchange of raw materials between the two countries. They are preparing themselves for a change of base, because they know that their supporters throughout the country will not follow them in the policy they propound. The first resolution these gentlemen introduced in the House this Session was one in favor of our having the right to make our own treaties. It was almost laughed out of the House. Would the British nation be so foolish as to concede us the right to make our own treaties—a nation which has protected us in every respect, and which gives us the advantages of its power and influence throughout the whole world? Would it, in the hour of difficulty, when it might be at war with a foreign nation, allow us the right to make a treaty with the nation it was fighting with? If we had the right to make our own treaties, we would have the right to do this. The proposition was too absurd. Now, what are the arguments these hon. gentlemen furnish in support of the proposition they now offer us? They describe this country in the words of Goldwin Smith, in the words of the hon. member for North Norfolk, as a helpless country lining the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, whose natural markets and natural instincts connect them with the people to the south. They describe the wonderful progress of that country; they speak of the number of men they could put in the field, the amount of wealth they possess, and the extent of their internal commerce; they give a glowing description of it, and at the same time point to the poverty of our own country and to the inability of our own people to do anything. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen who spoke in that way that the Empire to which we belong is the greatest and most powerful nation the world has ever known. A single one of its possessions is a more powerful and a richer country than the whole of that country to the south, which they talk about so much. India alone, with its 360,000,000 people, has more wealth than the United States; it has an army of 400,000 trained brown men, and 2,000,000 besides who live by arms; and if the system which prevails in some European countries were adopted here, they could put

in the field, because they have the wealth and the resources to back it, an army of 20,000,000 men. The British Empire could put an army in the field capable, not only of defending its colonies and itself, but capable of conquering the world. The hon. member for North Norfolk describes the internal resources of the United States, and points out what a great benefit would flow to our people by opening the markets of that immense country to our productions. He said its internal commerce amounted to thirty-two billions of dollars. The figures rather startled and astonished me, when I heard the statement. Divide that amount with the population of the United States as given by the census, and it gives an internal trade to every man, woman and child in the country of \$650. Now, that statement was made by Mr. Switzer, the chief statistician of the United States, but when I looked at his authority, I found that it was reduced one-half. I prefer to take the statistics quoted by the hon. gentleman himself, those of Mulhall, as to the resources and wealth of the two countries. Mulhall states that the annual earnings of the people of Canada average £38 sterling a year *per capita*, and the average annual earnings of the people of the United States £44 sterling a year *per capita*. We were then without statistics from British Columbia and Manitoba, where everybody knows the *per capita* earnings of the people are far greater than they are in the older Provinces. Take these into consideration and you will find that the wealth *per capita* of the people of Canada is as great as that of the people of the United States. We are in every respect as well off, as happy, contented and prosperous, I believe, as the people to the south of us. Now, Mr. Speaker, what advantages are to be gained from a union with that country? We cannot change our allegiance simply by a resolution of these people opposite. What the Government of this country always proposed and always intended to do was to trade fairly and equitably with the people to the south of us. We are willing to enter into negotiations for the reciprocal interchange of commodities consistent with the protection which we have given to the manufactures and industries of our country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say look at the development of our mines which it would give; look at the development of our copper and silver and iron. Why, do hon. gentlemen suppose that the people of the United States will admit our iron ore and our minerals into their territory free, without some corresponding advantages being obtained by them? Would there be a single pound of iron ore smelted in the United States, if they had free trade with the rest of the world? Would not the people of Great Britain supply them with iron? Would not the ores from some parts of England, from some parts of Spain anyway, enter into competition and put an end to the development of the mines in that country? They are not going to open their territories to our minerals without some corresponding advantage, and that advantage will be that they will have the monopoly in this country of manufactures and commerce. The result would be the closing down of the manufactures we have established and the transfer of the commerce of Montreal and Toronto to the large cities of the United States. It would wipe out the industries we have established throughout this country, and when those were wiped out, even if we had unrestricted reciprocity without any chance or expectation, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, of political union, could we rely on the continuance of that policy? The moment the Americans chose to say to us that they would no longer continue the system in vogue, the result would be that we would be left without manufactures and without commerce, and would have to commence all these things anew. The sequence to the proposition the gentlemen make, even without political union, must be a continuance of the policy. How do they propose to continue that policy? The only continuance of it possible at all would be by means of some legislature

which would protect us and them. I was astonished at some of the arguments advanced in favor of this measure. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) began by describing the fearful amount of taxation which the farmers in this country endure through the National Policy. That hon. gentleman described and I say this notwithstanding his statement and the correction of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) because I heard the hon. member for Huron's remarks, and I am astonished that when the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) criticised his remarks, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) should have risen to state that the hon. member for Toronto had put arguments into the mouth of the hon. gentleman which he had not used. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) stated distinctly that the duty which each farmer pays throughout the country is at the rate of \$83 per annum. Multiply that by 600,000, the number of farmers in the country, and you will see at once the absurdity of that statement. The result will be an amount of taxes paid by the farmers alone, greater by \$13,900,000 than the total revenue of the whole year from all sources. Supposing the statement was in every way correct, what is proposed as a remedy for those evils? A union with a country which has a far higher tariff and in which, if the hon. gentleman's argument means anything, the incidents of taxation upon the farmers would be still greater than they are at present. The argument was the same all through. It was that we were overtaxed here, that there was no result open to us but union with the United States. There was another hon. gentleman who spoke, the new member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter). I suppose it is pardonable for gentlemen, on first coming to the House, to speak volubly and in the declamatory manner of my hon. friend, and that is a compliment to my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). I suppose the hon. gentleman gave the address he has been in the habit of delivering throughout the County of Haldimand. It is pardonable in gentlemen on first coming to the House to deliver their election addresses. As a general rule, however, they deliver them when a new Parliament sits, on the resolution in reply to the Address from the Throne, but my hon. friend took the first opportunity of delivering his election address on this motion. He made the same wild statements. He stated that the amount of protection to the sugar refiners was at the rate of \$1 per 100 pounds. I ventured, when he made this statement, the declaration "Hear." He said: "Yes, the hon. gentlemen may well cry, 'hear,' because these parties from the immense amount of money which they have wrung out of the poor people of this country are enabled to supply funds to the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and keep them in their places." The statement of the hon. gentleman was entirely incorrect, to say the least. The amount of protection—for I have the figures here, as I went into the calculation very carefully—to the sugar refiners of this country is only 54½ cents per 100 pounds. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I will give him the details:

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty Collected.	Price per lb.	Specific duty per 100 lbs.	Ad Valorem.
	Lbs.	\$	\$ cts.	cts.	\$ c.	
Sugar above No. 14, D. S. ....	4,003,558	171,052	123,898 82	4.24	3.09	72½ p c
Sugar not above No. 14, D. S. ...	10,884,445	289,896	203,756 02	2.66	1.87	70½ p c
Melado .....	186,393,682	4,669,097	3,092,869 78	2.54	1.66	66 p c

This gives an average duty on a 100 lbs. of refined sugar brought into the country of \$2.20, and on the unrefined  
 Mr. HAGGART.

\$1.66, or a difference of 54 cents per 100 lbs. These are the species of arguments which have been adduced in the House to prove the effect of the National Policy upon the country. An hon. gentleman stated that in Buffalo he could buy sugar for 6 cents, for which he had to pay 8 cents in Haldimand or Cayuga, but a gentleman on this side proved conclusively that the price of sugar was equal in each of these places. But how the argument is one in favor of unrestricted relations with the United States, I confess I am unable to understand, because if the United States is anything, it is a more highly protected country than Canada; and if the hon. gentleman's arguments apply to the farmer paying a duty under our protective tariff, they would apply all the more if there was commercial union with the United States. Now, I shall come to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) this evening. He commenced by stating that the expenses on the Intercolonial—and again how that referred to the trade relations I cannot understand—was largely in excess of the revenue, that it was a corrupt and extravagant expenditure. The figures which were adduced by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he began to correct. I have the figures here, but shall not go over them. I shall simply state that the figures given by the Minister of Marine were those furnished by the Department, and that the accounts were made up in the same manner as they always have been. No change has been made in the nature of the charges to one account or the other from the system which has hitherto been pursued. But was that a reason for the adoption of unrestricted trade relations with the United States, or was the alleged mismanagement of the Prince Edward Island Railway an argument for that? The hon. gentleman has toned down his statements from those he made last year, when he gave us such a lugubrious description of the state of Cape Breton through which he had been travelling, when he said that the young men of the country had been leaving it for the United States in order to obtain employment and get a living. He also described the sad state of affairs in his own country, which thousands of people were leaving and were going to the United States; and he said that the sad, sad tale would have been still sadder but for the remittances which were coming from those young men to their friends in Prince Edward Island. I was curious to see what was the total amount of emigration from that island to the United States, and I found that, according to the United States census, the total of all the people born in Prince Edward Island who now reside in the United States is 7,500. This is taken from the returns of the United States census of 1880, and there is a separate column for those who had left Prince Edward Island. They must have got into positions of opulence, they must have been very successful in the United States when their remittances to the dear old people who live in that dear old isle have kept them from being sadder than they would otherwise have been.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was before the National Policy.

Mr. HAGGART. Let us look at Prince Edward Island, and see what the taxation is on the people there. The amount of duty paid by the people of Prince Edward Island is \$47 per capita. The taxation of the people of the United States on their debt is \$23 per capita, and the average tax on the State debt is \$23 per capita in addition, though in many States it is very much larger than that. Besides that, they pay State taxes and municipal taxes, and they contribute to their schools. Prince Edward Island has only the Dominion tax to pay. It is furnished with postal facilities, it has communication with the mainland, it has its piers built, and it has the whole machinery of its Government provided by the Dominion, and it has not a single cent of municipal taxation to pay. I assert that it is in the most favored

position of any country, any Province or any State on the continent of North America, and yet we have this lugubrious complaint as to the burdens which are placed on the people of that dear isle of the hon. gentleman. Then, as to the incident of taxation, the fishermen get their twine, the material for their nets, free from this paternal Government. I tell the hon. gentleman that he lives in a paradise, compared with most of the people who inhabit the Provinces of North America or the States of the Union. What is this proposition? It is that we should do away with this state of affairs and desert the Empire for the purpose of forming a union with the people on the other side. I have proved conclusively that unrestricted reciprocity, if it were carried out, can mean nothing but commercial union. Why should we leave our allegiance to the mother country to join with the people opposite? Are we not as prosperous as they are? Looking even at the returns of Mr. Mowat's statistician in Ontario, though it is true that the value of farms may have decreased, the value of farm houses, of machinery and of everything that constitutes the wealth of the farm has increased. Look at the business done by the banks, look at the deposits in the banks, look at the deposits in the savings banks, look at the increased communication between the people in different parts of the country and you will see this. The hon. gentleman stated that the tonnage of the country had decreased since 1867. The tonnage has increased in that time by 2,000,000 tons. Our trade has increased externally and internally, if you take the tonnage. In every respect the trade of this country is increasing and the only fault to be found is that the hon. gentlemen opposite have not the rule and direction of it. We know what the result of their direction was during the time they were in power. Was the country more prosperous then? Was the incidence of taxation less? Did the debt decrease? The debt of the country is now, in round numbers, \$232,000,000. That is composed principally of the indebtedness of the Provinces when they entered into Confederation, the debts which we have since assumed of the different Provinces, the amount we expended in building the Intercolonial Railway, the amount we expended in building that magnificent road of which we are all so proud, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we may add to that the deficit which was contracted under the Mackenzie Government. Were not all these gentlemen as much responsible as the members now on the Treasury benches for all those matters, for the assumption of the debt of the Provinces, for the further assumption of the Provincial debts, for the building of the Intercolonial Railway, and did they object to the money expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway? This is leaving out the expenditure on the canals and the public works of the country, and those hon. gentlemen are as much responsible for these additions to the debt, and agreed to them as much as the gentlemen who support the Ministry on this side of the House. I know there is no feeling in this country in favor of changing its allegiance. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have found out their mistake and are changing their policy. I know they are going to drop unrestricted reciprocity as they have dropped commercial union, and before a general election takes place, next year they will have a more modest resolution introduced into this House than the present one. They will have a policy more in accord with the views of the people. That is the tactics they adopt, and I am glad there is a sentiment among the people of this country of loyalty and attachment to the Empire to which we are so proud to belong, which has its effect in directing these hon. gentlemen. If there were an opportunity of appealing to the country on the cries which they have raised, I have every confidence that the people would show their attachment and loyalty to the Empire to which we belong, and the result would prove that those hon. gentlemen have been mistaken.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I have listened patiently while the debate upon the financial statement has gone on for some days in this House, and I do not rise with the hope of being able to add much information to what has already been said upon the question. This year, owing to the amendment that was moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) there has not been as much time given to a criticism of the statement of the Finance Minister with reference to the finances of the country, as upon some other occasion; but I think the criticism that was offered by the gentleman who offered the amendment was a very full one. We have had somewhat of a criticism from others who have followed, and it is not my intention to night to enter fully into that question, or attempt to do so; for I recognise the fact, as does every other speaker upon this side as well, I believe, upon the other side of the House, that it is necessary to draw this debate to a close. But I cannot forbear this remark when I see hon. gentleman rise and speak so lightly and so flippantly of the public debt that is upon this country; I cannot help remarking that there was a time when hon. gentlemen sitting on the opposite side, when Ministers occupying positions on the Treasury benches, yes, and some of them the very gentlemen who occupy that position at the present time, in looking forward and contemplating a great increase in the public debt, hesitated and felt that it was an unsafe thing, and only persuaded the House as they persuaded themselves, that it was safe for us to heap up such a vast public debt as seemed inevitable, by declaring to us that they saw beyond a peradventure a source of revenue from which they could derive over \$69,000,000 which were to come into the public treasury and recoup us for the money thus expended. I do not mention this incident to show how utterly they failed to grasp the situation of the country; I do not mention this fact in order to show how terribly they have failed in the administration of the affairs of this country. This has been pointed out on other occasions, but I emphasise it to show this one point, Mr. Speaker, that when these gentlemen were committing the country to such engagements as left us with such a terribly large national debt as we have, they only persuaded themselves and their supporters to it by a declaration that the country might be able to bear the strain because they had a source of revenue within their administration from which they could extract \$70,000,000, which would go in reduction of the debt. The hon. gentlemen themselves, let them be the judges, will confess that the public debt that is upon the country is something that is, at any rate, serious enough to bring before the consideration of this House. Now, Sir, I do not pretend to enter into all the arguments that we have heard with reference to the state of the country, the position of affairs under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to the exodus, with reference to the depreciation of lands, questions that have been threshed out during the course of this debate, gentlemen on one side producing one set of statistics, and gentlemen on the other side producing another set. I just wish to make this one remark, however, with reference to a statement that was made by the Minister of Marine on the disputed question of the depreciation in the value of farm land in Ontario. His answer to the hon. member for South Oxford, who had pointed out that our lands had depreciated in value, was, granted that such is the case, granted that there is a slight depreciation, there has been an immense depreciation in lands in Europe, they have depreciated to an extent very much greater than they have in this country. He mentioned an amount for depreciation, which was an immense amount in itself, because it wiped out the whole values, and left the lands valueless. He quoted from a Mr. James who, he said, had declared that the value of farm lands in Europe had fallen 100 per cent. Well,

I thought there was a mistake in the figures. When challenged he read the quotation, I looked it up and saw that it did not prove the statement that he made at all, as any gentleman looking at the *Hansard* will see for himself. The statement of Mr. James, as read by the gentleman, was not that farm lands had fallen 100 per cent. in Europe, but that agricultural products had fallen 100 per cent., and not lands at all; so that, perhaps, is a sample of how arguments of hon. gentlemen are sustained by the authors whom they bring forward. With reference to the state of the country, gentlemen have said that we have gone on and we have prospered moderately well. There is this one fact which I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, that during the past few years the condition of trade in Canada has been helped somewhat unduly by the large expenditure of borrowed money upon public works, notably railways, in this country. That has given somewhat of a stimulus and impetus to trade in this country, that we might say was not legitimate, or, rather, was extraordinary in itself. But the hon. gentleman states that they have come now to the determination to stop this expenditure. Well, Sir, if they do I think they will find that there will be more tightness in trade, that there will be a greater stringency felt, that trade will be duller during a year or two, unless Providence favors us, as it has done in past years, with very bountiful harvests indeed. We know that a temporary benefit has resulted while this large expenditure of money was going on. But, I turn from these questions of debt and expenditure, because the figures are in the public accounts, which the people can see for themselves. I turn from them to consider the amendment that has been offered by the hon. gentleman for South Oxford, to which exception and objection have been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I trust that they will take no offence when I say that while they profess to experience some difficulty in understanding the position of the Opposition in reference to this question, I say I trust they will pardon me if I do say that after listening most intently and most earnestly, as I believe, I have done, to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, I have very great difficulty, yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been utterly unable, to understand what their position is in regard to the matter at all; their statements are so contradictory. Let me take the Minister of Marine, and let me examine his statement. Why, Sir, I find that he uses this language in reference to the amendment what was offered by my hon. friend from South Oxford. He says: the Opposition have been driven back to take this desperate and foolish course; and in another part of his speech he says, we are again renewing our foul attack upon the policy of the Government. Well, Sir, I should judge that the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford is simply this: that inasmuch the House of Representatives of the United States, that deliberative body, by an unanimous resolution, signify their willingness to enter into negotiations with the Dominion of Canada for freer trade relations; this resolution simply says that the United States having done that, we, as a legislature, ought to meet them in the same spirit, as there have been outstanding differences between the two countries, and that we should send men to confer with men selected by them, to ascertain on what terms and conditions we can have freer trade relations with them. Is that easily to be understood? And if it is not easy to be understood, I remind them of the terms we propose for full and unrestricted trade by the appointment of commissioners in order to ascertain in what way such a result can be brought about. I think that is a very plain proposition. But the Minister of Marine terms this a disastrous and foolish course we have entered upon—this resolution that we send persons to ascertain on what terms we can obtain freer trade relations—and he tells us in almost the next breath that the people need not be deceived, that the Liberal Conservative

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

party are now, as they always have been, in favor of a treaty with the United States with respect to the exchange of commodities with them, and freer trade relations. While the hon. gentleman has made that statement, other hon. gentlemen have declared the opposite, and the Postmaster General has reasoned, if there be any logic in their arguments and anything to be gathered from their statements, that they are utterly and entirely opposed to freer trade relations with the United States in any shape, manner or form. Will some hon. gentleman opposite rise and tell us in plain terms what the Conservative party are willing to do with respect to freer trade relations with the United States? No doubt some hon. gentleman will follow me, and I call his attention to the fact, and I trust some one will be found, some Minister will be found to rise in his place, speaking with authority, declare what is the kind of freer trade arrangement, at which the Minister of Marine hinted, to be proposed by them. That is what we should like to know. Last year when the subject was discussed we found hon. gentlemen opposite willing to renew the old Reciprocity Treaty, but they found that was rather untenable ground, because when they admitted that it was desirable to have freer trade to a certain extent, why it logically followed that we might be able to increase the exports in other directions with benefit to ourselves; and this year, with the exception of the statement of the Minister of Marine, who spoke with authority in this matter, hon. gentlemen opposite have rather taken the line of argument that we want no reciprocity with the United States, we want nothing to do with them, we do not want to trade with them, we do not want to marry our daughters to them or have our sons marry their daughters, we will hoist the flag and we will have nothing to do with them. That has been the tone and temper of their speeches.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) An hon. gentleman opposite groans in spirit. If I have misinterpreted their position, I shall be glad to hear what kind of trade relations hon. gentlemen opposite want with the United States, what kind of a treaty they desire to have negotiated, or whether they are in favor of a treaty at all. We now come to consider some of the objections that have been urged by the hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the proposal of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). And, in the first place, we will glance at the statement that has been made that a Reciprocity Treaty upon the lines of the old Reciprocity Treaty would not only be not beneficial but would be actually detrimental to the interests of our agriculturists. And what is that? The Minister of Marine in his most contradictory speech said, quoting from a paper, that the United States grows more agricultural products than they require, and therefore what advantage can it be to us if their markets are thrown open to the surplus products of our markets? That has been the line of argument followed by hon. gentlemen opposite. They cannot see, they say, that it would be any benefit to the agriculturist to have freer trade relations with the United States even in agricultural products, because the United States grow a surplus of those products, and, therefore, that country is not a market for our products. True, they are compelled to admit that even under the restricted trade relations that now exist millions of dollars worth of our products find their way into that country; but this does not affect hon. gentlemen opposite at all. It is, however, a statement that deserves a little consideration at our hands. On the face of it that statement before an audience, the declaration in so many words that the United States grow more than they require of wheat, barley, oats, rye and peas, and that therefore it would be no advantage for us to have access to their markets, is a plausible one. Let us examine the statement a little and ascertain

whether it would confer any benefit or not. And now, in order to ascertain that fact, we must remember one or two things. There are more restrictions to trade than are created by governments. There are restrictions to trade that are caused by nature. Let me illustrate this from our own Dominion. Take a coal mine in the Province of Nova Scotia and take a coal mine in Pennsylvania: We will suppose that the coal produced from each of those mines is equal in quality, and that from each mine the coal can be laid at the pit's mouth for exactly the same money. Suppose there is a purchaser in Ontario who requires coal, Ontario not producing any. He looks around for his supply. He notices the price of coal is precisely the same and is quoted at the same price at each mine's mouth. What does he do as a business man? He looks at the restrictions that are imposed upon his purchased coal, and he finds—what? That the distance separating Nova Scotia from Ontario is great, that it is covered by a railway, but that the railway has cost money to construct, that accordingly there has to be a certain rate of freight imposed upon coal and other traffic passing over the road; and he takes that restriction to his purchase into consideration before he completes it. Next he looks at the mine in Pennsylvania. He observes that it is a distance from home, and that there is a certain tariff for railway freight against him before he can bring coal from Pennsylvania to Ontario, and accordingly he determines which offers the least restrictions to him and he will make his purchase in that market. But if in addition to the freight tariff of the railway company from the mines in Pennsylvania, the Government steps in and places a Government tariff of 60 cents per ton upon the coal coming from that mine, then the purchaser has not only to take the railway freight tariff into consideration as against his purchase, but he has to add 60 cents per ton as a Government tariff to the restrictions already imposed, and if those two combined restrictions operate less potentially from that mine will he make his purchase and not from the other. We all know the result, for I am speaking of experiments that have been made. The restriction of distance, the cost of freight from the coal mine in Nova Scotia is greater than restriction of the railway freight plus the Government tariff from the mine in Pennsylvania, and the result is that the mine in Pennsylvania receives the order for coal brought into Canada. I have used this illustration in order to show hon. gentlemen opposite, if it is possible to satisfy them, that you may have a country—and I will grant, for I do not wish to argue the question, although I might take exception to one or two items, that the United States have a surplus in agricultural products—having a surplus of agricultural products, and yet the conditions imposed on the two countries by nature might be such that we would benefit by freer trade relations with them notwithstanding. If I weary you not, allow me to give you just an illustration or two in reference to how I conceive that free trade relations with the United States would benefit Prince Edward Island, would benefit the Province of Quebec, would benefit Ontario, would benefit Manitoba and the North-West, admitting as I said that the United States grow a surplus of all those commodities. To ascertain the facts, which I am about to give the House, I had to take the figures from the census of the United States of 1880, this being the last census, and the census for Canada for 1881, our last census. The figures I will give you are for those years, there being no data of a later date that I can avail myself of. But I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me that relatively we have made progress with the States, and that, therefore, although things may somewhat have changed, yet those figures will hold; at any rate other figures are not to be found and I must use them. I find that Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York, with a population of 8,484,583 souls, about one-sixth of the whole population of the United States at that date,

produced 42,513,566 bushels of oats or a little over one-tenth of the entire crop of the States. Those States containing about one-sixth of the population of the entire United States only raised about one-tenth of the entire crop of oats grown in that country. Ontario, with a population in 1880 of about 2,000,000 people produced 40,209,919 bushels of oats; in other words Ontario with a population of 2,000,000 produced as many bushels of oats as the States I have mentioned with a population of over 8,000,000 of people. Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska, all distant States from these before mentioned, produced altogether over one-half of the entire oat crop of the States. Prince Edward Island, taking the census returns of 1881, produced 3,533,219 bushels of oats, and Prince Edward Island exported in that year 1,606,894 bushels, of which only 172 bushels were sent to the United States, and last year only 1,372 bushels were sent to the States from Prince Edward Island. Now, what does that show? It shows that those New England States I have mentioned offering a near and close market for Prince Edward Island for the sale of her oats only received a very small portion of the crop. Why is that? It is because of the imposition by the United States of a tariff that restricts the trade there, and which was more potent in its influence in restricting the trade than was the freight on the greater distance to Great Britain. But, Sir, who will venture to say that if you wipe out that tariff, that barrier to trade, that restrictive potent factor of 10 cents a bushel against the oats of Prince Edward Island going into those neighboring States, which are of necessity from the figures I have quoted buying States, Prince Edward Island will find a ready market for every bushel of oats she has to sell in these States and at a larger profit too. Let us take again the potato crop, which with oats is the great staple product of Prince Edward Island. Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey, States lying close to and easy of access to that Island Province, with a total population of 9,615,692 souls, produced in 1880 only 54,212,704 bushels of potatoes. Ontario with a population of about 2,000,000, produced 18,893,996 bushels of potatoes, or Ontario with 2,000,000 population produced one-third as much as the States I have mentioned with over 9,000,000 people. Why do I give those figures? Simply to show that those States lying adjacent to Prince Edward Island did not produce the quantity of potatoes that they require for consumption there. Although the whole United States may produce a surplus of potatoes, yet the fact remains that these States being in the market to purchase potatoes will buy from the cheapest and nearest place that can supply them, and the nearest and cheapest producing market to them is that rich little Island Province down by the sea. As a proof of that I may point out that notwithstanding, the restriction imposed by freight from Prince Edward Island to those States which we cannot get over, and in addition to that the restrictions put upon that trade by the tariff of the United States Government, Prince Edward Island exported in the year 1881, 723,995 bushels of potatoes, and in the year 1888, she exported 1,184,940 bushels of potatoes to the United States. This proves conclusively that the States lying close to Prince Edward Island did not produce the quantity of potatoes they required. They are in the market to buy, and Prince Edward Island has been able to supply them with potatoes at a lower rate, even paying the duty, than they were able to bring those potatoes from the more distant States which produced a surplus, perhaps. What is the inevitable conclusion from that: simply, that if that American restriction of 15 cents a bushel be removed, Prince Edward Island holds the market of those States right in her hand, and that she can ask her price, and get it, for her products. Passing from that, let us come to the Province of Ontario, and let us see how this policy of unrestricted reciprocity



will affect that Province. With reference to the crop of barley, which is a large crop in Ontario, I find that New York, Ohio and Michigan, three bordering States, and extensive malting States, requiring large quantities of barley for manufacture, produced according to the census of the States in 1880, 10,703,507 bushels of barley. Any one can see at a glance that those States have not produced anything like the quantity of barley that is required for their malting purposes, and you can have further proof of this from the fact that Ontario alone produced 14,279,841 bushels of barley, or 4,000,000 bushels more than those three States combined. Take into consideration this further fact, that California produces 28 per cent. of the total barley crop of the United States, Wisconsin over 11 per cent., Ohio over 9 per cent., and Minnesota over 6 per cent., or, in other words, California, Wisconsin, Ohio and Minnesota, all distant from these three manufacturing malt States, produced over one-half of the entire barley crop of the United States. What do we gather from that? We find that Ontario exported, in 1881, 8,805,579 bushels of barley, of which 8,378,002 bushels were sent to the United States. And in 1888 Ontario exported 9,370,158 bushels, of which 9,193,222 went to the United States. Sir, the trade worked in this way: Those States requiring barley for malting purposes found that it was better to get barley from Canada, notwithstanding the restriction of tariff, *plus* the railway rates from Ontario, than it was to get it from those distant States. But will hon. gentlemen opposite say that if that artificial restriction were removed, if that duty of 10 cents a bushel on barley were taken off, Ontario would not benefit, perhaps not fully, but almost to the amount of that duty, when hon. gentleman see that those States inevitably draw their supplies from Ontario, it being so much nearer, and the rate of freight being so much lower? Take wheat, which has been an important crop in Canada, and is to-day; what are the facts? The States of Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey, with a population of 9,615,692, produced in the census year only 14,379,045 bushels of wheat. All of these States, lying close to the Dominion of Canada, produced only one-thirtieth part of the entire product of wheat in the United States, although their population is one-fifth of the total population. Cannot hon. gentlemen opposite see, then, that although they might have a surplus of wheat in the United States, this question of distance from market and this question of railway tariff rates comes in as an important factor in determining the markets? The people in those States must inevitably buy the wheat and the flour they consume. They do not grow enough for their own consumption, and they must draw either from distant States or from the Province of Ontario or some of the other Provinces of this Dominion the supplies which they want. Now, Ontario produced in 1881 27,406,091 bushels of wheat; in other words, with a population of about 2,000,000, the Province of Ontario produced three times as much wheat as those six States I have mentioned, with a population of 9,600,000. Hon. gentlemen can see at once from these figures that there is not a sufficient supply of wheat grown in those States to supply the needs of the people; and what is the lesson to be drawn from that fact? Why, Sir, it is that those States would naturally draw their supplies from Ontario and the rest of the Dominion of Canada, as this country is their nearest and cheapest market. And, there, Sir, would be a solution of the problem that besets the Finance Minister with reference to the millers who waited upon him and asked that simple justice should be done to them; and he seems afraid to move for fear the Opposition might criticise their policy. Well, Sir, there is an opening for the millers of this country. There is a population which in 1880 amounted to 9,000,000, vastly increased since that time; there is a market now

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

closed up, with low rates of freight, only awaiting the wiping out of the tariff that has been erected against the free introduction of our products, for the millers of Ontario to ship every single surplus bushel of wheat and every single surplus barrel of flour they produce. Sir, you would have a trade natural and profitable; you would have a market ten times greater than the market of the Maritime Provinces, which is only obtained by the imposition of taxes which the people of those Provinces resent; you would remove the friction that exists; you would allay the discontent that brews in the minds of those people, as they feel that every loaf of bread which goes into the mouths of their children is taxed. They would have free bread, while the millers of Ontario could have a market ten times better than the tariff forced one which they have now. Now, not to trouble you too long, I wish to call your attention and the attention of the agriculturists present, to some figures given by Sir Charles Tupper with reference to the imports into Great Britain; and I find here something that will tend to excite interest at any rate, I will not say alarm, in reference to the agricultural prospects of this country. What, then, do the figures he gives show? They show, Sir, that the imports into Great Britain from Russia were in 1886 between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 cwts., in 1887 between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 cwts., and in 1888 between 21,000,000 and 22,000,000 cwts.; while the exports from British America to Great Britain which were over 3,000,000 cwts. in 1886, nearly 4,000,000 cwts. in 1887, were only a little over 1,000,000 in 1888; and the High Commissioner comments on the fact that out of the total quantity of wheat which was imported, about 57,000,000 cwts., less than 12,000,000 cwts. came from British possessions. But in this 57,000,000 cwts. are included importations from India which is a British possession, and imports from other parts of the British Empire; and as the means of transport have been improved and the cost reduced, India is to-day a stronger competitor in the English market against Canada in the supply of wheat than it ever was before. Therefore, I say that we are able to demonstrate from figures which I think cannot be controverted, that there lies at our very door a market which is bare of wheat, and bare of flour, which does not produce and cannot produce what it wants, that there is a market which the agriculturists of this country would desire to have opened to them and which would be of the greatest benefit to them. Now, Sir, there is a crop in which our friends in the neighboring Province of Quebec are very much interested,—what do I find in reference to the hay crop? I find that the State of Massachusetts, with a population of nearly half a million more than that of the Province of Quebec, produced only 684,679 tons of hay, while the Province of Quebec, with a population of nearly half a million less, produced 1,614,906 tons of hay, more than twice the quantity produced in the State of Massachusetts. Well, Sir, what lesson do I draw from that? Simply that that rich and populous State, which has Boston within its bounds, as well as other thriving towns, where there are thousands of horses that must be fed, does not grow the hay required for consumption in that State. Who, then, should supply it if not the neighboring Province of Quebec which has a surplus, and which does largely supply it, notwithstanding the restrictive tariff of \$2 a ton which is imposed upon it? Who does not see that if that \$2 a ton were removed, our friends from the Province of Quebec could sell their hay and realise \$2 a ton more for it than they are able to do now? And when you remember what an important crop it is in that Province, you can readily see that the agriculturists there are deeply interested in this question; and I think they will be able to see that even if the United States as a whole does produce a surplus of hay, yet it is produced in distant States, while Quebec lying at their door would have an advantage over those States, and would be the market from which they

would draw their supply. With reference to horses, which concern very largely the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, what do we find? In taking the figures for horses from the United States census, I find those in cities and towns are not enumerated, and I was unable to get them, but that will make no difference as the same system is followed through all the States of the Union, and therefore for the purposes of comparison, the omission makes no difference. Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania—States easy of access to the Dominion, with a population of one-quarter of the whole of the United States—had only one-seventh of the total of horses. Hon. gentlemen can readily see that the question put by the gentlemen opposite, since the United States produce more horses than they require, what is the use of our making that country a market for our horses, is answered by the fact that these seven great States, with a population one-fourth of the whole of the United States only have one-seventh of all the horses, and the supply being spread over the whole Union, there is a scarcity in the States I have mentioned that must be supplied from some place. Whence do they obtain that supply? They obtain it now from the Western States, but there is a railway tariff rate against them. From Canada there is a railway tariff rate of a much less amount, but supplemented by the United States Government tariff, which reduces the price of horses in our market—but wipe out the United States tariff on horses, and what would be the result? It would be that the export of horses from Ontario to Quebec would vastly exceed its present proportion, because were our market open they would come and buy our horses, and would be able to buy them to more advantage than they could from our competitors in the distant States, whose animals have to be brought so far by railway. With reference to sheep, I have the figures here, but I need not go into them. They demonstrate precisely the same fact as I have endeavored to prove with regard to horses. I have been a little long on this point, but I thought it was worth the time I have taken to give an answer to the plausible statement made broadly that as the United States produce more agricultural products than they consume, they cannot furnish a market for our produce. But the figures I have shown show that while that is the case, the consuming centres do not produce what they require, and as we are nearer to them we could ship to them easier had we free trade relations with the United States, than can those distant States from which these centres now obtain their supply. Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces, Prince Edward Island, would grasp and hold the supply of those States, which are short of these articles, which they must get from us, or else from distant States at greatly enhanced cost, owing to the freight rates that prevail there. There is one other point on which I wish to speak. While these hon. gentlemen have attempted to prove that it would not benefit our agriculturists much to have free trade relations with the United States, they have in former years admitted it would. If the statement of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be taken to mean anything, it is that the Government favor something in that direction at present. If I mistake not, the right hon. the First Minister has given a hint, in some remarks he made, that he was in favor of free trade with the United States, as far as was consistent with the interests of Canada. Well, what are the objections taken by hon. gentlemen opposite? While they have this year declared that they doubt if it will be any good to the farmer to have free trade with the United States, I have not heard an hon. gentleman opposite say that free trade relations will not benefit the fishermen of this Dominion. Not one hon. gentleman opposite has had the boldness to argue that free trade with the United States would not benefit our fishermen. Well, are our fishermen not an important class? Are these men who go down to the sea in ships and draw their

riches from the deep, and export to the extent of \$7,000,000—more than the export of our mines—a class not worth considering in this country? Will any hon. gentleman opposite say that our fishermen would not be benefited by free trade relations with the United States? Why, hon. gentlemen opposite know they desire, and did desire, while negotiating a treaty at Washington last year, to secure the free admission of fish into the United States. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who has ventured to say that free trade relations with the United States in the products of our forests would not benefit the great lumbering industry of this country, which last year exported \$24,000,000 worth of goods. Not a gentleman has risen to say that the vast army of men employed in that industry would not be benefited by free trade relations with the United States. Not an hon. gentleman has risen to say that our mining interests would not be benefited by free trade with the United States. Not an hon. gentleman has risen to say that our mechanics and our laboring classes would not be benefited by free trade relations with the United States. But there is one class—only one, so far as I can learn—which they lay stress upon, and say that free trade between the two nations lying side by side would destroy, and that is the manufacturing industries of this country. That is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, let us examine into that position. When first came the anxiety for the manufacturers, which is so strong in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite? It did not come at the inception of the National Policy, for when the hon. the First Minister announced that policy, he declared that the imposition of these duties on manufactured articles and on agricultural products was imposed for the express purpose of promoting the bringing about the reciprocity in trade with the United States—not only in agricultural products, not only in lumber, but in all the articles on which he imposed a duty. That was the very ground on which he imposed the duty. Therefore, at the inception of the National Policy, the First Minister declared that his purpose in putting these protective charges on manufactured goods, was to bring about a reciprocity of trade in manufactured goods as well as in agricultural products. The hon. gentleman attempted to hedge somewhat when a remark was made the other night in reference to this matter. When the words of this resolution were quoted, which were to the effect that moving, as we ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs, as far as the interests of Canada will admit, will eventually tend to bring about a reciprocity of trade, he said that his National Policy resolution only contemplated bringing about reciprocity as far as the interests of Canada required; and as the interests of the manufacturers does not require it, therefore he is not permitting it. But the right hon. the First Minister is a good enough logician to know that, that in the interests of Canada, applied to the imposition of duties, it may be found injurious to Canadians to put as heavy a duty on some articles as on other, and therefore they would not go as far in that direction. But the reciprocity was to be unlimited, not having reference to any industry or any interest in Canada. It was to bring about such a reciprocity of trade full and free as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asks this House now to ascertain the means by which it can be brought about. I remember very well—and I will not take up the time of the House by reading extracts, as I easily could do, in order to prove it—that the First Minister often and often used the argument which the manufacturers also used, and what was that? We are not afraid of free trade with the United States; we would be very glad to get free trade with the United States, but we do not believe in this jug-handled free trade—that was a favorite phrase of the First Minister;—if they will take off their duties, we will take off ours, but we do not believe in taking off our duties while theirs are so high. That was

the language, the avowed language, the declared language, not only of the First Minister and his supporters, but of those manufacturers who are to-day found supporting and aiding the First Minister in resisting the very policy which they said at the time they were not afraid of, when the National Policy was first introduced. In regard to the manufacturers, I wish distinctly to say that there is a distinction to be drawn. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of being the friends of the manufacturers, and they point to the Opposition as being the enemies of the manufacturers. I deny it. I claim not that the manufacturers stand on any higher plane than the rest of my fellow citizens, but, as one of them, I have never been ashamed to stand with them. I admire the legal profession and other professions, I admire the agriculturists and all other classes of the community, but I believe the persons who are engaged in the manufacturing and commercial interests of this country stand equal to any. In the time of ancient Tyre, her merchants were princes, and her traffickers were among the honorable of the earth, and, from that day to this, I assert that the mercantile and manufacturing classes have been men who have been noble, intelligent, public-spirited men. Everyone who hears it will admit that that is the case, but I regret to say that, in that class, as perhaps in all other classes, there are some who have not maintained the dignified and manly stand which I think that class, as a whole, will maintain and ought to maintain. I think those manufacturers, or those who belong to that or any other class in this country, who will come to the Government of the day and ask them to shape their fiscal policy, not with a view to revenue, but so as to enable them to take money out of the pockets of other classes of the community and put it into their theirs, have dishonored the noble class of men to which they belong. It is an unworthy position to take, and I say that the manufacturers as a class have never taken that position. You speak of your manufacturers' association, but do you mean to tell me that they comprise the whole of the manufacturers of this country, or even a large portion of them? There may be some favored men there; there may be some men there who have had their peculiar interests looked after, but it is not to the credit of those men who were as loud as others when the National Policy was first introduced, in stating that all they wanted was free trade with the United States, to come now and besiege the Minister of Finance, and not only ask that the National Policy shall be continued under any circumstances, but that its stringent restrictions shall be increased. I draw another distinction, and, when the distinction is drawn, you will find that the number of men of this kind is limited whose conduct I cannot commend. I draw a distinction between those manufacturers of whom I have spoken and those who, in self-defence, have come to this Government and asked for an increased duty on some articles because the Government have legislated against them by the protection which they have given to other favored individuals, or by raising the cost of the raw material. These men asks no favors, but only to be left in as good a position, and no better, than they would have been in under a revenue tariff. These men are not to be confounded with the men who oppose the introduction of the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We have heard the remark made sometimes that these manufactures would be crushed out if this were adopted, because the United States would make this a slaughter market. I was surprised last year to hear a gentleman of the large mercantile experience possessed by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) use that expression. I think I also heard the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), use the same term, and I think the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), in some well thought out remarks, from his point of view,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

which he made the other day, spoke of this as being made a slaughter market and leading to the crushing out of our manufactures. Why, Sir, it is impossible that that should take place under the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That proposition is not to take down the Canadian bars and let American manufactured goods come in here free while the American tariff is maintained against our manufactures. It is a proposition to have men appointed here to confer with men appointed by the United States in order to see on what terms and conditions the bars of both countries may be let down. Then, where can be the danger of the manufacturers of the United States slaughtering goods in the Dominion of Canada? Let the Finance Minister himself bring what commercial experience he has gained by study, if not by actual experience, to the consideration of that question. Suppose a manufacturer in New York determines to make a slaughter market of Canada, understanding that we have unrestricted trade with that country in regard to his manufacture. He says that eight cents is the market price for his article in the United States, but he will sell it at six cents in Canada, at cost in fact, while he would keep up the price in the United States. If the Finance Minister were engaged in manufacturing that article in Canada what would he do? He would immediately buy up the six-cent goods offered by the New York merchant, he would stop them in transit in the State of New York, and would sell them in the eight-cent market, and would realise 33½ per cent. on the transaction. It would be an utter impossibility that such a thing could be done. There would be another alternative in such a case. If the manufacturer in New York was trying to kill the manufacturer in Canada in that way the Canadian manufacturer would say that two can play at that game; and, if the New York manufacturer was offering his goods at 6 cents here and keeping up the price in the United States, the Canadian manufacturer would very soon sell his goods in New York at 6 cents, so that the 8 cent price would be destroyed very quickly. The arguments would not bear examination by a business man for a moment of time. I make this proposition to the hon. gentlemen opposite. I say their objection to the hon. member for South Oxford embraces one of two propositions: either that the Dominion of Canada does not possess equal natural advantages with the United States, or that the Dominion of Canada has produced a race of men that are inferior to the inhabitants of the United States. I say their arguments that the manufacturers of this country would be killed out, that the agriculturists would be injured, that harm would be done to this country by free trade with the United States, involves either one or the other of these propositions: either that the Dominion of Canada has not as good natural advantages as the United States, or that the Dominion of Canada has produced a race of men inferior to the race produced by the United States. Which ground do they argue from? Sir, I do not think that they argue from the first ground, because they have taken occasion to charge upon members on this side that they depreciate their country, that we have a better country than the United States. I agree with them. I believe that in Manitoba and the North-West, our fertile wheat fields and lands, are better wheat-producing regions than any comprised within the American Union. I have said at all times, and I believe it now as I utter it, that not excepting the State of New York, I do not believe there is in all the region comprised within the American Union, a State with better natural advantages than the Province of Ontario, the Province in which I live. Sir, I am glad to agree with the gentlemen who say that our sister Province of Quebec has better facilities, is richer by nature, than the New England States. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from the Annapolis Valley speak the other day of the fruitful vale of Nova Scotia; they are fruitful indeed. I was glad to hear that. Our

country, then, is equal to that of the United States. Then, Sir, if we are unable to hold our own, if the sad picture of desolation marked out by the Postmaster General, of Toronto obliterated, of Montreal wiped out, of Hamilton existing no longer, simply because we have gone into free trade relations with the United States, his argument amounts to this, they themselves confessing that we have equal natural advantages, that in his opinion, and in the opinion of those who agree with him, Canada has grown a race of men that are inferior to the men of the United States. I deny it, I hurl it back at him. The people of Canada are as able to hold their own as the people of the United States. Sir, I say that a Canadian is able to hold his own with the American, sharp, bright and active a business man as the American is, and I give as proof the thousands, the tens of thousands of Canada's sons that are to be found in the United States of America to-day. What are they doing? These gentlemen say that if we had free trade relations with the United States the dwellers in Canada would become hewers of wood and drawers of water to the men who inhabit the United States. Where are the tens of thousands of your countrymen that are scattered through that Union to-day? Are they hewers of wood and drawers of water in the community in which they dwell? Say it if you dare. Your language implies it, your logic inevitably leads to it; say it out if you dare. You cannot, because you know that to-day wherever a Canadian is found in the United States, speaking of them in comparison with the others, taking them in the aggregate, they rise to as high positions, they hold their own as well as any man that is born within the bounds of the United States. Sir, how did the United States develop their fishing industry? Where do they draw the bone, muscle and sinew that man their fishing fleet? They are drawn from the hardy sons of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Sir, will you not find them in the highest positions to be had in that country? Will you not find them elevated upon the bench, and in dispensing justice? Will you not find them in legislative halls? Will you not find them in the busy marts of commerce? Will you not find them in the seats of learning? Will you not find them in all the professions the equals of those by whom they are surrounded, in every respect? Sir, if a Canadian can go into that country, which is practically to them a foreign country, where they are unknown, among a people alien to them by nationality, though speaking in the same language, and can attain unto the highest places in that country, who shall say that Canadians are not able to hold their own in their own land simply because we have decreed to have, if we should so decree, free trade relations with the people of the United States? Sir, I am glad that it has fallen to the lot of hon. gentlemen opposite, by their statements and by their course of reasoning to declare that it is their belief that the people of Canada are inferior as a race of men to the people that are in the United States. We deny it on this side of the House. We deny that our country is inferior to theirs, we deny that our people are their inferiors in any respect. Where, then, is the danger of entering into free trade relations with them? Is it not rather to our advantage? For while they, with their 65 millions of people, have access to a market of five millions, the people of five millions have access to a market of 60 millions of people. Who shall say that the gain is not on our side? And, Sir, shrinking from a fear, and a candid discussion of the question, the Postmaster General says that the effect of this resolution is annexation to the United States. Sir, he may try to justify himself in voting against this resolution by such a proposition; but it is a plain resolution, written in plain English, a person of less intelligence than that possessed by the Postmaster General, can understand that it is a proposition reciting that as the United States have expressed a desire for freer trade relations with Canada, it would be

expedient that this Legislature, in a like spirit, should appoint commissioners to meet with their own and report to us upon what terms and upon what conditions this can be brought about. What objection should there be to that motion in the mind of any gentleman who honestly desires to have freer trade relations with our neighbors to the South? Sir, if the proposition before us were adopted, if ways and means were devised, and it became evident that it implied political union with the United States, the hon. gentleman would not be bound by this resolution to assent to that. It is time enough to consider that, I think, after we have taken the first step. The Postmaster General must not think that suddenly, while he sleeps, the flag will be changed over his head, and all his liberties bartered away. Sir, will he raise a phantom, something that does not exist, in order to prevent the members of this House from expressing a desire to take the first initial step. Those who consider the subject, no matter what is their political leaning, must admit that it would be a benefit to the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I do not think that the effect of having free trade relations with the United States would tend in that direction of annexation. He referred to Germany, and he spoke about that trade policy having welded all those States together. I think he was mistaken. Was not Austria in the Zollverein, and it was not confederated? Was the union of the German Empire brought about by trade influences? No; it was brought about by the clang of arms. He gave us no parallel case. The Reciprocity Treaty we had with the United States before, instead of promoting a desire for annexation, stamped out the desire that had already begun to make itself felt; and in the light of all these facts why should hon. gentlemen opposite rise and try to throw dust in the eyes of those who wish to calmly consider this proposition? What does this proposition mean? It means a vast addition to the vitality of Canadian interests, for, if this scheme is carried out, in my judgment, all interests, manufacturing and otherwise, will be benefited by the vast extension of our trade. You may answer me that this cannot be carried out without inflicting injury on the different industries of this country. That there will be displacement of capital in some cases, that there will be some changes brought about by this new state of affairs and that in the turn of the wheel some will go down and some will come up, I do not deny. That transpires in the mercantile world every day. You cannot take up the trade journals but you will read that this firm has gone down and perhaps that another firm are prospering. Those changes will occur, but this great commercial change to which this resolution refers will not be brought about suddenly. Time will be given for trade to adapt itself to it; and having thus entered upon the broader field of trade and commerce, who shall say the development that will be ours? Hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed to the figures of the inter-provincial trade established by means of the National Policy. They could not have offended me by doing that. If we had been able to develop increased trade with the Maritime Provinces I would have rejoiced, for I desire, as a Canadian, above all things that we should have extended trade relations with our friends in the Maritime Provinces. But there are natural difficulties in the way. We have been unable to accomplish it, and their trade is largely with the United States as is ours in the Province of Ontario. But, if it had been fostered by natural means and not by tariff rates, much good would have been done in that regard. But if there has been a considerable development of inter-provincial trade, as is claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask them to consider this, if there has been a development of the resources of Canada, if there has been an increase of our wealth as the result of inter-provincial trade between the Provinces, what would be the increase of our wealth, the increase of our trade, if instead of having these seven Pro-

vines to trade one with the other, the doors should be opened to over forty neighboring States and Territories to which our trade would extend, and in whose trade we would share. What has made the United States the country it is? It is its vast inter-State commerce. In that free and unrestricted trade Canada would share, and if they have prospered we would prosper too. To-day, the great need of Canada is, what? An enlarged market. This is the need of the manufacturers. What does the Minister of Finance tell us he is going to endeavor to do, in order to obtain increased trade? He declares that there is but one relief for the manufacturers whose interests he seeks to promote: we require a foreign market, and an outlet for our surplus goods. That is what the hon. gentleman tells us himself. To that end, and for that purpose, he will endeavor to remove in part that restriction which nature has imposed on trade between foreign countries, on trade between the Argentine Republic and other portions of South America, by subsidising steamship lines in order to achieve this result. We have that proposition and that declaration, that the manufacturers of Canada need a foreign market. Suppose we open up trade with the Argentine Republic to the extent of half a million dollars, supposing it is even two millions on account of subsidies given to steamships: the hon. gentleman at the same time proposes to vote down a proposition that initial steps be taken to ascertain whether we can secure free and unrestricted trade and a market of 60,000,000 lying at our very doors. Admitting that the manufacturers can only now find relief by securing an enlarged and a foreign market, the Finance Minister proposes to subsidise steamship lines to proceed to the ends of the earth in order to sell a few hundred dollars worth more goods while at our very doors lies a nation that, even under the restrictions at present imposed by both countries, takes over \$40,000,000 of goods from us annually while we take about a like quantity with them, and the hon. gentleman will vote down and call upon his supporters to vote down a proposition looking to the removal of the barriers to our entrance into that trade which has benefited the United States.

Mr. DICKEY, I feel I shall need all the indulgence which the House generally accords to new members in rising to speak on this question which has already been so ably debated from both points of view, and especially when I have the honor to follow an hon. member who is so able as is the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. There is one statement which the hon. gentleman has made which I think was quite unnecessary, if he had waited till the close of his speech he might have left it unsaid, namely, that he did not understand and could not comprehend the position of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I think after listening to his arguments it was quite evident to any hon. gentleman who appreciated the position that he, whether intentionally or not, had not placed himself in sympathy with it. The speech of the hon. gentleman to which we have just listened was a very admirable argument in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty. He showed that the agricultural products could be sold to the United States, that coal could be sold to the United States, in other words his argument was that the old Reciprocity Treaty would be a great advantage to this country. Does anyone on this side of the House deny that? All I desire to say to the hon. gentleman on that point is, that he is taking the very course that will prevent this country ever obtaining such a treaty, that hon. gentlemen opposite are taking a course that will prevent the United States from ever dealing with us upon any fair commercial basis, and only when we shall have got rid of all the difficulties raised by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the discussion they have had on this question, can any treaty be secured. I do not intend to answer in detail the argu-

ments of hon. gentlemen opposite, or even as fully as I might be able to do, but I will touch upon them as I proceed with my remarks. The argument of hon. gentlemen opposite in favor of the amendment is this: In the first place, they return to their old love of ten years ago and attack the principle of the National Policy, which seems to be a labor of love to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Then the hon. gentleman tells us that the country is ruined, that we have no country left and especially that our farmers are suffering. He goes on to tell you that you have a ready cure, and he tells you further that the population of this country is stationary and that Canada is a case of arrested development. He tells us further, that we have the cure in unrestricted reciprocity, and that it is a cure we can get for the asking. I submit that hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, if they are were laying down a policy upon which to go the country should above all things ensure that it shall be a practical policy, and I say that it is a peculiar thing that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite offer to this House and to this country, if they get into power, is that they will enter into negotiations with a foreign nation in order to obtain a treaty which they may get or which they may not get, and they give us no information whatever as to the mode in which they will carry on the business of this country until they get that treaty, or in case they fail to get that treaty. They offer us no policy in the meantime and they ask the people of this country in voting for them to go it blind, because no elector of this country, however intelligent he may be, can get the slightest information from watching hon. gentlemen opposite for the past ten years as to what their policy would be if they got upon the Treasury benches. One fact has come out in this debate which I think is of some value, and that is that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is the financial exponent of his party in this House and in the country, has bound himself to a policy of direct taxation. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that indirect taxation is the trouble with the farmers of the country, and he has referred to England as a country where the poor man and the farmer are alike favored. I think that the farmers of this country will receive with a great deal of interest the announcement that so far as the hon. member for South Oxford can commit his party, that if he were put in power he would send his tax gatherer around hat in hand to every farmer in this country asking for a certain contribution to enable him to govern the country. Anyone who has had any experience with direct taxation knows that it is the property owned by the farmer which pays the largest share of direct taxation, no matter under what system you levy it, and this statement of the hon. member will be received with a good deal of interest by the farmers of the country. The hon. gentleman's proposition of direct taxation is one directly affecting the farmer, because under it he will have to pay the largest share of that taxation. I do not care to weary the House with statistics, but let us look for one moment at the condition of England at the present time. We are told that the policy adopted by England is one that we should imitate, and is one that has produced great results in that country. Possibly it may not be generally known that since 1867 the export of manufactures from England in wool, cotton, linen, hardware and other articles of iron, have decreased in 1886 as compared with 1867. During that twenty years there has been a decrease in the export of these articles under the free trade which the hon. member for South Oxford lauds and admires. The total *per capita* export of England in 1867 was £5 18s. 4d., and in 1886 it had decreased to £5 15s. 9d. sterling, or 3s. 7d. per head. If there is one industry in the world which it is perfectly certain is in an absolute state of prostration it is the agricultural industry of England. It is

admitted in the Queen's speeches, in the speeches of public men, the books of economists, that the agricultural industry of England, which has been fostered under this free trade system that the member for South Oxford wants us to adopt for the benefit of the farmers of Canada is absolutely depressed and helpless at the present time. It is exactly the same if you look at the free trade colony of New South Wales. We have heard a great deal about that colony in this debate, and there were figures used with reference to it by hon. gentlemen opposite which I must say were very carefully culled, and culled with considerable judgment from the midst of other figures which told very seriously against their arguments. The agricultural development of New South Wales as compared with the neighboring colony of Victoria is almost trifling. Victoria has gone ahead of New South Wales in her agricultural development by enormous strides, and you find also that the population of Victoria is four times greater per square mile than the population of New South Wales. You find that in New South Wales, while one out of every 77 persons in the population is out of employment, in Victoria only one out of every 191 is out of employment. We find also that New South Wales has at the head of its financial affairs a gentleman who has undertaken to rival the member for South Oxford, and who has taken the position formerly held by that gentleman as the leading man of deficits. In 1883 the deficit in New South Wales on ordinary expenditure was \$6,471,000. In 1884, \$6,300,000. In 1885, \$4,800,000. In 1886, \$7,400,000, or a deficit in four years of \$24,971,000, which were met as the hon. member for South Oxford was in the habit of meeting his deficits by a capitalised loan; while in the colony of Victoria, which pursue the policy of protection we find that she pays her way every year and has a handsome surplus in the end. There is another little fact about New South Wales which was not mentioned by gentlemen opposite, and that was that an election was recently run there in which the Free Trade Government was left in a minority when the House met. It is true that the Protectionist Government had been defeated by a majority of four, but I think that the comfort that can be gathered from free trade in New South Wales under those circumstances is very small indeed. In order that the position may be clear, I quote from an article written by Baden Powell, M.P., England, in the *Fortnightly Review* for the present month, in which he says at page 426 :

"Every year there, as in Europe, more articles go in the expurgatorial list and every year the cause of free trade seems to pass more into a purely defensive attitude."

It was said here that there were 100,000 popular majority of the United States in favor of free trade. Until I heard the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken I was surprised that a statement of that character could be made; a statement which every hon. member in this House must know is absolutely inconsistent with the true character of the last presidential election. Do not hon. gentlemen know that Mr. Cleveland had from one end of the Union to the other canvassers and speechmakers trying to convince the people that he was not in favor of free trade; and that the whole issue on which his election was run was in trying to force the people to believe that he was in favor of protection. But so great was their suspicion of a man who had gone so far as President Cleveland did, that in their jealousy the people of the United States turned out of office President Cleveland, whose administrative record was as good as that of any other president of the United States, and who had given no other reason beyond his trade proclivities for being turned out of office. Now, I do not wish to make any argument on the subject of free trade. All I wish to say is, as has been said before, that all the world, outside of Great Britain, is against those gentlemen. Of course, I do not say that all the world is right. It is

possible that the hon. gentlemen opposite may be Noahs, and all the rest of the world may be wrong about this ark; they may have the true ark, but I very much doubt it; and I think they will have to show some stronger arguments to convince us than they have done. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite this, that while frequently in the history of this world a few men, and sometimes one man, have been right against the rest of the world in starting a cause, or in a new and growing cause, the history of this world does not contain one instance in which one man, or a few men, who hung on to a waning and dying cause were right in the end. History has given to the men who hang on to a dying cause, like the cause of free trade, an entirely different name from any which hon. gentlemen would claim; it has called them reactionists, Tories, and a great many other bad names. The name of Tory would be especially offensive, I know, to the hon. member for South Oxford. Now, I am not here to argue that England is wrong in adopting free trade. I do not pretend to universal knowledge; I do not know what is best for England; I do not think we are called on here to consider what is best for England. I think trade questions are practical questions, to be settled by people for themselves with regard to the circumstances in which they are placed; and I wish to state that the aim of protection is simply to utilise the labor in the country, which, for the want of such protection, would go to utter waste, and be absolutely and irretrievably lost. That is the aim of protection, and in doing that, as all revenue must be raised by taxation, it taxes the inward foreign commerce of the country instead of taxing production or putting a direct tax on the operative and the manufacturer, leaving production free, so that labor may be employed. Now, there is one other advantage in protection, which I am glad to see the hon. gentleman who last spoke sustained, that is, that very frequently, though not in the majority of cases, under protection the foreigner pays your revenue for you by paying the import duty. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down gave a very good instance of that, because he said that when our farm produce was sold in the United States, we had to sell it at very much less than we would otherwise have to do on account of the duty that was put on it by the United States. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gave a very good instance of the same thing in speaking of a lamb, with regard to which he showed great feeling, which he said had to pay \$1 of duty as it went into the States. That is one advantage a protective policy has which is quite evident. Now, I do not wish to argue at any length about this free trade question. But I wish to quote the words of a gentleman who in this House is always recognised as a master of expression, a gentleman who can always clearly say what he means and can clothe his ideas in elegant and precise language; I refer to the hon. member for West Durham, the former leader of the Opposition. Speaking at Wellaud, in February, 1887, the hon. gentleman said :

"I speak now as the leader of the party expounding on all questions of principle, not merely my individual views, but the common sense of the great body of the party, the general lines on which the party would act if entrusted, as they will soon be, with power. What I am about to say on all questions of principle you may take as authoritative, and, so far from their being any divergence, I can assure you that there is, in my belief, a general concurrence of sentiment between us, including Sir Richard Cartwright."

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of free trade for Canada he may be, has yet suggested—no man, I believe, can suggest—a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met otherwise than by the imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make or can make within our bounds. I invite the most ardent free trader in public life to present a plausible solution to this problem. I have not believed it soluble in my day, and any chance of its solution, if any there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge and by the other conditions that have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

That is a far better statement than I could make of protectionist doctrine, and in making that statement he pledged

the party opposite to that policy. Now, the next statement made by the member for South Oxford is that this country is ruined, and I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House must have appreciated the amount of dramatic ability which the hon. gentleman threw into that statement. Of course, we all know that as a patriotic Canadian, he was actually suffering as much wretchedness as a patriotic man could feel when he had to stand up in this House and denounce his country and say it was hopelessly ruined; and yet the hon. gentleman showed the greatest glee; his countenance looked as if he was never more pleased than when he made the statement that this country was deeply involved, and must cast in its fortunes with a foreign nation. That was a piece of good acting, for which the hon. gentleman deserves credit. The hon. gentleman says the country has gone to the bad. That is an assertion which was not backed up; and although the hon. gentleman has a very high opinion of his own assertions, I do not feel obliged to take them at the same value. I will meet it with a counter assertion. In words which have been stamped as parliamentary by the president of the Lime Kiln Club, to which as an authority I know you will bow, I beg to say that that is a matter of wrongfulness of statement; it is not correct as a matter of fact. We know the ability of the hon. member for South Oxford; but he did not answer one single figure or set of figures which the hon. Finance Minister presented to this House as showing the prosperity of the country; he did not attempt to do so; but he set up his own *ipse dixit* that the country was in a bad position. Now, I remember hearing of an election trial in the Province of Ontario in which the judge said that the sitting member stated that he did not know there was any corruption, and he said he would not believe that any more than he would believe that if the hon. gentleman went into Lake Ontario, he would not be wet. Now, I will say this, how the hon. gentleman dipped in the scenes of prosperity as he sees them everywhere in the country, could get up and say that this country is in a bad position, is more than I can understand. I do not propose to argue this matter. I do not propose to tell hon. gentlemen on the other side to read the financial papers; I do not propose to tell them to read the reports of the loan societies, because wherever they go, they will find signs of prosperity. I will only quote from two authorities, one, the *New York Tribune*. About a year ago I found in this paper the following article:

"It is folly for Americans to shut their eyes to the fact that Canada is becoming every year a more formidable competitor for the commerce of the continent."

That is the opinion of a foreign and not a very friendly source, the editor of the *Tribune*, who stands very high in the commercial world of the United States. But for fear hon. gentlemen opposite would not like that opinion, I will give them the opinion of a leading organ in the Maritime Provinces. The *Morning Chronicle*, only four months ago, in November, when this hideous depression we heard of this year must have been apparent to the gentleman, a good Liberal who edits that paper, the following article appeared in it:

"Canada is now assuming national proportions. She has an enormous territory, 5,000,000 of people, great wealth and large resources. She has every quality of a nation, except national life and sentiment. Why should 5,000,000 of wealthy and prosperous people, such as Canada now possesses, enjoy all the advantages of the Empire and contribute nothing to its support?"

There is the statement that Canada contains 5,000,000 of wealthy and prosperous people. But in order to show indirectly the prosperity of Canada, I wish to submit just one table of statistics, namely, with reference to the coal output in 1877 and 1888. In 1877 there was sold from the Nova Scotia mines 687,000 tons, and there was imported 978,000 tons, making a total quantity available of 1,665,000 tons. Now deduct coal exported 140,000 tons, and we have

Mr. DICKEY.

a total in 1877 of 1,535,000 tons. Now, in 1888, the Nova Scotia mines instead of selling 687,000 tons, sold 1,550,000 tons, and we imported, instead of 978,000, in 1888, 1,284,000 tons, or we sold 203,000 tons, and we consumed in this country 2,621,000 tons, or an increase of over 1,100,000 tons coal consumed in this country in that ten years, and that at a time when gentlemen opposite tell us there were no more people in the country. I would like to know then how that coal came to be consumed. It was consumed in the manufactories of the country, in the railways carrying our inter-provincial traffic from one point to the other. There is one fact from which hon. gentlemen opposite cannot escape and which is not explicable on any other supposition except the enormous development of this country within that period. We are told that the farming interests of this country are depressed. We will assume the hon. gentlemen opposite have the interests of the farmers at heart; we will assume that they are patriotic and trying to do what they can for the country, and I ask if they want to find out the progress that the farmers of this country are making, why did they not give us some comparative statistics? Why did they not compare the farms of this country with those of the United States? Why did they not compare the prices of farms here with those of the United States? Why take the farms of this country, and after telling the House of the enormous fall in value, argue from that fact that the farmers are in a depressed state? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to compare the condition of the farmers in this country, in every particular, in general prosperity and general accumulation of wealth during the past ten years, with those of the United States, and I undertake to say that the farmers of Canada will come out with a far better showing than those of the United States. Statements like these, would perhaps be fair game in an ordinary political debate, but which whenever they touch the honor of a country and the instincts of patriotism they should be better sifted and be treated on a higher plane than they are by hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the population is decreasing. That question is one of these assertions which are not borne out by facts. The statistics given us are very misleading. I am not in a position to discuss that question, and I take the liberty to say that no hon. gentleman opposite is in a position to discuss it, until the census is taken. These statements that the population of our country is decreasing, that our farmers are ruined, that our country is ruined, may be good politics, and I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to discuss that question. They are better judges of that, but I take leave to say, it is bad patriotism, and if I know the people of this country, when these hon. gentlemen come to the polls, they will find it is bad—it is bad politics. They will find that they cannot join bad patriotism and good politics. The people want both united, and are keen enough to distinguish the pure article. Why did not hon. gentlemen, if they wished to get at the facts, look at the movement of the population from east to west. Take the State of Massachusetts. It has been held up as a live State, and is beyond doubt one of the best in the American Union. We find that in 1880, Massachusetts had a population of 1,783,000 people in all, and you find residing outside of Massachusetts in the other States of the Union, men born in Massachusetts, who have moved away to the number of 1,366,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Where did they go?

Mr. DICKEY. To the western and other States. That is to say, if Canadians had left on the same ratio as the Americans have left Massachusetts instead of their being 1,000,000 of Canadians to-day in the States you would find 4,000,000. If the Legislature of Massachusetts produced such another gentleman as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I should like to hear him

get up in the House there and make a great essay on the decline of that State. Nearly half of its population has left for the west, and the State does not increase in population as fast as Canada. I would like to hear him say to the State: Let us take leave of the union and take up our place as Canadians and we will do as well as Canadians. That is exactly the line the hon. gentleman takes. Fortunately for Massachusetts, I do not think they have a gentleman there who would dare to get up in their House and take that position. Now, to come to the cure. The hon. gentleman opposite, having diagnosed the body politic and found a disease which did not exist, has proposed a cure, and that cure is unrestricted reciprocity. Well, unrestricted reciprocity is rather an uncertain quantity. I would take the two terms, commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, and, by a little legerdemain and transposition, I could make out the policy of the Conservatives and the policy of a good many gentlemen on the other side of the House. By a slight transposition, it is evident that the policy of the Conservatives is commercial reciprocity, and the policy of a good many gentlemen opposite is unrestricted union. By that transposition, hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the hon. gentleman who spoke last, can get at the policy of the Conservatives, which is commercial reciprocity. So many answers have been made to this question that I scarcely know how to approach the subject. One very good argument which was used—and that was used by the last speaker—was that unrestricted reciprocity would cure annexation, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was kind enough to name several Canadians, who, in former years, as he stated, had been annexationists, but were cured by the adoption of the old Reciprocity Treaty, and he seemed to take pride in stating that those gentlemen were Tories. Well, whatever they were at that time, at any rate it is safe to say that the annexationists in this House do not sit on this side and I think this House and this country will consider that the price we should have to pay for unrestricted reciprocity is rather too high a price to pay for the purpose of curing those hon. gentlemen of their peccadilloes in favor of annexation. I have already stated that I do not know how to distinguish between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. I know that is a fault of my own, and is owing to my inability to grasp the clear and lucid explanation which we have had from the other side in regard to it. One gentleman argues in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Another gets up and argues in favor of the resolution, and declares he is straight for commercial union. Being in this state of doubt, I turn to the bible of the party, the *Toronto Globe*, and I find there the true statement of this matter, and this is what the *Toronto Globe* says in reference to unrestricted reciprocity:

"The opponents of unrestricted reciprocity sometimes ask what the term means. Having obtained the information, they hold up their horrified hands and groan: 'Why, that's just commercial union.' There is a story that Douglas Jerrold was once asked by a very dirty man for a cure for cold in the head. 'You take a pail of warm water,' said the joker, 'then bare your legs, put your feet in the water, and rub them with soap and a scrubbing brush.' 'Why, that's washing my feet,' cried the other. 'I admit it is open to that objection,' replied Jerrold. Just such is the answer to the cry that unrestricted reciprocity is commercial union. 'It is open to that objection.' But what of that?"

They go on to say:

"But the situation is that we cannot obtain the most valuable privilege, that of free trade with the nearest and wealthiest sixty million people in the world without consenting to forego that free trade with the rest of the world which they deny to themselves. We cannot obtain the inestimable boon of free access to the States for our products without accepting the closest approximation to the commercial position of a State of the Union. They will not favor us more than one another. Unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union is the unattainable best, with customs union, it would be very good, and that we can probably obtain."

Turning to this high authority in the Reform party, I find that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity are

interchangeable terms, which may be used indiscriminately. The argument, as I understand, is that, if we had unrestricted reciprocity, we would have a market of sixty millions people for our products. If these hon. gentlemen will condescend to look facts in the face, I think they will have to cut down that market of sixty millions very considerably. They tell us that Canadians are as good as anybody else, that Canadians can hold their own against all the world. So they can on fair terms, and I say further that, if Canadian brains had the handling of the capital possessed by the United States as a weapon, they could not only meet the people of the United States on equal terms, but could beat them out of their own market. But how is a man with \$1,000 going to fight a man who has a million dollars? How is a man who has \$50,000 invested, who is struggling along and trying to support his family on that small capital, to maintain a fight, a strong commercial fight against the surplus products of men who control millions, and that not for one or two or three years, but for many years? That is the question which must be solved, whether a man bare-handed can fight a man with a sword, who knows how to use it; because the position of the Canadian manufacturer, as compared with that of the American manufacturer, is almost that. They will tell us that we will have access to the American market. They must know that the American manufacturers have everything perfectly organized, that they have their agents in every hole and corner and cranny of the United States. They have their whole commercial system completed, and any man going in there from Canada would not only have to fight this establishment, but also the national prejudice, and that with only one hundredth part of the capital possessed by those against whom he was fighting; so that the market of sixty millions of people would be practically worthless to our manufacturers if it were open to us to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have a great objection to Canadian manufacturers, but, if they would extend their researches, they would find that other manufacturers are just as objectionable; they would find that they are ready to combine in enormous numbers, not only to get at the American producer directly, but at the Canadian producer by getting into the Canadian market, stamping out the Canadian manufacturer and so getting the whole market to themselves. If they were to provoke a contest with the American manufacturers, with the enormous capital which they have, amounting to something like six thousand millions of dollars, they would find that they had a very hard battle and a losing battle to fight. As to the difference between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial reciprocity, you are told that the leader of the Government was in favor of reciprocity, and it is asked, if we are in favor of reciprocity, why cannot we go for unrestricted reciprocity? The distinction between the two terms and the two states of trade is absolutely radical. If we make a treaty for commercial reciprocity, we will see that our interests do not suffer, that the treaty will preserve to us our autonomy and our commercial independence, and our control over our own affairs in any political or any other exigency which might arise; but, if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity for a period of years, we would place out of our control the whole fiscal policy of this country and all our own affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot argue fairly a readiness to go into unrestricted reciprocity, from the readiness to go into commercial reciprocity which this Government has always shown. Now, do hon. gentlemen opposite really mean to say that they think that we can get unrestricted reciprocity? Do they really imagine that this House will credit for a moment that there has been any change of sentiment in the United States upon that question? What is the indication of a change of sentiment? Will any hon. gentleman who attempts to answer me, point out in the United States any



sign or shadow of a change in the sentiment of the people during the past year? We have, it is true, Mr. Hitt's resolution for commercial union, supported, of course, by Mr. Butterworth, and by the gentlemen who want to annex us to the United States kite as a sort of tail. But we were told in this House last year by Sir Charles Tupper that he had talked with leading public men in the United States, and found that every one was earnestly in favor of commercial union. Has there been any change since? Is there a single public man in that country who has declared himself in favor of unrestricted reciprocity? Since then we have had a declaration from Mr. Sherman and Mr. Blaine, stating in the strongest manner that unrestricted reciprocity they will not have, and commercial union they will only have as a step to political union. Hon. gentlemen opposite may get around that point the best they can, and try to show that there is a distinction between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, but it is impossible for them to show that there has been any change of sentiment in the United States in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. All they can say is that the universal sentiment in favor of commercial union, which every gentleman in this House knew existed a year ago, has been put in the shape of resolution by Mr. Hitt which, I may say, is so transparent, is so thin, is so palpable a step to political union, that it is almost an insult to the intelligence of the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen surely cannot suppose that the United States would allow us to arrange our tariff as we choose. The United States imported last year \$278,000,000 worth of goods which pay duty. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that the United States are going to allow us to fix the duty on those goods, are going to allow us to say that they shall pay 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. to come in here or to come into the United States? The proposition, as the hon. member for Queen's—who I am sorry to see is not in his place—said, would show that the Americans are arrant fools, that they were willing to do what hon. gentlemen opposite want Canada to do, that is, to sell their commercial independence to a foreign power, and that the Americans will never do. The only possible condition upon which they will give us reciprocity is a uniform tariff, and as a sort of rider upon that, they would have the making of that tariff. Now, there is another class of argument to which I wish briefly to refer. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) used some very extraordinary arguments. He argued that because the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway were not properly kept, we should have unrestricted reciprocity. He argues that because the carpets in Rideau Hall cost a certain sum, we should have unrestricted reciprocity. His ideas seem to be that, because what he elegantly called the Tupper family, cost the country a certain amount of money, therefore we should have unrestricted reciprocity—at least that was the class of arguments to which he addressed himself. I will say just one word as to the charge against Sir Charles Tupper which was made by the hon. member for North Wellington. Those of you who have read Oliver Wendell Holmes, will no doubt remember a very interesting character in one of his books—an old man who had passed his whole life in collecting beetles. He was very much annoyed if any one called him a naturalist. He said he did not deserve that name, that he was simply a collector of the genus *scarabæus*, and he said, I want you to call me a *scarabeist*. This gentleman spent his whole life in collecting these nasty, ugly, ill-smelling insects which, to an ordinary man, would be simply disgusting. Now it is, perhaps, proper that a political party in opposition should have a *scarabeist* to collect the facts of this particular class suitable to his taste. But I submit that when an hon. gentleman takes that scientific position, and claims to be a *scarabeist*, he should be sure that he classifies aright, and that the insect he has got is one of the true genus. I submit that his statement

Mr. DICKEY.

about Sir Charles Tupper lacks that essential element, because he should have known that Sir Charles Tupper, during the two years he referred to, never took one cent from the public treasury of this country, except the salary that was freely and cheerfully voted to him by this House, and which he amply earned. I make this statement because Sir Charles Tupper is not here to defend himself. I presume if he had been, the charge would not have been made. As for the Minister of Marine, he does not need any defence at my hands, and if he did, he could take care of himself. The hon. gentleman who spoke last seemed to indicate by his remarks that gentlemen who spoke on this side should enumerate every article that they were supposed to put in a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. I for one would not propose to do anything of the kind. It would be a childish thing to do, it was an entirely mistaken thing to ask for. But I would say that the present Government is pledged to a policy of commercial reciprocity with the United States as soon as it can be obtained. Their policy, Sir, is this, that if we want to make a bargain with a man, you do not show that your whole life depends upon it; you show that you are able to stand alone, that you are independent, and then if it is for your interest and to the interest of the opposite party, you can perhaps make a bargain. As soon as the United States are satisfied that we can stand alone, and not until that time, will they consent to make a Reciprocity Treaty with us. This is no new policy. The Government have carried out this policy. It is the policy enunciated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he spoke in Charlottetown in 1878. He said then that he would go in for no cringing to the Americans for a Reciprocity Treaty, that we should hold up our heads, and that if we adopted that course we would in the end obtain reciprocity. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) made use of similar language at Halifax, and stood up upon his dignity as a Canadian and declared that he would not bow to any American in order to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty. But there is a still higher authority and that is the leader of the late Government, the hon. member for East York (Mr. MacKenzie); and, in passing, I may say that it is instructive to read these debates, because they show what hon. gentlemen thought at that time, and, perhaps in their inmost minds, they are now in favor of the Government assuming a similar dignified position. I read these extracts from the debate of 1875:

"Mr. WALLAOE (Norfolk) asked, Whether during the Parliamentary recess it is the intention of the Government to renew negotiations for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?"

"Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE. We will always be glad to negotiate for a Reciprocity Treaty with any nation."

And with that the discussion closed. In 1878 we have the following:—

"Mr. BEOHARD enquire!, Whether a treaty of commercial reciprocity between the United States and Canada is at present in question between the Governments interested?"

"Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no such treaty at present in question between the Governments interested. The Government of the United States has made no proposition to us; but when the Government of the United States makes any such proposition, we will, of course, give it due consideration."

Hon. gentlemen there see the policy that the present Government has adopted, and I say that under the circumstances it is the only policy that could possibly be adopted. I do not go back upon the position taken by the Minister of Marine. I believe that this is the last desperate attempt of desperate men. I know that the last election was run in Nova Scotia upon a free trade issue, in Ontario on a protective issue and in Quebec upon the race and revenge issue; and having tried various policies and having failed, this is the last desperate attempt to formulate a policy which will to some extent satisfy the country. There is one element in this matter which I think hon. gentlemen do not seem

sufficiently to appreciate, and that is the great and growing patriotism and national sentiment that animates true Canadians from British Columbia to Nova Scotia. We know we have resources unsurpassed by any country in the globe, and we are not now going to admit that we are unworthy of that heritage, that we cannot support ourselves without the aid of any other nation. Our forefathers fought for responsible government, and this colony set an example to other colonies of England which they were not slow to follow. We have acquired the right to legislate for ourselves on all trade question. The proposition of the hon. gentleman is that we proclaim to the world, and to those other colonies which, in times past, have looked to us for guidance and for example, that self-government is a mistake, that it is far easier to hand over our fiscal affairs to a foreign country to deal with, and that it is far better to allow foreigners to govern our trade, to control and regulate our commercial progress as seems to them best, and then we can sit at our ease and enjoy the rest that will come to us from being relieved from grappling with those great questions. I do not believe there is any such craven feeling abroad in this country. I believe, on the contrary, that Canada is prepared to fight her commercial battles alone against the whole world; and I believe the last proposition we will endorse is one that involves a loss of commercial independence. Hon. gentlemen opposite will at least admit that we have enough to eat and a little to spare, and I verily believe that the people of Canada would rather enjoy that much, as a self-contained and self-governed people, than clothe themselves in purple and fine linen for which they have to pay the price of their manhood and commercial independence. I fear my imperfect remarks have added very little to this debate, but I trust I have made my position pretty clear, namely, that I am unalterably convinced that there is a higher and a nobler destiny for this country than a condition of commercial vassalage to the United States of America.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat discussed the National Policy and then dwelt upon the evil effects of having any commercial intercourse with our neighbors in the United States, and finally wound up by saying that they, the Conservative party, were in favor of commercial reciprocity, and when the States were ready they were prepared to enter upon it. I fail to see in what point the hon. gentleman differs from the proposition laid down in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We claim unrestricted reciprocity. True, the hon. gentleman has chosen to contend that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity were the same things, but in the course of this debate, and more particularly from remarks made in other debates, more particularly by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), the distinction has been pointed out, and at this late stage of the debate it is not necessary for me to enter into it. The Postmaster General said the results would be the same, because eventually there might be a similarity of tariffs. While commercial union would involve assimilation of tariffs or rather a union of tariffs, yet under unrestricted free trade we would have entire control of our own tariff. It is quite possible that, in the course of events, it might result in some condition such as the Postmaster General has pointed out, namely, a similarity of tariffs, but at the same time we would be independent in regard to tariffs; we would have a right to make our own tariff and frame it for the benefit of Canada. Under any arrangement for unrestricted reciprocity there would be no obligation to assimilate our tariff, either to lower or to raise it, but our position would simply be that of forming our tariff with a view to benefit this country. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) has stated that the last elections were run in Nova Scotia on free trade, in

Ontario on the protective issue and in Quebec on race and revenge. I beg to differ with him. My impression is, and I think I will be borne out by the facts, that the elections in Nova Scotia were run on railways, and in Ontario on the gerrymander, and by these means the Treasury benches are now occupied by the Conservative party, and the people never had fairly before them the question of reciprocity, protection or free trade. I did not intend to go into the question of the National Policy or to discuss it, it has been discussed at length in this House, but the hon. gentleman has referred to the position of New South Wales and Victoria. The hon. gentleman was forced to admit that the Protective Ministry in New South Wales had been defeated, he said by the small majority of four in the Legislature, but if he will look at the latest accounts, he will find that the majority is much larger. The following is a comparison of the wealth of the two countries: In the year ended March, 1886, there were in the Colony of Victoria 304,693 horses, 1,290,790 head of cattle, 10,681,837 sheep and 239,837 pigs. New South Wales in March, 1886, had 34,507,062 sheep, 1,270,078 of horned cattle, 329,933 horses and 208,927 pigs. This shows that in the possession of sheep, which is the principal source of wealth in those colonies, the Free Trade colony of New South Wales had four times the number of sheep that Victoria had. I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Dickey) alluded to the remarks that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made with regard to Sir Charles Tupper and the Tupper family, for I do not think that it should have entered into this discussion at all. I think my hon. friend will find that during those two years referred to, not only did Sir Charles Tupper draw his salary, but that the Auditor General's report will show that pretty large sums were expended in travelling and other expenses, so that the remarks made by the member for North Wellington were fully borne out by the Auditor General's Report and by other reports laid before this House. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) said that he deprecated this discussion now before the House, because by it we would prevent this country from getting a Reciprocity Treaty. Surely if hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in stating that reciprocity is going to be an injury to the country we would from their point of view be doing a benefit to the country, if this discussion would prevent us getting such a treaty. I hold that this discussion is of benefit to both sides of the line, for I believe the Americans are astute enough to study the position and to know that when the matter is fairly discussed and considered that it will be found that reciprocity is not for the interest of Canada alone, but for the interests of the United States as well; it will be mutually beneficial that this great wall of protection shall be thrown down between those two great countries, and that we should unite together and enjoy the benefits of free trade between Canada and the United States. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood)—whom I am sorry is not here to-night and I regret the cause which prevents him being here,—made very eloquent speeches upon what was commercial union, and upon this subject my hon. friend from Westmoreland was very eloquent and touching. When he made that speech, so eloquent in bringing forward those facts, it led me back to the first time when I heard the hon. gentleman. It was an occasion in which he addressed in equally eloquent tones a meeting held in honor of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) who was then visiting the county he represented. On that occasion, in 1881, the member for Westmoreland praised the policy of the member for West Durham and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as a great benefit to the country, and he deprecated the injury which we sustained by the National Policy which was then inaugurated. While he described himself then as a toboggan wavering on the top

of the slide he took a downward slide himself because he could not resist the temptation of the fertile plains below him—shall I call them the plains of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The plains through which a railway runs.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have felt the same difficulty that my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) did in not knowing exactly what is the line taken by members on the other side of the House in this discussion. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson), my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and the Postmaster General were directly opposed to reciprocity. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) followed in the same line; but my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) was more candid in his admissions, and I can see that he is an apt pupil of the gentleman he succeeded, and that he is willing to follow the footsteps of Sir Charles Tupper when that hon. gentleman on the question of reciprocity diverged from the line laid down by his colleagues. My hon. friend from Westmoreland endeavored to explain away the great increase in our export trade to the United States between 1854 and 1866 when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force by stating that this increase of trade was due to Civil War which raged in the United States during the last years of that treaty. My hon. friend, however, found that this reason could only apply between 1861 and 1866, and in order to support himself in his position he had to attribute the cause of this increased trade previous to 1861 to the Crimean War which ended in 1856. We have a right in discussing this question to consider the great increase in trade which followed that Reciprocity Treaty in 1854, and my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island, has shown the great bound which our trade made in the first years of that treaty. So far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned we must remember that when the National Policy was inaugurated it was stated throughout the length and breadth of those Provinces that the only means by which reciprocity could be obtained was by adopting the National Policy then put forward by the Government. This was reiterated on every platform throughout Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The people then really believed that this was the reason put forward by Sir Charles Tupper in support of the National Policy; that the policy which they were going to inaugurate would lead eventually to reciprocity. But this result failed, both because nothing flowed from it, and also because of the subsequent action of the Ministry. It is necessary that we in the Maritime Provinces should have the trade of the United States, because nature has placed us in that geographical position which places the markets of that country within our reach. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was candid enough to admit that if the American market were open to us we would receive advantage from it, but he also said there were other foreign markets within our reach. I would like my friends from the Maritime Provinces who support the Government to point out in what part of the globe we would find a market for the products of our forests and mines equal to that to be found in the country adjacent to us. A few years ago we had a gentleman sent from Halifax to the West Indies with the intention of opening up trade between that country and Canada. He went there, had a very pleasant trip at the expense of the country, and made a report, but not the slightest advance has been made and no benefit has been received by the country. The other day a gentleman from my own city was sent down to the Argentine Republic for the purpose of opening up trade there. Here we are sending men away thousands of miles to establish trade relations, and I suppose that the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Marine, to which two or three hon. members objected rather strongly, is due to the fact that that trade may increase to such an extent that certi-

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

ficated masters have to be appointed to supply the vessels engaged in it. But we have a coasting trade, and a more important trade with the United States. Look at the number of vessels from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick which are employed in carrying the produce of one country to the other. But while I find that we send large quantities of goods to the United States, our vessels often come back in ballast. Taking up a return for last July, I find that 130 trading schooners came into St. John during that month; they all went away to the United States with cargoes, but only 29 came back with cargoes, while 99 came back in ballast. If we had free trade with the United States, they would all have return cargoes, so that they would be able to carry our goods at lower rates than they do now, and give more profit to the producers. Now, I confine myself in my remarks to the Maritime Provinces, as the other Provinces have been referred to by other speakers who are more cognisant of their circumstances than I am. Now, the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry) who spoke on this question, represents a county which I knew very well in my boyhood days. We had then a very fair trade with England. I can recollect the time when the navigation laws were repealed, and the first ship carrying the American flag that ever floated in our waters sailed into our harbor, and it was said that there was an end of British shipping, and that all our carrying would be done by the Americans. I need not say what the result has been, that so far from that being the case, not only has Great Britain the carrying trade of the world, in which our ships have a large share, but we all know that the great carrying trade from New York is done by ships carrying the British flag; and to-day many of the ships carrying products from that port to the East hail from New Brunswick.

Mr. WELSH. Most of them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend says most of them. But we find that that trade has declined in consequence of our products being sent to the United States instead of to England. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry), the other day showed the amount of produce sent to the United States from the County of Kent, and I would ask the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) what effect unrestricted trade would have on his county. It is an agricultural county producing hay, horses, oats, and other grains, and containing valuable stone quarries; and I venture to say that all these productions have found a market in the United States, save a small quantity that has been sent to the Upper Provinces; and my hon. friend is himself engaged in that very carrying trade from the County of Westmoreland to the United States. Go up and down the Bay of Fundy, and ask where all the vessels sailing there are going to, and you will find that in spite of the heavy duties imposed by the United States, they are carrying products seeking a market in the United States. When I was a boy on the north shore smelts were only caught as a pastime by boys; but to-day, many tons of smelts are caught every winter and sent to the United States, the only market that will receive them, and the fishing of smelts has become a fruitful source of revenue during the winter season to people living in the Counties of Northumberland and Kent. The same is the case with the root crops of our Province, and the valuable quarries in the Counties of Albert and Westmoreland. The great market, in which the demand is growing greater every day and would be quadrupled, I was going to say increased in volume ten times, had we unrestricted reciprocity, is to be found in the United States. Now, the great cry is that the manufacturers will be injured by reciprocity. But, I think, if you went to New Brunswick, you would find that Mr. Gibson, who, as an individual cotton manufacturer owns probably the largest mill on the continent, will tell you that he would be perfectly

willing to have the American market opened to-morrow; and if you go to the border line of the State of Maine, you will find that the manufacturers there are ready at any moment to enter into competition with the United States. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have great advantages over the State of Maine, in being more fertile and possessing mines and minerals, which are absent from the State of Maine. The only fertile portion of the State of Maine is the valley of the Aroostook, adjoining New Brunswick, which was taken away from us by the Ashburton Treaty, but the rest of Maine is sterile. Notwithstanding that, we find that the State of Maine has more looms and spindles than the whole of Canada—why? Because they have a large market; and not only that, but the States of New Hampshire and Maine have more looms and spindles to-day than New York and Pennsylvania put together. With the natural advantages we possess in the Maritime Provinces, with our great water powers far in excess of hers, and with our advantages of climate, I believe we could enter fairly into competition with any of the manufacturers in the United States. We would then be able to keep our people. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) seems to think that the people are not going away from the country; but I venture to say that you cannot go into any portion of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, where you would not find in every cottage or farmhouse at least one vacant chair, left by someone who has gone to the United States. The Postmaster General said that by the census of 1880 only 7,500 people went to the United States from Prince Edward Island. That may be true; but remember that was at the time the National Policy was inaugurated. I would like to see the returns of 1889. Anyone who will go to the international steamboats leaving the wharf of St. John, will find there morning after morning the stalwart men and women, the pride of the country, with their luggage, seeking to go to the United States.

Mr. HESSON. Why do they go?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Because of the taxation caused by the National Policy. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) undertook to make a comparison between Massachusetts and Canada. He said that while Massachusetts had something like 1,700,000 people in her borders, about the same number of her sons were to be found in other States. That is true. Massachusetts is one of the oldest colonies in the Union. She was settled years before either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick were even thought of. But there is this difference between the exodus from Massachusetts and that from Canada, that in the case of Massachusetts, her sons and daughters remained under their own flag and did not seek a home on foreign soil, as the sons and daughters of Canada have done. My hon. friend spoke of the great output of coal from Nova Scotia and the large increase in its consumption. I would have been much more pleased if he had given us the quantity of coal from the Springhill mine as compared with that from other mines, because with regard to the Springhill mines we have been paying a very heavy tax on coal. We are paying a duty of 60 cents a ton, and probably the extra price caused by some combine to raise the prices, and lastly the people are paying taxes to have the coal drawn over the intercolonial at the expense of the public for the benefit of the producers. The coal taken from the Springhill mine is a very large proportion of that raised in Nova Scotia, and the quantity taken from that mine which is fostered and pampered at the expense of the public and carried on at an enormous loss, show what has to be paid for out of the public exchequer. In addition my hon. friend says it shows the country has increased. But look at the miles of railway which have been established throughout the country since then. We all know that within the last few years all the railways have

become coal consumers and that wood has ceased to be a locomotive fuel, and the increase in the quantity of railway mileage and in the quantity of coal consumed by railways would quite account for the increase of coal which my hon. friend has put forward as an instance of the great development of the country. The objections made to this resolution are, first, that it is a weakening of the tie of the mother country, and that it will produce annexation. So far as I can judge by the past, so far as leading to annexation is concerned, any desire of that kind dies out according as our prosperity increases, and it is only when we are in penury, when our business is depressed, and we are hampered by high taxation and dear living, that the craving for some relief turns people's minds towards the United States. So far as I know, I believe that sentiment has not prevailed to any great extent. The more we prosper commercially the more markets are open to us, the less that feeling prevails. New Brunswick is peopled by the descendants of the men who left Massachusetts and New York, rather than live under an alien flag, and who still retain to a large extent the feelings of their forefathers, but they feel that in endeavoring to have increased intercourse with our neighbors, and to cultivate the kindly spirit that ought to exist between us in our social and commercial life, while it increased our prosperity would strengthen our connection with the other country. Mr. Wiman, in one of his addresses, shows that Canadian loyalty is a barrier to annexation. He said:

"Those who are most acquainted, however, with the public sentiment in Canada know that loyalty to British institutions permeates the whole country, and that with mother's milk has been drunk in the love for the mother land; love for the good Queen who has ruled them so wisely for half a century, and pride in all the glory of British connection; belief in British prowess, and faith in the integrity of the British Empire. Americans, who have shown their love of country by the vast sacrifices they have made to preserve its integrity, will not quarrel with this devotion of their Canadian neighbors, because they love their own land and the great nation on the other side of the sea that gave their ancestors birth. The sturdy loyalty of Canadians, to-day, never endured the severe strain that was put upon the loyalty of the colonies a hundred years ago, and the resistance to which resulted in the independence and creation of the great constellations of commonwealths that now rule so large a portion of the continent. The results of that resistance to British rule have not been confined to the United States. They have indeed been world-wide in their effects; but to no country in the world have the results been more beneficial than to Canada. The difference in the mode of government of Canada by the British authorities now, as compared with the mode of government attempted in the colonies previous to the American revolution, is the difference between despotism and freedom—the difference between the dawn of an imperfect civilisation and the full sunlight of the glorious present. Had the same liberality prevailed in the latter part of the last century in the treatment of her colonies by Great Britain as has prevailed in the latter half of this century, there could have been no American revolution; there could have been no cause for separation and the great experiment of republican institutions, on the vast scale, now being worked out, would never have been undertaken, because it would never have been justified. Canada has, however, profited by these stupendous events, which for a hundred years have been occurring on her border, and in no respect greater than that, while she has maintained the British connection, she has enjoyed all the privileges of self-government. Thus, to-day, except in the mere treaty-making power, she is just as free and just as self-reliant as if she were entirely independent. The relations which exist between England and the Dominion imply no interference whatever with local government; not even with the tariff which taxes the products of Great Britain, as you have seen, with the same rigor that applies to the products of all other countries. Not a dollar of contribution is asked from the colony to the Exchequer of England, while not a dollar of money of the British government is asked for by the Canadian authorities. About the only tie that is visible between the mother and daughter now is, that the mother selects, every now and again, some distinguished member of the British aristocracy, who, as a guest, she coolly asks Canada to entertain for a few years as a representative of royalty in the person of the Governor General. A few years ago the selection was made from the Queen's own household, and for a time the Marquis of Lorne and his charming wife, Princess Louise, held a mimic court at Ottawa. More recently the able and accomplished Lord Lansdowne, with his good lady, have dispensed the hospitalities of Rideau Hall, at Ottawa, the Vice-Royal residence, and won all hearts by their cordiality and unaffected courtesy. It is now only by such ties as these that a connection is visible between Great Britain and her great colony on this side of the sea, implying an interference so slight as to be in startling contrast with the exactions, annoyances, and petty tyrannies exercised by Great Britain with her North American colonies prior to the American Revolution. It is true that Canada is the gainer of the heritage of self-government, as the

result of the struggle for independence which the United States endured; while her loyalty has been cultured and made perpetual by the liberality of the treatment she has received at the hands of the mother country."

That is put forward to the Americans by Mr. Wiman who advocates commercial union, a step beyond what is proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) spoke of the city of St. John, and his statements were contradicted by the hon. the Minister of Finance. I think, if the hon. the Minister of Finance would go to St. John and through the country in that neighborhood, and see what the price of real estate as compared with what it was a few years ago, he would find that the best test of the condition of the Province. If it had not been for the position in which we were placed by the Ashburton Treaty, if it had not been that lumber was sawn by Americans in the harbor of St. John and shipped to the United States, we would have been in a very sad state indeed, but now nearly all the mills in the city of St. John are sawing American lumber under American owners, and that is shipped to the United States, and that has done something to keep us up. By our ships being employed and being a source of revenue, instead of a source of loss, as they were a few years ago, and by the increase in the price of lumber, a better feeling is now prevailing than has been for three years past, when we were in a very depressed state in St. John. The suspension of that great cotton factory, which cost \$235,000, and was sold for \$75,000, and of other factories caused a great depression in that city. Our shipyards were idle, as they were throughout the whole Province of New Brunswick, and I believe that now only one solitary ship is being built in the Province. The Postmaster General referred to the Zollverein, and said that the result of the adoption of this resolution would be political union. The only Zollverein I am aware of was the German Zollverein, and that existed for half a century before the German Empire was consolidated, and that consolidation took place, not in consequence of the Zollverein, but, as has been stated, by the clash of swords and the clang of arms. It was by the power of the King of Prussia that Germany was brought under his control, and he became the German Emperor. It was altogether independent of the Zollverein which existed for half a century without any attempt being made to alter the political status. At this late hour, I will not detain the House. In our portion of the Dominion, this is a burning question, a question of vital importance, and every day, as the intercourse between the two countries increases, we find that the feelings of harshness which may have existed have been softened by time, and that there is now a friendly feeling between these countries. Certainly no citizen of St. John ought to hesitate to bear his testimony to that, because, in our hour of distress and trouble, when everything was swept away from us by that great conflagration, the first people who came to our relief were American citizens. The cities of Boston and New York came to our assistance at once, while, though that great emporium, as I think it is called, the city of Montreal, voted some money, they never sent it to us. I believe the Americans are willing to meet us in a friendly spirit. I have been a great deal in the United States, and have met that people socially and commercially, and I believe their feelings are every day growing warmer and warmer towards the people of this country. They feel that we are of one race and of one blood, and I believe, if the Government of the day, instead of allowing that fishery matter to delay day after day, instead of, when they were called upon by Lord Derby in 1833 to make arrangements for a treaty, letting it hang until they were forced to send Sir Charles Tupper to Washington and to make a treaty on the eve of a presidential election, if they had taken earlier measures, we would have had now a treaty in force which would have avoided the irritation which now exists, in consequence of the Government, by little petty

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

measures, destroying those kindly feelings which exist in the people of the United States. I know of a case which took place the other day. The owner of a trading vessel, whose vessel has been trading for years between New York and St. John and had been allowed to go into harbors of refuge without any petty restrictions, found the other day that the fishermen laid an information that his vessel was in a certain harbor, and the result was that the vessel was fined \$1,500, and I believe that, unless he can get relief from the bonds he has given, he will have to abandon the vessel altogether. We on both sides of the boundary line are of the same blood and speak the same language, and we came from the same motherland. The men who fought the battles in olden times, the great battles of the commonwealth, the battles of Marston Moor and Naseby, were the ancestors of those who fought before Richmond and Gettysburg. They are engaged in the same object that we are in creating a new civilisation on this great continent, and it ill-becomes us, with the same faith, with the same ties, and endeavoring in the same way to extend progress and freedom throughout this continent, to shut ourselves within ourselves, each holding itself in selfish isolation. Instead of that, let us throw down the barriers between us, and unite in carrying out what I believe to be the destiny of these two great countries, and in spreading civilisation and freedom, not under the same flag but with the flag of the Republic and the flag of the mother country floating over the same continent.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question; call in the members.

Mr. HESSON. If the House is ready for a division, I do not desire to delay it. If it is distinctly understood that this terminates the debate, I am willing to take my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. WATSON. I had the floor before the members were called in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the hon. member behind me Mr. Hesson arose, and the sense of the House apparently was that we should close the debate. He said that if it was so, he would re-ume his seat, and the House cheered him, and it was so understood. I think that under the circumstances the hon. gentleman should not now try to speak, especially after the Speaker had given orders to call in the members. If, on the contrary, the House permits the debate to go on, of course my hon. friend behind me has the floor.

Mr. WATSON. I do not wish at all to transgress any rule or to offend the House, but I must say that I am entirely opposed to the system apparently adopted by which the leaders of both sides agree that the debate shall close at a certain time. I acknowledge that my hon. friend opposite has the floor, if the debate is allowed to go on. I had intended to speak on this question last year, but a similar arrangement was entered into by some members of this House, and I remained silent. On this occasion I should like to address the House for a few moments on this question, coming, as I do, from a Province whose people are largely interested in trading with the United States; and if the House would permit me, I would like to speak.

Mr. DAVIN. As a question of privilege has been raised, I would like to say a word upon it. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) states that he would like to address the House. Now, Sir, although some members of the Government and some members supporting, and some members opposed to the Government, may wish to close the debate, if any member of this House thinks that he has something to say that it would be well for the House to hear, and that he should say in the interests of his constituents, I say it is a very improper thing to try to close the

debate. Let me say on this question of privilege that I think it is a system utterly unknown to the British Parliament for the leaders on both sides to arrange with the whips to speak to the Speaker and arrange who shall speak or shall not speak. I say there is scarcely anything that could be conceived that would strike such a blow at the independence of Parliament as that—strike a fatal blow at free discussion, strike a fatal blow at the dignity of the Speaker, because if the Speaker puts his speakership in commission, becomes a speaker *faintant*, whereas the leaders on both sides would be *maitres du palais*, and then what would become of the independence of this House? I agree with my hon. friends of the party to which I belong, that we are face to face with a great crisis in this country. According to them—and I agree with them—whether by design or by accident, members on the Opposition side of the House take a tone that is calculated to play into the hands of those who would land this country in annexation to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. DAVIN. Did I not guard the statement properly so that it would not be offensive to you? I said, according to them, it is of the greatest possible importance, because we are face to face with a great crisis, and it would be a perfectly monstrous thing that free discussion should be shut off on such an occasion. As the question has been raised by the hon. member for Marquette, I wish to stigmatise this arrangement as it should be stigmatised.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Fisher,	Mulock,
Beausoleil,	Flynn,	Neveu,
Bécharé,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Borden,	Godbout,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Préfontaine,
Bowman,	Hale,	Purcell,
Brien,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Innes,	Robertson,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Scrivier,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Semple,
Charlton,	Langelier (Montm'ency),	Somerville,
Choquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Ohoninard,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cook,	Lister,	Turcot,
Oouture,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Desaint,	McIntyre,	Welsh,
Doyon,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin), and
Edgar,	McMullen,	Yeo.—77.
Edwards,	Meigs,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Foster,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Freeman,	Moncrieff,
Bell,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Boisvert,	Grandbois,	Perley,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Porter,
Boyle,	Haggart,	Prior,
Brown,	Hall,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Cameron,	Hudspeth,	Boome,
Cargill,	Ives,	Ross,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Joncas,	Scarth,

28 1/2

Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Chisholm,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Oimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Oochrane,	Labelle,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Labrosse,	Sproule,
Colby,	Landry,	Stevenson,
Corby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Costigan,	LaRivière,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Lépine,	Thompson (Sir John),
Coulombe,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Curran,	Macdowall,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McCarthy,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McGulla,	Wallace,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Ward,
Davis,	McDougald (Pistou),	Weldon (Albert),
Dawson,	McDougall (O. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Denison,	McGreevy,	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dewdney,	McNeill,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickey,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	Mara,	Wood (Westm'd), and
Dupont,	Marshall,	Wright.—121.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. AMYOT. I voted through error, and I wish to have my name erased. When I heard that Gen. Laurie, the member for Shelburne, had met with a serious accident and that he could not find a pair, I said I would pair with him, but I was not told that the pair had been accepted.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mrs. Delaney, wife of the Indian agent killed at Frog Lake..... \$400

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received from the Governor General's secretary a message stating that the Hon. Mr. Justice Strong, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber tomorrow afternoon at three o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to the Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present Session.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:35 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER CRUISER.

Mr. COOK asked, Is the Government aware that the Government steamer *Cruiser* on the lakes carried last season an engineer who was an American citizen while so engaged, and that the said engineer carried an American certificate instead of a Canadian certificate?

Mr. TUPPER. During the voyage of the *Cruiser* on her way to Sturgeon Bay, the regular engineer of the ship was taken suddenly ill, and, without reference to the department, the captain of the *Cruiser* engaged an engineer, who had an American certificate, temporarily, while the regular engi-

neer was ill. It was supposed the engineer would be back to his ship in a few days. The engineer so employed was altogether employed two months, and is not now in the employ of the Government.

#### COLLECTOR AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) asked, 1st. Whether the Government is aware that the collector for the port of Three Rivers has levied, or attempted to levy, duties on catalogues distributed gratuitously by the booksellers of London and of Paris? 2nd. Whether, in so doing, the said collector is acting under orders from the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Customs, I would say that the Government is not aware that the collector at Three Rivers has levied, or attempted to levy, duties on catalogues, but if he has, he would only be carrying out the law. There are no orders given to the collector on the subject.

#### POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) asked, 1st. Whether the Government is aware that the postmaster at Three Rivers exacts, or insists on exacting, postage on newspapers and reviews addressed to persons who return them because they refuse to receive them? 2nd. Whether it is by order of the Government that the said postmaster so acts?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government is informed that the postmaster at Three Rivers does not exact, or insist on exacting, postage on newspapers and reviews addressed to persons who return them because they refuse to receive them. The postmaster at Three Rivers has received no special instructions, but acts in accordance with the regulations in force throughout the Dominion.

#### FISH PROPAGATION, N. W. T.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is taking steps to have the lakes and rivers of the North-West Territories stocked with varieties of fish not now found in those waters, but which from analogy, and according to the opinion of competent persons, would thrive there?

Mr. TUPPER. The department has made enquiry, and received reports upon this subject of stocking the rivers and lakes in the North-West Territories with varieties of fish not found there, and at present the question of transportation is engaging the attention of the department.

#### JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the notices of motion are called, I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the subject of giving up a day to the discussion of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and, if so, what day he is prepared to suggest to the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In consequence of an informal communication from my hon. friend opposite, I spoke to my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who says he is going to move on that subject, and, with his assent and concurrence, and after discussing the matter with other hon. friends, it is proposed to bring on Supply early on Tuesday next, so as to give my hon. friend the opportunity of moving in the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear the statement made by the hon. gentleman. It is, then, understood that the question will come up on Tuesday?

Mr. TUPPER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The opportunity will be given on Tuesday for the hon. member to move in the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the papers be printed by that time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are being printed now.

#### SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to make a statement to the House in reference to an important matter, and, as it may take more time than I should properly occupy in a mere statement, to put myself in order, I would move that the House adjourn. My object is to bring to the notice of the House the facts connected with a very important measure which is likely to engage their attention with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In 1835 the Government supplemented the previous grant for the construction of a line of railway from Sherbrooke to St. John, *vid* Mattawamkeag, and from Mattawamkeag to Harvey and Fredericton, and Salisbury, connecting with the Intercolonial Railway line to Halifax. The subsidy was \$250,000 for 20 years. On that occasion it was understood that the Government would take every proper means and every security in order to secure the construction of that line to Salisbury, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works, speaking on that subject in reference to a motion made by the member for Guysborough, used this language:

"I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the Government makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, and to take advantage of this vote of money, of \$250 000 during 20 years, the Government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith; the faith of Parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as Parliament wishes."

In the Session of 1887 (his question was also before the House, and on that occasion, when a vote was submitted to the House, I took occasion to make an enquiry of the Minister of Finance of that day. I read from the *Hansard*:

"Mr. JONES. I see there is an item here for the Short Line Railway; and while we are on that subject I would like to ask the Minister of Railways to give us some information with reference to the Short-Line Railway which is now going on to the cities of St. John and Halifax, and which, it was expected, would shorten very much the distance from Montreal to those cities. There is a good deal of anxiety at present, on account of reports that they were about connecting with the Maine Central Line, instead of proceeding with the work as originally contemplated to Fredericton, Salisbury and Moncton; and if that is the case, it would appear from the information which reaches us indirectly, that while the road would have an advantage in connecting with the American line, the distance to be gained by the connection with St. John would not be anything like what was originally contemplated. I have heard it stated by a person who pretends to be well informed, that the line has been deflected so much, owing to the lack of accuracy in the original survey, that the distance to Halifax will not be shortened fifty miles. I should like to have some information from the Minister of Railways on that point, because the expenditure can only be justified on the ground that it would shorten the distance to Halifax and St. John by over 200 miles; and if, as is said to be the case—I speak from personal knowledge—it will not shorten it more than to the extent I

B

have named, I think the intention of Parliament will not be carried out. If the hon. gentleman is in a position to give any information on this subject, I know it would be very acceptable just now, when the question is being discussed a good deal in the Lower Provinces.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that that work is in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with whom a contract has been made, and that contract is on the line originally agreed upon by Parliament, to carry the road to Mattawamkeag, and from Mattawamkeag, the company, as I understand, have made arrangements with the Maine Central Railway and the New Brunswick Railway to go on to St. John. That was always the intention. The road is therefore being constructed precisely on the line and in the terms of the contract approved by Parliament, and the work is going on vigorously; and I am informed by the company that the line will be completed by the end of this year. The other portion of the contract requires the line to go from Harvey to Fredericton and from Fredericton to Moncton, for the Halifax connection, and that the company are also bound under their contract to construct on the line originally laid down by Parliament.

"Mr. JONES. If my information is correct, they are constructing the branch from Mattawamkeag to the central railway, and no progress is being made on the other branch. I am aware that it is said to be under the charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it appears to me the Government should exercise supervision over those roads when public money is expended on them.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, the contract is with them.

"Mr. JONES. I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House whether progress is also being made on the line from Harvey to Fredericton. I am informed that it is not.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that they are concentrating their attention on the main work first, and that they will then take up the other; but they are bound by the contract to take up the other and prosecute it vigorously, and complete it within a certain time."

That discussion took place in this House. In 1887, Sir Charles Tupper stated at a public meeting in Halifax, in reference to the same undertaking:

"When I stated last night that the last act I did before leaving London was to sign, as joint trustee with Lord Revelstoke and Lord Wolverton, the bonds for the construction of this line of railway (the Short Line) by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that it is now in their hands; when I told him (Mr. Jones) that, he felt that it was a death-knell ringing in his ears."

And at a meeting the following night he repeats himself in these words:

"I have already told you that this gigantic Pacific Railway Company, with between 4,000 and 5,000 miles of constructed railway now in operation, with an army of 25,000 men in their employ, and expending money to an extent that is calculated to sustain and develop a country of itself, if we had to rest upon it almost alone. When that company have declared by the most solemn, important and business-like act that it is possible for them to do—by putting their hand and seal to a contract binding them to build not only the short line of railway that comes to St. John, but also the short line of railway that passes St. John by coming from Fredericton to Moncton, because that is in the bond, and that is the work with which they are immediately to grapple."

In connection with this statement of the late hon. the Minister of Finance, I think it is extremely desirable that the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be laid upon the Table of the House before the Bill to which I have referred is proceeded with.

Sir JOHN A. MADONALD. My hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), made a motion the other day, which was carried, that all the papers connected with the Short Line should be brought down. They will

be brought down; I do not really know why they are not brought down already, but they will be brought down at once.

Mr. LAURIER. In view of the fact that the Bill, concerning which my hon. friend wants this particular information, may come up at any moment, it is important that these papers should be brought down, not only at an early moment, but now, in the same manner that the hon. gentleman brought down, yesterday, papers connected with another question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, the papers ought to be brought down at once.

Mr. LAURIER. What my hon. friend wants is that bond concerning the sale of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will bring down all the papers, all the bonds that we have got.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will this be brought down before the Bill is proceeded with?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill is now in the Railway Committee, and before we proceed with it, in this House, I will see that the papers are brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was there such a contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say until I see the papers. I have not looked at the paper yet.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Sir Charles Tupper says that there is.

Motion withdrawn.

#### DISMISSAL OF CAPTAIN R. CAMPBELL.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return of all correspondence between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa, and A. Lord, Esq., agent, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, or any other person, having reference to the dismissal of Capt. Ronald Campbell, harbor master for Summerside. Also copy of all complaints made against the said Capt. Ronald Campbell, showing by whom made, with a copy of evidence touching said dismissal."

He said: I wish to give the reasons for making this motion, Mr. Campbell was appointed in 1874, and he was dismissed in 1887. During all the time that he served I am not aware that he neglected his duty as harbor master for Summerside, and I do not know any reason why he was abruptly dismissed in 1887. I suppose some complaints have been made; but I do not believe any complaints were made that he had neglected his duty. I am afraid that he was discharged because he was accused of having voted for the Liberal candidates in 1887. Well, complaints were made, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ordered Mr. Lord, the Marine Agent in Charlottetown, to hold an investigation, and a day was appointed for that purpose. It is hard to believe that Mr. Campbell was never invited to go to that court, he was never subpoenaed to go to that court, but it was held all the same. Well, the parties who made the complaint took a person well known about the police court, a person well known in the jail, and they called



him forward, and without inviting Mr. Campbell to be present, they got this man to swear that Mr. Campbell, on election day, gave him a dollar to vote for the Liberal candidates. But Mr. Campbell has sworn that he does not know this person, that he has never given him, or anybody else, one dollar to get him to vote for any man. I do not know myself, Mr. Speaker, whether Mr. Campbell voted for the Liberal or the Government candidates. I do not know his politics. I never saw him attending any meeting, I never heard him speak at any meeting, and I never knew that he canvassed in any election. I am at a loss to understand why he was dismissed so abruptly without having an opportunity of coming forward before the court and defending himself. I suppose a report has been made; I think I ought to have the privilege of inspecting that report, but I suppose I will not get it. It is nearly seven weeks since I asked for the return of a report on the Lobster Fisheries from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I have not got it yet.

Mr. TUPPER. It is on the Table.

Mr. PERRY. Well, Mr. Speaker, they came in good time. Where were they all this time?

Mr. TUPPER. On the Table, for some days—two or three days ago.

Mr. PERRY. They were not here last night.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. TUPPER. They were on the Table.

Mr. PERRY. I do not know that. I went to the department and asked if the returns were there, and the hon. gentleman's subordinates said they were not. Now let him settle that question between himself and his subordinates. He is not going to run that down my throat, positively that these papers were on the Table for several days. They were not on the Table last night. The witness upon whose testimony the department dismissed that gentleman, has been guilty of telling a lie, and Mr. Campbell's enemies have got him dismissed because he was wise enough to vote for the Liberal candidates. Sir, I want to know if that is British justice and fair play. I do not blame my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the present incumbent in that department, but I blame the Minister of Marine who was then in that department, now the Minister of Finance. If it is British fair play to condemn a man without giving him a hearing, I think it is a queer interpretation of British fair play. I am anxious to find out the reason, the grounds for Mr. Campbell's dismissal; I want to know whether he was charged with neglecting his duty. Sir, I am sure that my hon. friend in that department will not stand up here now and say that Mr. Campbell has been guilty of mismanaging his department. Mr. Campbell is a man of good standing in Summerside. He is a man who is not dependent upon the office, he can live independent of the Government. He has a good reputation, he is a good citizen, he is a man well off, he is a credit to Summerside,

Mr. PERRY.

and a credit to the country that gave him his birth, and that has given him a living independent of all a harassing Government can give him. Sir, I have reason to complain of those gentlemen, Mr. Lefurgey and Mr. Hackett—if they did make the complaints, I do not know that they did—but I believe that when they found themselves defeated at the polls and found that Mr. Campbell had voted against them, they wished to have revenge upon him. Without going into the merits of the case I may state that the acting Minister of Marine, without any proper investigation being made and without giving this gentleman an opportunity of vindicating his conduct before a court of enquiry, dismissed him. And for what? Was it because he voted for me and my colleague? There was no other cause. He has not been charged with having neglected his duties, with having neglected the care of the buoys or with having done any wrong act. I contend he has not done anything for which he should be dismissed, and I exceedingly regret that the department should have been led away by the *ipse dixit* of the defeated candidates. The same thing is occurring now at other points. Similar occurrences are taking place in the Post Office Department. An application was made by 150 respectable citizens for a post office at a certain point in the county, and their representations were backed up by the two representatives of the county, but one of the defeated candidates at the late elections merely wrote to the Post Office Department to say that the post office was not wanted, and the people had to do without it. Is that the state of things what we have to expect? Is everybody to be a slave to the present Government in order to obtain justice in this country? If so, it is a very sad state of affairs. I charge the Department of Marine with having dismissed this officer, not for neglect of duty, but because he voted for us, and further, that the officer has been dismissed without having an opportunity to appear in court to defend himself. I hope and trust we will hear no more of the dismissal of officers because they are Liberals. I do not know whether anyone disclosed the fact as to how this officer voted, but it appears that hon. gentlemen opposite have to revenge themselves on some one, and that is the explanation of his dismissal; but the more they do that, the worse it will be for themselves, and the more the eyes of the people will be upon them, and they will fail to obtain the goodwill of the people by such a vindictive act.

Mr. TUPPER. In the first place, let me set myself right with the hon. gentleman in regard to the delay in bringing down the returns and papers asked by this House. I think I made a mistake a few moments ago, and it is only right I should correct the mistake at once. I had reference to a return which was moved for in regard to bounty claims filed from Prince Edward Island. There have been three returns moved for lately for papers from my department, and two of those are already on the Table, and the return to which I now think the hon. gentleman had reference was the one relating to lobster fishing, which is not yet on the Table of the House. This is, however, through no fault of anyone, and it will be brought down in a few days, but it requires certain care in preparation and the collection of

information that is not immediately at hand. With regard to the particular charge which the hon. gentleman makes against the department in relation to the dismissal of the harbor master in 1887, I think if he had confined his remarks to the first division, which he seems to have made in his argument, it would have been better, and then when the papers were brought down he could have adduced the second branch of his argument; and if he had adopted this course I think he would, when the papers were brought down, have refrained from making the statements he has made across the floor of the House. The first branch of his argument went this far, that he did not know why the officer was dismissed, and his ignorance of the reason was obvious in the latter branch of his argument, when he stated, for instance, that the officer was dismissed without any enquiry or investigation being made, without any opportunity being given to the officer to be present and heard in his own behalf, and simply because he voted for the hon. gentleman, the Liberal candidate, at the elections held in that year. It is not satisfactory to the House to discuss very fully this matter at the present time, as the information relating to it is solely in the possession of the department, and, in consequence, I can only meet the statement made by mentioning that when the papers are brought down, the hon. gentleman will find that specific charges were made against the harbor master, not for voting, as he had a perfect right to do, for the Liberal candidates at that election, but because he not only voted for those candidates while in the employ and service of the Government, but he canvassed actively against the candidates supporting the Government; he abused the Government of the day in the most violent language; he offered bribes to a voter to vote for the Liberal candidates; and not only offered a bribe but was busy in driving voters to the polls who voted for the Liberal candidate. Those were the charges, and they were investigated by the agent of the department, a gentleman not in political sympathy with the Government of the day, but that does not matter. The evidence was taken, and that evidence will be laid before the House, and so far from the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that this man had not an opportunity to be heard, I may say that he received notice of the time and place of the investigation, that he attended that investigation and cross-examined the witnesses. The report of the agent on which the officer was dismissed, together with the evidence containing the points to which I have alluded, will be brought down as soon as possible, and I am sure it will be pleasant to the hon. gentleman to know that the action was not based upon the one statement he supposes it to have been based upon, viz., that this officer simply exercised his right under the franchise.

Mr. YEO. I think the hon. Minister, in the statement he has made to the House, is a good deal astray. If I remember aright the hon. gentleman was not in charge of the department at the time in question and had no personal knowledge of the matter; at all events, under the circum-

stances it is not much use to discuss the subject until the papers are laid on the Table of the House. Mr. Campbell, however, never took an active part in the election, to my knowledge, and those who are best acquainted with him and with his doings at the election will be able to say that he may have voted, but if so, no one knew how he voted, and as to the charge that he bribed anyone or drove anyone to the polls, or canvassed for the Liberal candidate, or took any action against the Government, that cannot be proved. I think there was one gentleman who came forward and stated that he had been offered money by Mr. Campbell, but Mr. Campbell swore that he never saw him and never knew that there was such a man, and in fact I understand that Campbell was not notified, but happened to come into the court towards its close. Mr. Lord is a strong party man; there can be no stronger party man; he was appointed by the present Government, and he did all he could in that way, and Mr. Campbell was told, at the close of the court, that he would be given a chance for investigation. The present Finance Minister dismissed him in a very summary way without giving him any chance to clear himself. When the papers come down we shall be able to go more fully into the whole subject.

Motion agreed to.

#### FISHING IN THE COUNTIES OF BERTHIER, MASKINONGE, ETC.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (translation) moved for :

1st. Copies of any order or regulation adopted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, with a view to regulate fishing and to put in force a system of licensing and taxing of fishing apparatus, in the counties of Berthier, Maskinongé, St. Maurice, Richelieu, Yamaska and Nicolet, during the two years ending 31st December, 1888;

2nd. Copies of all instructions forwarded, during the period aforesaid to the Fishery officers having jurisdiction in the said counties, respecting the enforcement, suspension, modification and re-enactment of the said regulation;

3rd. Copies of all reports and information furnished by the Fishery officers to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in relation to the enforcement of the said regulation;

4th. A list of all the fishermen of each of the said counties, as furnished by the Fishery officers, showing those who took out the license so required, the amount paid by each of them, the total amount received as the product of the said licenses from the date of the enforcement of the said regulation up to the 31st December, 1888; and also those who did not take out the license so required, and whose fishing gear was confiscated or not, as the case may be;

5th. Copies of all letters, petitions and correspondence addressed to the Government, or any of its members, asking for the repeal of the said regulation and the abolition of the said license, of all answers made thereto, and of all other documents relating to the matter.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year, about the close of the Session, I had the honor of drawing the attention of the House and of the Government to certain petitions which had been presented by the fishermen of the counties bordering on Lake St. Peter, to wit, the counties of Berthier, Maskinongé, Saint Maurice, Yamaska and Richelieu, com-

plaining of the imposition of a tax on fishing tackle. I received on that occasion, the support of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle), who joined his prayers with mine when asking the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to abolish this tax, which was useless to the Government and oppressive to the fishermen. The hon. the leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) at that time expressed himself in the following terms, in answer to the request which I made:—

"The Government have received several petitions from fishermen who are stated to be very poor and unable to pay the tax imposed. The Government have studied the question, but before coming to a definite decision, we must devote our time to the business of the Session. So soon as we have leisure, the day after prorogation, we will study the question. We shall endeavor as far as possible to satisfy the representations which have been made to us on the subject of the fishermen."

At this juncture I, myself, as well as the other members from the counties interested, received the impression that the Government were going to study the question and render justice to the fishermen. Unfortunately, they did not do so, and instead of being able to communicate the decision arrived at by the Government to those who were interested, the only news which we received was the redoubling of activity on the part of the employés of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and a system of terror established around Lake St. Peter, in the very midst of the fishermen who had reason for expecting, after the declarations made by the hon. the First Minister, that their request would be granted. This tax, it will be urged, is not a very great one. It consists of \$1 on each scoop net, 5 cents per fathom on drag nets, 3 cents per fathom on stake nets, and 25 cents per hundred hooks employed on the night lines. These figures, taken alone, do, in fact, represent but a small amount, but when these small amounts are levied on a population poor and unable to pay them, such a net may have serious consequences. The fishermen seeing themselves prosecuted by the Government, threatened with fines and the forfeiture of their fishing tackle—for the instructions issued by the department left no option to the agents; the instructions being to seize the fishing gear of all persons who might be found fishing without a license addressed themselves, again, to the department and to the Government, and during the month of December last I had the honor of forwarding to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a petition from the fishermen of my county, setting forth that they were unable to pay the tax, so that if they were compelled to pay it they would be obliged to leave their property, their homes and their country. Mr. Speaker, instead of making an enquiry, instead of sending officials for making certain whether these fishermen were really unable to pay for these licenses and at the same time provide subsistence for their families, the hon. Minister answered me in terms which I cannot characterize otherwise than as being cruel. In order that the House may have thorough knowledge of the

Mr. BRAUSOLEIL,

subject, I shall read the answer which the hon. Minister sent me in return for the petition which I had the honor of forwarding to him. Here it is:

"DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, Ottawa, 14th January, 1889.

"SIR,—I have the honor of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, respecting the system of issuing fishing licenses in the County of Berthier"

"You are doubtless aware that my predecessor, Mr. Foster, gave very great attention to this question. It appears, from your representations as well as from those of other Members of Parliament, that the carrying out of this system was suspended in 1887; but that in 1888 the Government determined to again put it into force. Instructions to this effect were given before my joining the Ministry.

"In the opinion of this department, the fishing grounds of the county of Berthier possess a great commercial value; but I consider that unless they are effectually protected they will soon lose this value.

"I am aware how unpopular a system of licenses is at the outset; but in my opinion, this system ought to have been adopted long ago, and a further delay in putting it into operation will be injurious to the interests of the people in whose favor you are interesting yourself.

"The tax on scoop-nets is quite a nominal one; and if, as is alleged, this tax will have the effect of causing the disappearance of one-half of these fishing engines, I believe that the result, in the end, will be to the advantage of both the fish and the fishermen.

"The regulation fixing the size of the meshes at one and one-half inch is made with the object of preventing the destruction of the young fish, and allowing them to grow and increase in value.

"Regretting that I am unable to accede to your request as well as that of the petitioners.

"I subscribe myself, Sir,

"Yours truly,

"CHARLES H. TUPPER."

This, Mr. Speaker, is the reply which the fishermen of the county of Berthier received to the request which they humbly made to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. I feel sure, and if my information is incorrect, the hon. Minister can correct it—I feel sure that absolutely no steps have been taken by the department to ascertain whether the fishermen of Grand Nord, as well as of the other counties bordering on Lake St. Peter, were able to pay for this license, and still continue their occupation. For my part, my information goes directly contrary, and I think that the members who are interested in the other counties are ready to bear me out in what I say, when I state that the keeping up of this license system will have, as its immediate result, the wiping out of one half of the fishermen of the five counties who are mentioned in my motion, and will drive away a great number from their possessions. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance, who acted last year as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, endeavored to justify the imposition of this tax on the plea derived from revenue considerations and statistics. The hon. Minister evidently desired to leave the House under the impression that, in 1888, the district in question was not subjected to the regulations relating to fishing and to the preservation of fish; that it was not provided with fishery officers, whose duty it was to prepare for the depart-

ment the necessary statistics, and that the House was completely in the dark respecting the produce of the fisheries in the counties of Berthier, Maskinongé, Saint Maurice, Yamaska and Richelieu. Now, nothing is further from the truth. For a long time past the Department of Fisheries has had organised in these counties as well as in other portions of Canada, the system of fishery officers. The report of the hon. Minister of Fisheries for 1887,—I regret that the report for 1888 is not yet distributed and I have been informed at the Distribution Office where I asked for a copy, that it was not yet ready—the report for 1887 states that for the division of Berthier, Joliette and Montcalm, there are four fishery officers, and that the value of the produce of the fisheries in these counties for the years 1884, 1885, 1886 and 1887 was as follows:—In 1884, \$15,699.40; in 1885, \$5,424.40; in 1886, \$13,231; and in 1887, \$11,854.50. Not only these fishery officers give to the department a statement of the produce of the fisheries, but they even give the quantity of each kind of fish which has been caught within these limits; so that we find that there has been caught within these limits which I have mentioned: of eels, 1,820 pounds, in 1884; 1,420 pounds in 1885; 101,000 pounds, in 1886; and 3,300 pounds, in 1887. Trout, whitefish, maskinongé, as well as all other fish which are taken in these localities, are mentioned in the reports made by the fishery officers to the department, and by the department to the House. So that the pretext given last year that this new regulation has been promulgated with the object of collecting statistics of the fisheries in these counties, had no real foundation, because for a long time previous the Government had in operation the system of inspection and statistics as it now exists. Now, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, in the letter which he has addressed to me in answer to the petition of the fishermen of the county of Berthier, says, that in his opinion the fisheries of the county of Berthier possess a great value. If the hon. Minister, before writing this letter, had taken the trouble to consult his own reports, if he had taken the trouble to ascertain what kind of fish the petitioners caught in the waters of Lake St. Peter, he would have seen that with the fishing gear which he wishes to tax it is impossible to catch deep water fish, because these fish swim at a much greater depth than can be reached by the bag nets, the sweep nets and the other tackle which he has desired to tax. The only fish which these poor people catch are mud-pout, suckers, perch, bass, eel and pike, fish which are protected by no law, and possess hardly any value. These are the only kinds they are able to procure. In 1884, the report states that 631,250 pounds of mixed fish were taken. In 1885, this fell to 106,800 pounds; in 1886, to 29,200 pounds; in 1887, 114,500 pounds. Well, Mr. Speaker, after dividing the produce of this fishery among some fifty or sixty fishermen, I ask if it is possible that a greater sum than from \$25 to \$30 can be reckoned as the result of each man's labor. And if a tax is levied, of \$1 for each bag net, of 5 cents a fathom for a sweep net, of 25 cents for each 100 hooks on the night lines, the fisherman is deprived by his means of probably one-fifth or one-sixth of the produce of his fishing, which renders it impossible for him to provide for his own

wants and for those of his family. In this case, Mr. Speaker, figures do not fail us. The fish caught possess little value. The fishermen are poor; and when one talks of levying upon people in so wretched a condition, a tax of \$1 per head, or \$1 per drag net, to swell the public Treasury, it appears to me that people have but a faint idea of what the fisheries of Lake St. Peter are like. It appears to me that it is giving very poor pretext to sustain a bad policy. Once more, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen are, as a class, very poor, the produce of their fishing is the least possible, and they are unable to pay the tax which is imposed upon them. I appeal, then, to the sentiment of humanity in the hearts of the Ministry, and I ask the support of the House in their favor.

#### ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by R. E. Kimber, Esq., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER,—His Honor Mr. Justice Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honorable House in the Chamber of the Honorable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned;

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to make further provision respecting enquiries concerning Public Matters.

An Act respecting corrupt practices in Municipal Affairs.

An Act to permit the Conditional Release of First Offenders in certain cases.

An Act to amend "The Weights and Measures Act," chapter one hundred and four of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Life Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Hawkesbury Lumber Company.

An Act to incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Ujiga Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada."

An Act respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Calgary, Alberta, and Montana Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lac Seul Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company."

An Act respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (Translation). The object of my motion, Mr. Speaker, is to bring before the House all the documents connected with the various petitions which have been presented, as well as the instructions which have been given to the fishery officers of these various counties by the Department of Fisheries. We will then be in a position to know whether all the fishery officers have displayed in the counties interested the same activity they have been recommended to do by the Minister of Fisheries in his circular of the 19th April, 1888. In this circular signed by Mr. Bauset, for the Minister of Fisheries, we read, among other things, the following:—

"If any person refuses to obey orders, or is guilty of any violation of the law, you will at once seize his fishing gear, and report the fact to the department."

In the circular of 1887, the hon. Minister was not content with the making of a report to the department of the violations of the law, but he says:

"If any person refuses to obey your orders, or is guilty of any violation of the law, seize his fishing tackle and send it to the department."

When these various documents shall be laid before the House, and I hope that will be after as little delay as possible, for if the Government decide not to carry out the prayer of the petition which the hon. the First Minister promised to receive favorably last year, I shall be obliged to bring the matter anew before the House before the end of the Session; we shall know the number of fishermen who are protected by their license, as well as the amounts which have been collected by the department as the price of these licenses, and further, the number of those whose fishing gear have been confiscated. When the House is in possession of all these documents, I think that it will see that an injustice has been done, and that it is now time to make reparation for it.

Mr. LABELLE. My intention is not to censure the Government, but I want to ask that they shall do justice in this matter to our poor fishermen in Richelieu, Berthier and the adjoining counties. I do not think that the Government thoroughly understand the position of these fishermen, because, if they did, I am sure that they would not enforce the tax. I have told the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that what we wish the Government to do is to take off the tax on the "hoop nets," *verveux*. I hold that those fishermen ought not to be taxed at all, but at all events there should be no tax on the appliances which they use to take that common fish. It should be remembered that the fish they catch in that portion of the river and the adjoining counties is not a marketable fish, it is a common fish, and not even protected by the laws the same as other more valuable fish. There are millions of those fish in these shallow waters, and they are as numerous now as they were half a century ago, which is proof that they do not need protection, and they are caught in shallow water, where good, marketable fish is not taken. This fish, however, is the food of these poor people, and they have nothing else to live on. They catch a great deal of this fish, and they take it to the market, but they get a very low price for it, which does not enable them to pay

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

any tax whatever. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in order to further prove the justice of the demand which we make in this matter, to the fact that fishermen in the Lower Provinces who are engaged in catching herring and mackerel are not taxed at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; they are.

Mr. LABELLE. Well, I have my authority from a very good source, and the hon. gentleman had better arrange that difference of opinion between himself and the member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who informed me that the deep-sea fishermen of the Lower Provinces were not taxed. Herrings, which are worth \$5 a barrel, and mackerel, which are worth \$28 a barrel, are not taxed, but those who catch salmon are taxed to the extent of 40 cents a barrel. If the Lower Province fishermen are allowed to catch a marketable fish—a fish which can be readily sold in the market, and on which they can make large profits—without paying any taxes, I think that the least the Government ought to do for us would be to take the tax off those poor fishermen of Richelieu, Berthier and surrounding counties. I have a great deal more confidence in the Government than my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), and I feel that when their attention is drawn to this subject they will, in a spirit of justice, look to the protection of those poor fishermen who have to earn their living by working day and night in order to make a few dollars to give bread to their children. If the Government imposes a tax on those fishermen, even though it be very small, it will be a very great burden on them. I hope that the Government will take off this tax on the poor fishermen of our counties.

Mr. TUPPER. This question, of course, is not a new one, but it involves a very important principle upon which Parliament has been acting ever since Confederation—that is, the propriety of the license system. In Ontario and Quebec, I believe, long anterior to Confederation this system was adopted, not so much for revenue purposes, as I understand it, but with the object of regulating the business of catching fish and of restricting to some extent and in some quarters the fishing, so as to prevent over-fishing. Now, if there be anything in the arguments so strongly urged to-day by both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that where fishermen are poor, we are to relax the regulations and abstain entirely from enforcing this system elsewhere in force, it seems to me that would attack the whole principle of the license system, because the system is not framed in view of these considerations but with a view of benefitting all fishermen, poor and rich alike, and protecting the fisheries from being exhausted by over-fishing; and we know how apt fishermen as well as other men are to take advantage of the present time to make as much as they can, regardless of the future. I briefly meet the argument as to the poverty of these fishermen in that way. But while this system is never popular in any district, and the enforcement of it seems at times to be hard, the fishermen do not often understand why the Government intervene between them and their business of catching fish which are common to all and, as they say, do not interfere with other occupations. Still, unpopular as it is, it has been the steady policy of this Parliament for some time back. Now, I am glad to be able to say that while, theoretically, the license fee may seem to be a tax, it is not so in reality. For instance, take the district to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, and the amounts paid for licenses. I have in my hand a statement in reference to not all the counties the hon. gentleman has alluded to, but the important ones, as Richelieu, Yamaska, Maskinongé and Berthier; and I find, running down the list of licenses, that the sums paid are as low as from 15 cents to 25 cents per man in some instances; there are a few men who have paid as much as \$4 or \$6; in one column there are a con-

siderable number who have paid \$2; in another column they range from \$1.80 down to 50 cents; and so on. The fee paid by these men is not so very heavy. As to whether these fishermen are not only poor, but the tax inconsiderable, I regret that I could not follow the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution as closely as I would like to have done, not being sufficiently familiar with the language in which he addressed the House. I will not go back to 1884, as the hon. gentleman did, because these regulations were not then in force. I have the figures for 1888 giving the value of these fish, to show that no exceptional argument can be made with reference to the particular districts to which allusion has been made—certainly not as a whole. The value of fish caught in 1888 in Richelieu and Yamaska was \$11,376, in St. Maurice and Champlain \$85,619, and in Maskinongé and Berthier \$11,682. These are approximations made in the usual way in which statistics are made by the officers of the districts. To show that the licenses are not for revenue purposes, I will take the amount that we pay for guardianship and official work in some of these waters; and I find that in a part of the districts mentioned—and the reason I am only taking a part is that I have not before me a complete memorandum of all the districts—the amount expended in protecting the division extending from Three Rivers to Coteau, including the Ottawa, in the year 1887–88, was \$2,000, the total revenue derived by the department was \$423, and the total number of licenses issued was 449, so that every license averaged about one dollar. So that if these districts are valuable, and the tax inconsiderable, certainly I would submit to the House that no case has been made out for exceptional treatment in those districts. Some hon. gentlemen who have put notices on the paper in reference to this matter, have pressed a new argument which I think the hon. member in charge of this motion did not press much to-day, that is, that while what I say may be correct of the districts as a whole, there are some portions of these districts where the fish are of so poor a description that they are merely used as food in the localities where the people are not very rich, and are not marketable, and not exported, or used in trade. That consideration has been pressed with considerable earnestness upon the department, and I have brought it to the attention of the Government, and it is being considered; because, as I have said, we have no desire to oppress the fishermen. The regulations are not those of any particular party, and we are anxious to meet the wishes of the fishermen so far as we can do so consistently, with the protection of the fishing interest itself; and further consideration will be given to the question as to whether it is possible, consistently with the regulations of the department, to make an exceptional rule in some of the districts where those special circumstances may exist. I have ordered an enquiry to be made as to that, and I have brought the matter to the notice of my colleagues, whose consideration will, of course, be given to the subject. I want to say, in reference to the circular that was issued, that the hon. gentleman will, on reflection, see that there is no such cruel spirit behind it as he supposes. It is a circular merely calling attention to the laws of the country, and follows on the enforcing of the license system; everything hinges on that. It would be far more cruel to refrain from sending a circular down to those fishermen, warning them of the consequences of violating the regulations, than to let the officers come suddenly upon them, and involve them in heavy penalties. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the effect of these regulations being to drive men out of the district, or out of the country. Well, that was the idea that he and those gentlemen who were with him propounded when they addressed the Government. It is quite true that they drew the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to the matter, and he promised to consider it. At that time it was stated the enforcement of these regulations

would have a disastrous effect on the localities concerned. Well, we have had the regulations in force for some time, and I am glad to say that they do not seem to have driven away any people, as these gentlemen thought they would. I think the reason is, that in the working out, the fee is so inconsiderable that the consequences are not at all of a serious character. I again repeat that the demand which I have alluded to will engage the serious attention of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad indeed to find the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries approach this subject in such a calm, deliberate spirit, and to hear him intimate to this House that the Government are disposed to take the matter into consideration with the view of re-arranging the system under which the great fishing interest is carried on. While on my feet, I may say that either I misunderstood the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) or he misunderstood me in relation to my correction of a statement made by him, when he said there was no tax in the Lower Provinces for catching herring or mackerel. I would reply that in the bays or rivers of the Lower Provinces, as everywhere else, there is a tax upon the nets used for catching herring and mackerel, just as there is upon other fish; but I quite admit the correctness of the hon. gentleman's statement that in the case of vessels fitted out for the deep sea fishing or for fishing outside the coast, where the herring and mackerel are chiefly caught, there is no tax, but, on the contrary, there is a bounty given to vessels fitted out for that purpose. I sympathise with the motion of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoliel), and also with the views taken by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle), in which he has so ably and eloquently submitted the interests of his poorer constituents; and I may say that I shall endeavor to impress upon the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the propriety of considering this special application which has been made to-day. He should take up and review the whole system of licenses as applied to the river and bay fisheries of the whole Dominion. When I organised that fishery service and framed its first rules and regulations, I had in view very much the same object which my hon. friend confesses is the view of the Government—an object not of collecting revenue at all, but of regulating and controlling and protecting the carrying on of these fisheries. On a former occasion, I told my hon. friend that when a slight fee was imposed on the fishermen, it was never contemplated revenue should be raised, but it was imposed merely for the purpose of enabling the department to have some control over the fishermen. It was levied to enable the Government to regulate where nets should be set, and have some system of registration whereby they could follow up infractions of the law. The whole system of taxing fishermen is one I entirely disapprove of. I am now speaking, not in any spirit of hostility to the course pursued by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in maintaining the rules and regulations of the department, but for the purpose of suggesting a better system without seriously impairing the revenues of the Dominion. The system when established, with a small fee attached for the purpose of registration, was found to be very objectionable by the fishermen. No matter how small the fee you touch a class of men—a great many of whom are very poor, indeed—and those people, with poverty surrounding them, and with difficulties presenting themselves every day to find food for their families, would naturally object to even the smallest fee. I think, since my hon. friend has intimated to this House that he will take into consideration the propriety of revising the whole system of licensing the fisheries of this country, it will be well for him, and well, certainly, for a certain class of fishermen, if he would not impose any fee at all, but impose instead the taking out a license for the pur-

pose of registration, and create a penalty if they fail to do so. By pursuing that course he will avoid the imposition of the tax, and will secure the object to be obtained by registration. He will be enabled to control the methods of conducting the fisheries, and at the same time give great satisfaction to a large class of the people who are very poor indeed. I may say that the fishermen of my own river, which I believe to be the finest fishing river in the Dominion, certainly for winter fishing, and the catch and export of smelt alone from that river is something enormous, and would surprise hon. gentlemen if they would look into the statistics. There are complaints far and wide over the whole river as to the licensing fees. True, they complain also of the rules and regulations and control of the department, but that is a necessity; about that I will not speak at present. What I ask the hon. Minister is that he should remove the paltry tax imposed, which only leads to irritation without bringing in any large amount of revenue. I make this suggestion in a friendly spirit, and I am sure my hon. friend will receive it in the same way.

Mr. LAURIER. It must be apparent to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has brought up a real grievance from which a certain section of the country are now suffering. I am glad to notice that the tone of the Government in this respect is somewhat changed since last year. Last year my hon. friend brought the same subject to the attention of the Government, and then the statement was made that this license was exacted for the purpose of revenue. I am glad to see now that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not at all entertain this view. It would be preposterous to speak of these license fees as calculated to bring any revenue, and if they were, it would be all the more blameable. This light tax is not calculated to bring in revenue, while it is large enough to create a considerable irritation. It is in itself a light tax, but a tax may be light or onerous according to the means of the party who has to bear it. The people who now complain are a poor class, and the tax upon them is all the more onerous. As I understand it, the object of the license is, in some respects, to control the fisheries and prevent illegal fishing. This is a very inefficacious way of attaining that object. How does it work? If this tax is levied with a view of diminishing fishing, it will act in this way. It will allow those who are rich to fish, and prevent from fishing those who are poor, so that the very idea is one which cannot be entertained by this Parliament. I have no opinion to express on this subject. It may be desirable, perhaps, to restrict fishing, but if that is the real object the department have in view, the suggestion offered by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) much better meets the case, and I hope the hon. gentleman will adopt it.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. The regulations which are now carried out in the counties mentioned in the motion were new in 1887. There was no license and no tax to pay in 1887. The system was established in that year only, and upon the representations of the member for the district the license and tax were suspended, but they were re-enacted in 1888, and they have been carried out since then. The kind of fish taken by this apparatus are not good fish, and have no commercial value, and when the Minister makes the distinction he does between marketable fish and those fish, he is under a mistaken impression. The fish caught by this apparatus are of no marketable value, and, therefore, the tax upon the apparatus bears upon the poor men who have no good fishing grounds. The statement I referred to was that which was addressed to the Minister in December, 1888, signed by 50 fishermen of the county, who stated that half of them would be compelled to leave their homes if this regulation were carried out. I hope that the licenses

Mr. MITCHELL.

will be removed. I am willing to accept the view of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), but I hope that the tax upon the apparatus will be removed.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has misunderstood my expression of opinion as to the object of these fees. While the object is not the collection of a revenue, the House should not lose sight of the very important fact that there would be a very heavy tax on the people of this Dominion for the preservation of the fisheries, unless we had that system in operation. I am not at all committing myself to the present system in saying this, but in the inland waters, and particularly in Ontario, where so many people take out these licenses, although the fee is a small one on each person, the result is that we get nearly every dollar which we spend on the protection of the fisheries. For instance, in Ontario, the House will, no doubt, be surprised to learn that, while the expenditure of last year in that Province was \$19,000, in round numbers, we collected from these license fees over \$18,000. It is, therefore, a very important matter. We collected altogether about \$42,000 in Canada to go towards the expenditure which is made every year for the protection of the rivers. I simply desire to put myself right, as the leader of the Opposition drew from my remarks the idea that the fee had no purpose in connection with the revenue, but was merely imposed for registration purposes. What I meant to say was that, while the main object might be for purposes of registration and regulation of these fisheries—and sometimes it is necessary in order to prevent overfishing, as, for instance, in the case of the mackerel trap, for which a fee of \$50 is charged—still we receive annually a large and important sum which is applied to the purpose of protecting this industry.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was very glad to hear from the Minister of Marine that he intended to consider this whole question of the fisheries, and I would invite his attention to a broader view of the fishery question, and would ask him to ascertain whether it would not be desirable in the view of the Government, as I think it would be in the view of the people who are familiar with the subject, to ask the American Government to come to some arrangement in relation to purse seining. There can be no doubt that that practice is most destructive to the fish generally. On many occasions, when a vessel is out fishing for mackerel and draws her purse seine, it is only the large mackerel that are taken out, and perhaps out of fifty barrels there will not be more than twenty or thirty barrels of large mackerel. The small mackerel are all thrown away, and of course are dead. The same thing applies to herring, which are taken in large quantities in purse seines by mackerel fishermen, and, in fact, all kinds of fish are drawn in these purse seines; and when fishermen are only looking after one kind of fish, the rest are all thrown away. It is the opinion of fishermen, to my knowledge, that that is the reason for the destruction of the mackerel and herring fishery along the coast, and also of the larger fisheries, such as the codfish fishery. We know that the large fish feed on the smaller fish generally, and if you destroy one you destroy the other. This question is one of very great importance, and it would be worthy of the attention of the hon. Minister to ascertain whether some arrangements could not be come to with the American Government to prohibit the use of purse seines on their part as well as on ours. I believe that the Americans recognise the importance of this question, and I do not think they would object to enter into such an agreement. At all events, it is worthy of the earnest and early consideration of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad to hear from the hon. gentleman on this very important subject. It is one which has engaged, and is still engaging the attention of the department, and I am in possession of very interesting reports

from the different officers who have connection with the fisheries on this subject. I am sure that the hon. member will not be surprised to learn that there is a great difference of opinion amongst those officers, as there is amongst scientific men who are studying fish life, as to whether there is much injury, or any injury, caused to any great extent by purse seining. In England, I believe, Professor Huxley and others are carrying on quite a fierce discussion on the subject of deep sea fishing, and that some of them are contending that, while these restrictions may be useful in inland waters, yet in the deep sea these engines used by men cannot be compared with the natural enemies of these fish in regard to their destruction. However, this matter is being thoroughly investigated by the department.

Mr. KIRK. I am very glad this subject has come up for discussion at this moment. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has drawn the attention of the Government to this question, and he recommends that this Government should confer with the American Government, with a view to prohibit, if possible, the use of purse seines in deep sea fishing. Now, it appears to me there is but very little difference of opinion, I think, at least, on the coast of Nova Scotia, with regard to the injury that purse seining is doing within the three mile limit, and that is a matter which the Government have under their control. They can, if they wish, without the concurrence of the United States, enact a law to prohibit purse seining within the three-mile limit. Now, it is thought by fishermen along the shore, and I think correctly, that purse seining is very largely the cause of the scarcity of fish on the inshore fisheries during the last few years. Purse seiners are allowed to seine fish, no matter how closely to the shore. They surround the schools of mackerel with their seines, and haul them all on the deck of their vessels, whether they be great or small and they save only the large mackerel, while the small mackerel and all other small fish are thrown overboard. These fish float on the surface of the water for a while, and then sink to the bottom and foul the ground, or float to the shore, and rot there. Not only is there a large amount of fish destroyed in this way, but this method drives away fish from the inshore waters. The fish will not come in to shore whilst the ground is foul. The interests of our shore fishermen are seriously injured, and the fisheries have been largely a failure during the last two or three years, on account of the ground being fouled by the system of purse-seining. I would like the Minister to give his attention to that matter; it is one over which the Government has full control, without conferring at all with the United States Government.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I think the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken last are mistaken. The chief injury is caused by throwing the smaller fish away. I am certain that, so far as the mackerel is concerned, there is no waste.

Motion agreed to.

#### CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. MITCHELL. The motion now called for claims for land damages on Derby Branch, and the two subsequent motions, I intend to withdraw. I regret that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and the Minister of Public Works are not present, but it will be in the recollection of the House that when, a few days ago, I called attention to these motions and the probability of their not being reached, I suggested a means of getting these matters settled without occupying the time of the House. I said that if the right hon. gentleman would either deal with these matters, or entrust the business to one of his colleagues, I would be happy to meet him with

a view to settling these claims that my constituents had in relation to some railway lands that were taken for railway purposes. I am happy to state that I met the Minister of Public Works, authorised by the right hon. gentleman, and in a few hours' time we settled pretty much all the claims that we had. 'Tis true they did not give over half what my constituents were entitled to, but as it is better to take a half loaf than no bread, I did not see a chance of getting much unless I accepted the suggestions proposed by the Minister as a compromise. I may say that he met me in a very proper spirit, and we came to a satisfactory arrangement about the larger portion of these claims; therefore, I withdraw these three motions. When the other motions are reached of a similar character, but which are not yet settled, owing to the department having to send to Moncton for information, I will have something further to say about them.

#### LUNENBURG HARBOR.

Mr. EISENHAUER moved for:

Return of copies of all correspondence between the Department of Public Works and the engineer sent to examine and survey the harbor of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, during the summer of 1888. Also all reports, maps and plans received by the department from said engineer.

He said: I have for some time been aware of the necessity that exists for dredging the harbor of Lunenburg, and have made representations to the Government. Last summer an engineer was sent down there; he spent a considerable time, and made a survey, a report and a plan. I called at the office of the department expecting to get that report, but I was told that I could not have access to it, that it was the property of the department, and made solely for the department. I was not aware that engineers are sent to various portions of the country, at public expense, to make reports and surveys only for the benefit of the department, but if that is the case I suppose I must submit to it. But a report has been handed to me by the chief engineer, Mr. Perley, in which he says:

"There are about ninety vessels belonging to this port which are engaged in fishing. Of this number about one-fourth are engaged in the West India trade during the winter, leaving about seventy idle until fishing is recommenced."

I find there is an error here, as, in point of fact, only about one-ninth, or ten of these vessels, are engaged in the West India trade during the winter, so that about eighty would be left idle. Mr. Perley goes on to say:

"From what could be ascertained during the examination, it has been customary to permit these idle vessels to berth both inside and outside of the legal channel, without any surveillance being exercised, and there is not a doubt that if a proper system were adopted, and care exercised in carrying it out, there would be ample room and freedom from danger of fouling, and this can be done by mooring the vessels in question instead of permitting them to ride on a single chain or hawser, and thus free to swing with the rising or a falling tide, or with the prevailing wind; and certainly no objection can be found to such a course, and it should be pursued, and the expense of dredging avoided."

Now, it is true, that by putting the owners of these vessels to extra expense for hawsers and other gear, the dredging might be avoided for some time, but this would entail considerable expense on those fishermen. The treatment extended by the Government to the fishermen of this country, and the fishing interests, is not that which they apply to the manufacturing and other industries of the country. They do not leave the manufacturers to paddle their own canoe; and while hon. gentlemen opposite are professing to take care of all the industries of the country, yet, whenever a request is preferred on behalf of the fishermen, it is denied. There was some dredging done in the harbor of Lunenburg, ten or twelve years ago, but it only covered a narrow strip of dredging along the wharves. When the wind is fair for vessels coming in or out of the harbor, it is all very well; but when the wind is contrary either coming in or going out, of course the vessels run aground. There



was some further dredging done during the time my predecessor represented the county, but this was not of any great advantage. It was carried on in part of the harbor where it was not of general benefit, and, accordingly, it was of very little use so far as the shipping trade was concerned. I find on looking over the returns for 1887 there were 92 vessels in the Lunenburg fishing fleet. That number was increased in 1888 to 100 vessels, and during the present season the number increased to 112 or 115 vessels. The value of the catch in 1887 was \$738,558. If we take the addition to the fleet and add twenty per cent. to the catch of 1887—of course we have not the figures here yet—the amount may be estimated at nearly \$1,000,000. This industry has grown to vast proportions, and Lunenburg is a centre of the fishing industry. It is only right and fair that the Dominion Government should pay some attention to this important industry, as they devote attention to other industries in the country, but it seems to be the rule that hon. gentlemen opposing the Government should obtain nothing from the Government no matter how strong their case may be. These fishermen are taxed very heavily, as can be easily shown. The Postmaster General stated last night that they were not taxed at all, but that is mere nonsense, as the articles consumed by the fishermen's families are taxed, as are those of other people in this country. It is true that the fishermen obtain their salt free, their lines free, and a few other articles necessary for the pursuit of their calling, but so far as the fishermen's families are concerned they have to pay taxes as well as others. I have selected a number of articles upon which the fishermen pay taxes, and I find they number about forty, these all being articles used in the prosecution of their industry. I have brought this matter of dredging to the notice of the Minister, and I trust a vote will appear in this connection in the Supplementary Estimates. It is impossible to take care of this large fleet of vessels without some further dredging being done, and further, the ocean terminus of the Nova Scotia Central Railway will be at Lunenburg, and it will be necessary, after the Government has expended nearly a quarter of a million in completing the road, that considerable dredging should be done, as we expect to load large vessels at that port. The Government should send a dredge there next year, and after carrying out the dredging required for the large fleet of fishing vessels, the dredge should be left there to do further dredging required for the loading of large vessels at the railway terminus. I think the policy of the Government is a wrong policy in this direction. It is impossible for members of the Opposition to obtain the execution of any work in their different localities, and it is high time the Government changed their policy in this respect and do what is fair and just to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess to have the interests of the country at heart, but their policy has been to favor their friends and do nothing for their opponents. At all events, I hope the Minister of Public Works will bear in mind this important work, and cause a vote in this connection to be placed in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry I could not hear the hon. gentleman distinctly, because he was so far away his voice did not reach this side of the House, and, therefore, I could not follow him; but I understood that he complained that a dredge had not been sent to that harbor, as he would have wished. That may be so, but the hon. gentleman may depend upon this, that whenever we can do dredging where it is required we do it; but we cannot do all the work in one or two years, because there are only a limited number of dredges and a limited amount of money. The hon. gentleman has asked for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Public Works and the engineer sent to examine the harbor of Lunenburg during

Mr. EISENHAUER.

the summer of 1888. I am informed by the chief engineer of the department that there is no such correspondence. The report of Mr. Perley, the chief engineer, of 30th January last, contains all the information obtained by the engineer who made the survey under his direction. That report the hon. gentleman has in his own hands, I think, because he asked me to let him see it, and I gave orders to send him a copy. Of course, I could not send him a copy of the plans, but I gave orders, also, that if he would kindly call at the department, the plans should be shown him. He was informed of that by the secretary of the department. If the hon. gentleman, therefore, wants the report of the chief engineer to be placed before the House, I do not object to the amendment to his motion; otherwise, his motion cannot be adopted, because we have not the information required, but the report I will bring down if he wishes it.

Mr. EISENHAUER. What I complained of was that the report of the engineer who was sent down to examine and survey the harbor has not been placed before the House. In conversation with the chief engineer he told me that the engineer sent down there was not in the employment of the Government, but that he was out of a job and that the Government sent him there to give him employment. If they merely sent an engineer to give him employment, it is a waste of public money, especially if they do not intend to carry out his suggestions. I was not complaining of the dredging not being done last summer, but I wish to get the report of the engineer sent down on the survey, because, in conversation with that gentleman, I understood that the report would be favorable to the dredging, but the report now before the House is not in favor of the dredging. The report of the chief engineer goes on to say:

"As to Mr. Eisenhauer's fear that the sea-worm would attack vessels laid up on the mud, no evidence could be obtained to bear it out. Sometimes a vessel may bring worms from the West Indies, or probably from the fishing banks, but there is not any evidence that the "trede" exists in Lunenburg harbor."

That, I think, is a mistake, as vessels have got wormed badly, although not employed in the West India trade. I believe that this fleet of fishing vessels will go on increasing there, and I think that it is the duty of the Government to see that they should have better accommodation, otherwise we will not have accommodation enough in the harbor. Of course, if I cannot have access to this report I will have to submit, but I should like to see it, as the report which I have now in my hands is not in keeping with what the conversation of the engineer would lead me to believe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman should not suppose that the chief engineer is giving a false report to the Minister of the department. Mr. Perley is a gentleman of high standing and high reputation, and he is not a man to deceive me or to deceive Parliament through me. I am responsible for Mr. Perley's action, and, therefore, I cannot assent to the hon. gentleman's suggestion. Those reports of sub-engineers who are sent out to obtain the information and to collect the data for the chief engineer, are never brought down; they are for the information of the chief engineer, who considers their contents and gives the information to the Minister in his own report; and that report, as I stated just now, I am ready to bring down if the hon. gentleman wishes it. I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot have correctly understood the conversation between himself and the chief engineer. When we send an engineer anywhere it is not to give him a job or to give him employment, but it is because the employment of that engineer is required by the public service. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that this was the motive for sending down an engineer in this case. If the hon. gentleman wishes I shall have the chief engineer's report, and also the plans, copied and brought down.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I may say that the chief engineer told me that this engineer who made the survey was not in the employ of the department, that he was out of work, and that they sent him down there to give him employment. I want the report of the engineer who was sent down to make the survey, because he told me that it would be favorable, and this report is not favorable.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand my hon. friend, he wants the report of the special survey which was ordered by the chief engineer, and if I understood the Minister of Public Works correctly, he said that those reports are never brought down. Well, though they are never brought down I do not know of any rule, constitutional or otherwise, why they should not be brought down, if the bringing of them down would be in the interest of the public service. Unless my hon. friend has some strong reason of his own to show to the House that this report should not be brought down, though it is not the rule so to do, I cannot see any reason why it should not be brought down. If the Minister of Public Works has not some very strong reason against it, the rule ought to apply that the light can be brought to bear on the recesses and corners of any department of this Government, and when my hon. friend asks the Government to bring down this report, the only answer that is made is: It is not customary to do so. Granting that it may not be customary, will the hon. Minister pretend to say that there is any reason why those reports are never to see the light of day, and why they are always to be confined under the eye, and the eye only, of the chief engineer who ordered the survey? I can very well understand that the chief engineer should supervise those reports and give his conclusions to the Government, but because such a thing may be the opinion of the chief engineer, it does not necessarily follow that his opinion is the right one, it does not necessarily follow that he may not have come to a false conclusion. As I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Eisenhauer), he complains that the chief engineer, in summarizing the report of that special survey, has not given the proper conclusion that should be arrived at. The Minister of Public Works says the chief engineer reported that those works are not advisable, and my hon. friend pretends that the special survey would show that those works are advisable, and that the conclusion arrived at by the chief engineer would not be supported by the report of the special survey. That is the reason why he wants to bring this matter before the House; and if this is the case it is a good and valid reason why this report, which he now asks for, should be brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those reports are made under the direction of the chief engineer, who gives his instructions to the sub-engineer to examine and report. The sub-engineers know that these reports are for the information of the chief engineer, and they are perfectly free to state matters as they find them, and to give their opinions as freely as if they were only conversing with the chief engineer. If these reports were to be laid before the public the freedom between the sub-officer and the chief would be lost altogether, and the chief officer could not obtain that full information that he must expect from his under-official. The chief engineer, in giving me the information which I have given to the hon. gentleman just now, said:

"My report dated 30th January, 1889, contains all the information obtained by the engineer who made the survey under my direction."

That is very clear. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will give him the report in full, as well as the plans, and that is all we have ever given in matters of this kind. We have always refused to bring down those sub-reports, because, by laying them before Parliament and before the public, we would destroy the usefulness of those officers, and prevent them giving the full information to their chief

which they ought to give. If the hon. gentleman wishes to see the report I have referred to, I have no objection that the motion should be altered in this respect. The hon. gentleman tells me that he has that report in his hands now, and if he is satisfied with that, I will not, of course, insist on giving him the report. If the hon. gentleman wishes more than that, I am ready to do this: let the matter stand and I will look over both reports myself, and if I find that something is omitted—it can only be through inadvertence of the chief engineer—I will see that the information is made complete, and will have a supplementary report made; but I must repeat that if the hon. gentleman insists on that report, we cannot bring it down.

Mr. LAURIER. While I cannot admit the reasoning of the hon. gentleman, I would advise my hon. friend to accept the suggestion now offered, and let the motion stand over.

Mr. KIRK. Before this motion is disposed of, I would like again to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to an application which was made a number of years ago by my predecessor, for a dredge to deepen the river St. Mary's, in the county of Guysboro'. A dredge was sent there in the summer of 1882, but, after working for some time, it was found that it was too large, and could not do the work properly, and was withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is hardly speaking to the question before the House.

Mr. KIRK. Have you not got the subject of dredging before the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not the general question of dredging.

Mr. KIRK. There can be no harm in my calling the attention of the Government to the necessity for a dredge in that river. I think the Minister promised that a smaller dredge would be sent, but that was not done. I hope he will be able this year to send one down to deepen that river.

Debate adjourned.

#### LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. TURCOT (translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, respecting the creation of a bi-weekly instead of a weekly mail service between Lourdes and Somerset in the County of Megantic.

Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I wish to draw the attention of the Government, and of the Postmaster General, to the important interests concerned, which call for the creation of a bi-weekly mail service between Lourdes and Somerset, in the County of Megantic. The weekly service which is now carried on might have been enough when it was inaugurated, for at that time Lourdes was peopled by young settlers, who were beginning to clear their lands, and who did business only with the neighboring parishes. At that time there was but little correspondence carried on, and these people found that a weekly service was sufficient. But at the present time a great amount of trade is done at Lourdes. There is even a steam saw mill, the proprietor of which does quite a fair business in lumber; there are also merchants and blacksmiths, all of whom complain bitterly of the present state of affairs. It is easy to understand how, that these people who are in business, and who only have a mail once per week, on the Saturday, and who are obliged to wait until the following Saturday to receive their correspondence suffer much from such a mail service. From the information, which I received from the hon. Minister last year, the reason why we are given a mail service only once a week, is, because the post-office does not

pay. It is true, that the post-office at Lourdes does not yield a revenue as great as its expenditure; but it must be borne in mind that having but one mail each week, those who are carrying on a correspondence are compelled to transport their letters to Somerset, in the neighboring Parish, and to go there for the answers also. According to the Postmaster General's report of last year, I see that the post office of Somerset had a revenue of \$1,131.08 and that the expenditure only amounted to \$422. In the first amount of the revenue is included a portion derived from the Parish of Lourdes because the bulk of her population who have correspondence to carry on during the week are obliged to go to Somerset, a distance of nine miles, and carry there their letters. Mr. Speaker, they say that a bi-weekly mail service would not pay. I admit it, but I am certain of one thing, viz., that a bi-weekly service would not occasion a greater deficit than the present weekly service, because, admitting that the expenditure would be increased, the revenue would be also. Do we not see every year the Government asking for an increase in the salaries of certain of its servants. I do not desire to blame the Government for doing so, but these increases of salaries are things from which no return is derived, the object being the rewarding of certain employees for their good services. This year it is proposed to increase the salaries of the judges, which will cause an annual increase in our expenditure of \$80,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for so much as that; I only ask for an increase of about \$30; and I am persuaded that if this service was granted, the revenue would increase and the deficit would not be greater than it is at the present, because there would be proportionally as much revenue as expenditure. If we take the total amount of revenue derived from the post offices of the county of Megantic for the past year, it is seen that the forty-one offices have yielded a revenue of \$6,555.43, and that the expenditure was \$4,567.14, leaving a surplus in favor of the county of \$1,988.29. If there is a deficit each year in the Post Office Department, I perceive clearly that the county of Megantic has not been the cause of it. It is not a favor that I am asking from the Government to-day, but it is a simple act of justice towards my constituents, who only receive a mail once a week. If the Government should grant the request which I am making at the present moment, their action would greatly assist in the settlement of this parish, because it is well known that a similar state of affairs sometimes hinders the settlers from establishing themselves in new places; it is always a disagreeable experience to find oneself in places where there is no easy communication with the outside world. I venture then to hope that the Government will take this subject into serious consideration, and that they will at least make the trial for one year; and I am certain that if this is done, it will be found that, while affording greater facilities in the service, the deficit will be less than it is at the present time.

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not the slightest objection to bring down the papers. The only papers in their possession are a letter from the hon. gentleman himself enclosing a petition from some of the inhabitants, and I think a letter from a Mr. Lessard, a priest in his district. The matter was referred to the Inspector to report upon it. He reported that the cost of the service already is \$50 per annum, and the increased service which the hon. gentleman asks would entail an additional cost of \$50, or, in the whole, \$100. The total receipts from postal revenue in that place is \$12.65. On account of the great deficiency between the estimated cost and the revenue of the district, the department refused to entertain the proposition.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TURCOT.

### SEIZURE OF THE AMERICAN SHIP *BRIDGEWATER*.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

Copies of all documents, papers, correspondence and telegrams relating to the seizure, or the release of the American ship *Bridgewater* at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, in the possession or control of the Government of Canada, including all correspondence which has taken place on the subject between Great Britain and the United States, and copies of all claims which have been made to recover damages from Canada, for the seizure and detention of such vessel.

He said: Most of the members of the House will have seen, during the past year, a good deal in the newspapers about the extraordinary case of the ship *Bridgewater*, and I propose to call the attention of the House briefly to some of the circumstances connected with that case, which will show, I think, a most extraordinary picture of the way some matters are managed in the Department of Customs. The ship *Bridgewater*, a large American vessel of over 1,500 tons burthen, was on a voyage from St. John, N.B., to Liverpool. She put into the port of Shelburne, N.S., seriously damaged by a storm, on the 5th of April, 1887. The vessel was, I believe, properly reported at the Custom house. She was offered for sale there, but there were no bids for her, and she was knocked down to her owner at a nominal figure. She was then being repaired by her owners, and on the 27th of July, the collector of customs at the port of Shelburne made a seizure of this vessel, claiming, I understand, that she was liable to pay a duty of 25 per cent. on her entire value, as coming under the class of unspecified manufactured articles of wood, which are subject to that duty. The owner of the vessel declined to pay this duty, and declined to admit that the vessel was subject to seizure at all; but he was delayed in his repairs, as the vessel was in the hands of the Government. I believe it will be found, when the correspondence comes down, that after the seizure, the Government or the collector tried to persuade the owner of this vessel to pay the duty to the Government, as a matter of form, and then trust to their tender mercies to refund it. He declined to take that course, as he resisted the seizure altogether. So the matter went on until September of that year, and I believe that the hon. Mr. McLelan, who was then the acting Minister of Customs, had the case brought before him and he telegraphed to Shelburne, to the Custom house officer there, a message to this effect:

"Allan can repair and take vessel away. If he requires Canadian register he will have to pay duty."

One would have supposed that would have ended the matter, because here was a telegram from the acting Minister of Customs declaring that the owner might take his vessel away unless he wanted to register her. He did not want to register her at all but to take her away; yet when he came to take her away, the collector required that he should previously give a release of all claims against the Government or against any officers of the Government, and should pay all expenses. To make this perfectly clear, I will read a letter, which the collector served on the owner, and which appeared in the *Free Press* of this city some time ago. Mr. McLelan's telegram, authorising the discharge of the vessel, was dated the 16th of September, and this letter from Mr. Atwood, the collector, to the owner, is dated at Shelburne the 22nd of September. The latter is as follows:—

"SIR,—I have to inform you that the acting Commissioner of Customs authorises the release of the ship *Bridgewater* on condition that she takes a clearance to a foreign port and leaves the country on completion of the repairs, after first paying all expenses incurred in connection with the seizure, and after you have formally withdrawn the protests made and given a written abandonment of all claims upon the Government or seizing officer on account of seizure. You will please let me know whether these conditions will be complied with; and I will give you an account of expenses."

I can hardly be surprised that the owner of this vessel, who certainly could see no reason, and when none had been validly given, why his vessel should be seized and detained by the Custom house officer, should have absolutely refused to take the vessel off the hands of the Canadian Government, and should have insisted upon its unconditional surrender to him; and no doubt he felt there were claims which he would be able to make hereafter for improper detention. After this correspondence, on the 15th of October, and just 81 days after the seizure, the Customs Department released the vessel unconditionally, and gave it back to the owner. Now, assuredly, that unconditional surrender made it impossible for them to say that that seizure was a proper and a legal one. It was either right or wrong to have seized and detained that vessel. They cannot now say it was right, because they have abandoned it. I understand there is a claim made by the owner against the Canadian Government, which partakes of the nature of an international claim. I understand that the claim is being pressed by the Government at Washington on the Canadian Government, through the British Government, and I have no doubt that this country will, in the long run, have to pay very handsomely for this extraordinary performance of the Customs Department. Well, perhaps the Minister of Customs will tell us that this man has no legal claim which he can enforce in the Canadian courts against the Canadian Government. That will depend on how far the Canadian Government would assent to his bringing a claim against them, but if the contention of the owner be correct, a wrong has been done him, and if the Government try to show that there is no redress to the owner in Canadian courts, that gives him the right to make his case an international question, and I must congratulate the Minister of Customs on having, so far as I will show, proved the case for the owner. I suppose it will be answered, in a case of this kind, if an American citizen claims to have been wronged, and asks his Government to seek redress from the Canadian Government, that he will be told by his own Government: You must make a claim in the courts of the country, and if you find, for one reason or another, that you cannot enforce any legal claims against the Canadian Government, then come to us, and it will be made an international matter. Well, the Minister of Customs, in order, no doubt, to save any trouble of that kind to this gentleman, wrote him a letter, of which he has very quickly availed himself, and which has enabled him, without having to go to court at all, to show the Washington Government that he has no legal claim here at any rate. I understand that the Minister of Customs wrote, on the 24th May, 1888, this brilliant letter to the owner of the vessel:

"SIR,—I am this day in receipt of the opinion of the Minister of Justice in re your claim for damages for alleged detention of the ship *Bridgewater*, at the port of Shelburne, N.S., in which he says: The claimant, Allan, cannot recover against any officer of the Crown for damages sustained in consequence of the seizure. Under the circumstances, I do not deem it advisable to further consider the question of recognising your claim until the decision of the case in the courts has been rendered."

And the hon. gentleman did not see that when he wrote that letter, he was saving Mr. Allan the necessity of going to the trouble and expense of going through the Canadian courts, and if the Minister of Customs had only reflected a little over the matter, he would have seen what a terrible mistake he was making and how he was placing himself at once in the hands of this vessel owner, by enabling him to make an international claim. There the matter stands, I believe. The Customs Department in 1886, as has been shown over and over again in this House, brought this country to the verge of war with the United States, by their treatment of vessels in the harbors of Canada during that year. And after they were stopped by the hand of the British Government from doing this in

1887 towards fishing vessels, they could not be prevented from doing their best to raise national disputes even in that year, when their hands were kept off the fishing vessels by the British Government. The *Bridgewater* was not a fishing vessel, so they were not kept in order by the British Government in respect to it, and, therefore, they made this seizure and kept this vessel for eighty-one days illegally. She was seized here, and illegally kept here, and then the Government gave her up, but they wrote a letter in reference to that subject which enables the owner of that vessel, more than anything else does, to make a claim against this Government. I wonder why this seizure was made. I wonder whether, in the seizure of a large vessel like the *Bridgewater*, there may not have been a good deal of plunder to be divided between the seizing officer and the informer. I suppose there would be something substantial in that if this man had been simple enough to do as they told him and to pay the duty into their hands, and let them divide it among the seizers and informers, as they have been doing, to the disadvantage of the country, as I think, in a great many cases. There is another view to be taken in this case. The Government committed a wrong. They authorised a collector in Nova Scotia to commit a great wrong, according to their own showing, against an American citizen. I have not heard that this collector has been dismissed or even censured, but we have heard of another collector, a man of high standing and respected by all in Nova Scotia, who, since this matter of the *Bridgewater*, for an act not of hostility, but perhaps an error of judgment in an act of friendliness to an American citizen, for allowing him a friendly privilege in his port which could do no one any harm, has been censured and dismissed. I think this case is a little more serious than it would have been if we had not had all these circumstances together—the troubles in 1886, the British Government interfering to try and make the Canadian Government behave themselves in 1887, and then the dismissal of Collector Ross in the port of Halifax for a simple act of friendliness and courtesy towards an American citizen. We remember very well that the Minister of Fisheries claimed on a recent occasion that the reason why American vessels were not seized in 1837 was that the fishermen had been taught by the action of our cruisers in 1836 that they had to behave themselves. Surely it cannot be said that the owner of this ship had been misbehaving himself. He had not been interfering with any Customs regulations which had been guarded so jealously by the Customs Department in 1886. He was an American citizen who was driven by stress of weather, in almost a wrecked condition, into a magnificent harbor in Nova Scotia, and what was the hospitality with which he was greeted? He was seized upon, he was threatened, and he was coaxed to admit the seizure, to pay the money and make an application for a refund. When he would not do that, he was still detained, after the acting Minister of Customs had given his opinion that there was no legal ground for the detention, and then conditions were sought to be made with him that, if the vessel was released, he should pay all the expenses of an illegal seizure, notwithstanding that, as I think his claim shows, he had been a very heavy sufferer by the loss of profits in the voyage he had intended to carry out.

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

#### After Recess.

#### ATLANTIC AND NORTH-WEST RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a Bill to enable the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company to build this railway, by obtaining an extension of time for the building that portion between Harvey, which is now reached, and Salisbury or Moncton. I move that the following be added to this section:

Provided that the extension of time granted by this Act in respect of the portion of the line between Harvey and Salisbury shall not be continued beyond the first day of January, 1890, unless before that time the company shall have expended on that portion at least the sum of \$100,000 to the satisfaction of an engineer to be appointed by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and in that case the time for the completion of that work shall be extended for a further period of two years.

Mr. HALL. I believe that the company are disposed to accept this amendment, although the time seems unreasonably short; but in view of the existing difficulty over the Bill, there is no objection to the amendment suggested.

Section as amended agreed to, and Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND MINING COMPANY.

Mr. DENISON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.

Mr. WALLACE moved in amendment that the Order be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to consider the following: To add after the word "Saskatoon" on line 8 of section 3, the words:

Thence in a generally north-easterly direction to Fort à la Corne, and to a junction with the Hudson's Bay Railway, or to a point on the Nelson River, and from the said crossing of the South Saskatchewan River, in a northerly direction to Green Lake, and a crossing of the Beaver River to Waterhen Lake.

Motion agreed to, and Order discharged.

#### ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the "Great North-West Railway Company," was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) moved third reading of the Bill. He said: This provision was in the original Bill, but on account of sufficient notice not having been given in one of the districts, the Saskatchewan district, the Standing Orders Committee could not report that the promoters of the Bill had complied to the letter with the Rules of the House, and therefore this provision was left out of the Bill. It is now proposed to re-insert it, and, for that purpose, to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr Jamieson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have no desire to impede the passage of this Bill through the committee, but I have been communicated with by the officers of another Order of Foresters who, not having seen the Bill in its amended shape, think that, perhaps, they might be placed in a dis-

Mr. EDGAR.

advantageous position through its provisions. They are anxious to understand it, and I think a deputation is coming to the Capital with respect to it. I would, therefore, ask the promoter of the Bill if it would be any great inconvenience, after the Bill has passed the committee, to let the third reading stand until Friday so that those gentlemen may have an opportunity of examining it. I think there is not the danger in the Bill which they imagine. One of the points of danger they apprehend is this: There was a Bill introduced for the incorporation of all benefit societies under one Act, and one of the provisions of that Act, as introduced in section 10, is:

"That no society shall be registered under a name identical with that under which any other existing society is registered, or so nearly resembling such name as to be likely, or under any other name likely, in the opinion of the Minister, to deceive the minds of the public; and further, that no registered society shall change its name without the assent of the Governor in Council."

There are three orders of Foresters, the Ancient Order, the Canadian Order, and the Order of Foresters that is being incorporated under this Bill. I think the fear of the officers of the Ancient Order of Foresters is, that special legislation being given to one order, if this general Bill were passed with that clause in it, then this order might have the exclusive right to the name of Foresters, and as I understand the contention is, that if there was to be an exclusive right given to any one of those three orders to bear the title of Foresters, that it should be given to this Ancient Order of Foresters, which they claim, as their name would signify, is the most ancient order. I have no desire to impede the progress of the Bill at all, but I would ask the hon. gentleman if it would put the promoters of the Bill to any inconvenience if, after passing it through the committee, it were allowed to stand for its third reading until Friday, and in the meantime I might know something more of the views of those who fear that the interests of their order are somewhat jeopardized by this Bill.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have no objection to accede to the hon. gentleman's request, but, if it is not going to a third reading to-night, I would prefer to have it lie over till Monday.

An hon. MEMBER. Monday is a holiday.

Mr. JAMIESON. Well, on Friday. I would say, in reference to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, that I cannot really see that the Bill is open to the objection which the hon. gentleman mentions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Bill is not open to that objection. But I understand that the Finance Minister stated, with regard to the Bill relating to friendly societies introduced by the member for Carleton (Mr. Dickinson) last year, and re-introduced this year, that the Government will consider the matter during recess and introduce a Government measure on the same lines as next year. If the Government should introduce a general Act next year there might be some difficulty under clause 10 of this Bill, inasmuch as this company having been incorporated and entitled to bear the name of "Foresters," it might be made impossible for the Canadian Order of Foresters or the Ancient Order of Foresters to bear their name of "Foresters." The hon. gentleman will see the difficulty there would be created.

Mr. JAMIESON. If the general Act be introduced next Session, we can deal then with the question the hon. gentleman raises. I do not apprehend, for a moment, that the Independent Order of Foresters would attempt to exclude anybody else, or prevent any other society from using the title of Foresters, so that, in view of this fact, I cannot, at present, see any necessity for allowing the Bill to stand.

Mr. HALL. I think I can settle the difficulty in a moment. When the Bill was passing through the Committee on Banking and Commerce the criticism which has been mentioned by my hon. friend was stated. At that time I consulted the solicitor of the society, and was told that there would be no objection to the adoption of the use of the name "Foresters" by any other branches of the order in so far as the society itself is concerned. I have a letter in my pocket to which the solicitor in charge of this Bill states that officially. In fact, he says the adoption of the words, "the Independent Order of Foresters," is an acknowledgment of the existence of other orders of the same society, and that there will be no objection, therefore, on the part of this society to the distinctive name of "Foresters" being used by the other branches.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I place a very great deal of confidence in what has been stated by the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), the chairman of that committee, and if he thinks there is no danger on the point I have raised, the Bill can go through, but I would like to have the third reading left over until Friday.

On section 7,

Mr. JAMIESON. I move an amendment that in the 35th line, after the word "proceeds" the word "thereto" should be struck out, and the words "of all such property" substituted. This clause provides for the disposition of the property on the dissolution of a branch. Unless this change were made there would be no power to apply the general proceeds of the property.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that this Bill provides that in a town of 6,000 population or over, the society should hold \$25,000 worth of property, but in a town of less than 6,000 they can only hold \$5,000 worth. I cannot understand why there is such a marked difference in this respect, because if a town happens to have 5,600 population it could only hold \$5,000 worth of property, whereas if it has 6,000 population it can hold \$25,000.

Mr. JAMIESON. One of the objects of that is this. The headquarters of this society is to be in Toronto, and it is altogether likely that a building will be put up there suited to the requirements of the society. In a large city it would be a comparatively poor building, including plans, which would cost less than \$25,000, whereas in towns there would only be a branch or subordinate office which would not require a very large building.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think the explanation is altogether satisfactory. I do not see why a town with 6,500 of a population or even 6,000 could hold \$25,000 worth of property and a town with less than 6,000 could only hold \$5,000 worth. I think there is a great disparity here.

Mr. JAMIESON. We had to draw the line somewhere, and in a case of this kind it must be somewhat arbitrarily drawn. I do not see that we could improve it very much. It was thought at one time that we could fix the population at 10,000. The matter was thoroughly considered by the Committee when they came to this conclusion.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think 10,000 ought to be enough. I am apprehensive of any of these societies being allowed to hold a larger amount of property than could reasonably be required for the purposes of the society. I wish to see everything done that is favorable to the interest of the society, but I do not believe in giving them the opportunity of holding an excessive amount of real estate. I, therefore, think that if you provided for \$10,000 worth up to a population of 10,000 perhaps it would be better suited to the purpose of the Bill.

Bill reported.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) to amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.—(Mr. McGreevy.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.—(Mr. La Rivière.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 16) to provide against frauds in the supplying of milk to cheese and butter manufactories.—(Mr. Burdett.)

#### WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved third reading of Bill (No. 2) to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the House will agree with me in the proposition that it is always proper to make reasonable counter-proposals to any proposition presented to us. We have before us to-night a Bill which is the exact copy of the American Bill making a proposal to the Canadian Government with regard to wrecking upon waters contiguous to the two countries. That Bill is one which, I think, we may reasonably ask to have, in some minor respects, modified. I propose to-night to offer an amendment to it, so as to make a counter-proposal to the American Government, in the line of proposing slight modifications of the provisions of the Bill now before us. It may be charged that my object in offering this amendment is to defeat the Bill. I deny that such is the case. The object is to make the Bill more acceptable to the marine interests of Canada. The proposal is simply to open negotiations with the American Government, to take the proposal they have laid before us, to modify that proposal slightly, and to ask the American Government if they are willing to accept the modification of their proposal which we propose to make. A few days ago, when this matter was under consideration, the hon. gentleman who leads this House said that some middle course might probably be adopted with advantage, referring to the proposition which was made by the Canadian Government, and which is now upon our Statute-book, offering to the United States Government complete reciprocity in the coasting trade. The middle course would be something between our offer of complete reciprocity in the coasting trade and the American offer of reciprocity in only one incident of coasting. The amendments which I shall offer will be in that direction; they will be something midway between reciprocity in coasting and the American proposal to select only the one incident which would be of advantage to them, while they would deny us reciprocity in all other incidents of the coasting trade. I had no chance to urge the views which I hold in reference to this Bill in the committee. I was a member of the committee, but, by accident, probably, I never received notice of the meeting until it was over. I urge my views in this House, believing they are just, proper, reasonable, moderate, and that they will be likely to receive the assent of the American Government, if we make that proposal to them, as we will if we make this modification to their Bill which is their offer to us. As I said, the Bill before us allows the American Government to select from the coasting trade the one incident which would be of advantage to them and in which they desire reciprocity, namely, wrecking, and to exclude us from all other forms of reciprocity in coasting.

It happens that this matter of wrecking has been in the past in favor of Canada. This advantage was thrust upon us by the action of the American Government in 1874, by a regulation which was issued by their Treasury Department, that Canadian vessels were prohibited from taking hold of wrecks upon the American coast; and the enforcement of that regulation has been of the most stringent character. The Mackenzie Government followed that up by adopting the same regulation as to American tugs taking hold of wrecks on our coasts. The order issued by Under-Secretary Fox, in 1874, shows that the condition of things which has since existed has existed by reason of the action of the American Government, and that Government cannot accuse the Canadian Government of acting in any spirit of unfriendliness or in any spirit but that of the broadest and most liberal character. The Canadian Government were not responsible for that order. They were driven into the position by the action of the American Government itself. That being the case, I hold that, when the American Government approaches us with a proposal to reinstate them in the position they occupied before they issued the order, we are warranted in considering whether, under the circumstances, we shall surrender the advantage we possess without some *quid pro quo*, without some consideration beyond what they propose, which is really no consideration at all. There has been a large amount of investment of capital in wrecking companies in this country. At Port Colborne, there is the wrecking firm of Carter Bros, who have spent a large amount of money in the purchase of pontoons, hydraulic machinery, steam pumps, and all the necessaries to carry on the work of wrecking fully and efficiently, and that is one of the most efficient wrecking firms in existence. There is another wrecking company at Windsor, and there is another about to be formed at Windsor; and these have been induced to make their investments under the regulations of the Canadian Government. It is these regulations which have called these firms into existence, and have led to the investment of this money, and to sacrifice those interests without good reason is something the Government should hesitate to do. I think it is only reasonable that some slight concession should be asked from the American Government, and I propose it in the belief that it will be given. I do not offer these amendments on the ground of factious opposition to this Bill or in order to prevent its passage.

The humanity plea has been used with a great deal of skill, but there is nothing in the regulations of the Canadian Government that ever has or ever will prevent the succoring of a vessel in distress or the saving of life. If the vessel is on shore, and an American vessel is near, there is nothing to prevent the American vessel from rendering assistance to the one which is in distress. The regulations are made to prevent the wrecking on the coast after a vessel is on shore, after the crew has left, and regular operations have to be undertaken to save the cargo or the vessel, requiring perhaps days or perhaps weeks. Then, the Canadian wrecking plant has and should have the monopoly of that work, except where that wrecking plant is not available, and, in that case, the Customs Department has always been ready to give permits to American wrecking companies to undertake the work. I recounted the other night some 15 or 20 instances where the department had given that permission when there was no pressure of necessity, but such permission has not been given by the American Government under similar circumstances. In regard to the conduct of the two Governments in this matter, and the humane consideration shown for wrecked vessels and for distressed mariners, the comparison is very much in favor of the Canadian Government. I do not think there has been a single instance where the American Government have relaxed their rules or have allowed Canadian wrecking plant to be

Mr. CHARLTON.

used for that purpose, while on our side many instances can be cited in which that has been done. This Bill is being pressed in the interest of a gentleman who lives in the city of Kingston, who thinks he has discovered, and who has patented, a steam pump which he believes will revolutionise wrecking. I am told by those who are acquainted with the matter that he is mistaken in his idea, but he desires to monopolise the business, as he supposes he is going to do, but, in doing that, he is putting in peril the whole wrecking business of the Dominion of Canada, and I do not think he is counting with his host as to the efficiency of his invention. The proposition that I make, that towing shall be permitted in the case of the tugs of each country, is one that is almost essential to the proper working of the concession of reciprocity in wrecking itself. If a vessel is wrecked upon the American coast of the great lakes, it is hardly possible that the wreck will be towed to the dry dock at Collingwood or to the dry dock at Owen Sound, but the natural destination would be to the dry dock in Detroit, to the dry dock in Cleveland, or in Bay City, or in Port Huron, or at Buffalo. In order to take that vessel from the coast and deliver it at a dry dock, it would be essential in the case of the Canadian tug that she should engage in coasting, she would be compelled to take that vessel from its position on the shore and coast along the American shore to deliver the wreck at an American dry dock. So that as a safeguard for the proper working of the provision contained in the Bill of my hon. friend, reciprocity in towing should be insisted upon, in the case of each country. Now our tugs are permitted to enter American ports and to take up tows of American vessels and tow them up and down the lakes, but they cannot deliver them in any American port. A tug can take up a tow of vessels in Buffalo and take them or cast it loose anywhere in Lake Huron up the straits of Mackinaw, but in case of stress of weather, and it becomes necessary to make port with its tow of vessels, the law prohibits it from doing so, it is not permitted to call at an American port. I think the modification that this amendment calls for is a just and humane modification, a reasonable modification, and I propose to make it reciprocal in respect of the tugs of both countries. I propose to ask that Canadian tugs should be allowed to tow vessels and rafts from port to port on the American side, and that American tugs shall be permitted to tow vessels and rafts upon the Canadian side, and this concession will make the law more easily worked with regard to reciprocity in wrecking. It is a reasonable concession, it is a concession in the interest of the men whose interests we are about to sacrifice if we pass this Bill; it is at least a proposition that is worth while making to the Americans, before we surrender the only thing by which we can secure any concession from them at all. I have heard it asserted that I am personally interested in this matter, and that is supposed to explain the reason of the position I take upon this wrecking question. Now, Sir, I never have been engaged in relieving a wreck, I never have been engaged in that business, and I do not suppose that I ever shall be; but I am connected to a limited extent with the navigation interests of this country, and I know enough of this matter to know that the proposal to give reciprocity in wrecking is a proposal made exclusively and entirely in the interests of the American marine. It is charged against me that I am acting in this matter inconsistently with my position upon the reciprocity trade question. Sir, I take my position upon the reciprocity question, upon the ground that the position the Liberal party takes is going to give us a fair advantage in return for what we give the Americans. But I oppose this particular Bill because there is no reciprocal advantage in this matter granted to the Canadian interest that is to be sacrificed, by giving to the American interests the possession of

the business that the Canadians have hitherto done. It may be asked, why are Canadian tugs not able to compete with the American tugs in the business of wrecking upon the two coasts? Now, Sir, the insurance companies, with the exception of the Western of Toronto, that write risks upon vessels, are in the American cities, in Buffalo, in Erie, in Cleveland, in Detroit, in Milwaukee and in Chicago. Whenever a vessel is wrecked the insurance company will naturally employ the wrecking company the nearest at hand. And there is a system of granting commissions the wrecking company gives to the agent of the insurance company a handsome commission for placing the work in their hands, and this system is so perfect that wherever a risk is written upon a vessel by an American company, the job of wrecking for the vessel which is wrecked, is sure to go into the hands of an American wrecking company. Our wrecking companies understand that the passage of this Bill, with the acceptance of this proposal from the United States, is simply a proposal to deprive them of almost the entire amount of the business of wrecking upon the great lakes. Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to go fully over this question, I have presented the leading points. This proposal is not designed to kill the Bill, but it is designed to put that Bill in such a shape that we may hope to derive some advantages from it. I object to any unconditional surrender. I believe that in this matter it is perfectly proper to make a counter-proposal. I do not think it is absolutely incumbent upon us to accept an American proposal that is not in our interests, without first seeing at least if we can get some modification of that proposal that will make it more acceptable and more advantageous to ourselves. It is said, why not pass the Bill, and then ask the Americans to make this arrangement with you about reciprocity in towing? Why not give away every consideration that you possess, for the purpose of securing a concession, and, after giving away all the considerations, then go and ask for the concessions. That is not a business way of doing business. I do not know that I need to engage further in this discussion. I say distinctly and positively that the object of this amendment that I am about to move is not to kill this Bill. I am prepared to accept reciprocity in the matter with a slight modification that will give reciprocity in towing to tugs, not reciprocity in coasting with vessels and cargoes, but simply a mutual reciprocity in towing vessels and rafts by the tugs of either country. This proposition would be mutually advantageous, it would be reasonable, and I am morally certain that it would be accepted. For that reason I think that this House ought not to place the country and this interest in a position where it is hopeless for them to ask for this concession after passing the Bill in its present shape. I, therefore, move that the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee with instructions to amend the first sub-section of the second section, by adding the following words:—

"And when the privilege of towing vessels and rafts from one United States port to another in waters contiguous to Canada is accorded to Canadian tugs."

If that is accepted, I will move a corresponding amendment to the other clause.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I was not in the House when this Bill was discussed before, but as I represent a constituency that has made very large investments in wrecking plant, I conceive it my duty, on the floor of the House, to enter my protest against such legislation at this time. I may say with respect to the wrecking plant at Port Colborne, in regard to which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke, that the investment is very large. Individuals there have no less than \$130,000 invested in such material. This wrecking plant has been purchased in good faith, some within the last six

months, some previously, and I say that the interest of that particular industry should not be disturbed by the Parliament of this country. They have purchased the plant, and have brought it into the country; have paid duty upon it, and yet to-day we are asked that the Americans, who do not live in the country, who will not spend one dollar of their earnings in the country, shall be permitted to bring in duty free wrecking plant, machinery and coal to operate within Canadian waters. I decidedly object to this, and I think there is no hon. member who desires to place Canadian wreckers on a worse footing than his neighbor across the line operating in Canadian waters. I venture to say that all the work on Lake Erie would be done by American tugs, and all wrecking plant on the Welland canal would pass over to Buffalo. This is the reason why I rise to enter my protest against this proposed legislation. The humanity cry has played a very important part in this debate, and I desire to show from the statutes that the legislature in this country has years ago been not unmindful of their fellowmen in this particular. The statutes clearly set out that every provision has been made for the human family in this particular respect, and that cry should have no weight in this House to aid in defrauding the wreckers of this country out of their legitimate business. In the Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada there is the following provision:

"The master of any steam vessel, not being a British ship, engaged, or having been engaged, in towing any ship, vessel or raft, from one port or place in Canada to another, except in case of distress, shall incur a penalty of four hundred dollars."

In case of distress it is provided that vessels of all countries shall be at liberty to relieve a vessel out of the distress in which she has been placed. It has been said that the Americans have made an offer. So have we made an offer, and it is an offer standing on the Statute-book of this country to-day. The standing offer we have made is in these terms:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to any ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of that country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another, in such country."

Let the Americans accept this offer. They do not, however, please to accept it, because they desire, as I have said, by their offer, to secure the wrecking trade of this country and place it in the hands of their own people, and, in my opinion, this Parliament should protect Canadian wreckers. At Port Colborne, as I have said, a very large investment is made, the wrecking plant costing \$130,000. If this Bill is allowed to go into force, tugs from Buffalo and elsewhere will come to the entrance of the Welland Canal, go out into the lake and tow vessels into harbor. They will come with their tugs full of coal, on which they have paid no duty, and they will work in Canadian waters with free machinery and free coal. If, on the other hand, our tugs go out to haul vessels, they have to pay duty on all their machinery, upon their diving apparatus, on the pumps they use, and on the coal they use in doing that work. Canadian tugs may go to Buffalo, a distance of twenty miles, get their coal there, and will then have to return the twenty miles in order to get to the entrance of the Welland Canal. When they reach Buffalo there are dock dues and other fees to pay, so that the coal of a Canadian wrecker, at the entrance of the Welland Canal, will cost at least \$1 a ton more than it will cost the American wrecker. We talk about reciprocity—and I do not intend to deal very largely with that question—but according to a paragraph I read in an American paper, a commissioner had been sent from Washington to find out if there were any Canadians on the Niagara frontier who were earning one dollar on the American side for his family, who lived on the Canadian side of the river, and if so, to have him expelled from the



country. No Canadian will be allowed to live in Canada, and earn a dollar in the United States. That is the position of the Niagara peninsula, and the county where I live. It was stated the other night, that the Americans had taken the duty off fruit. Let me tell this House that, while they pretended to take the duty off fruit, they imposed such an embargo in the shape of charges on papers, and entries, and so forth, that fruit crossing the frontier at Niagara was met with a large protection in favor of American producers. In some cases the Minister of Customs has ascertained that these charges amount to a protection in favor of American fruit growers of from 50 to 75 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Over 100; I have the evidence here.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I will say this, and I say it in all earnestness, that if the protective policy which was adopted ten years ago, and which has been in force during these years, is to be trifled with at the suggestion of either the American people or at the suggestion of a member of this House, who by his personal influence can carry a Bill like this; if the National Policy has no more permanence than this, I say do away with it altogether. If the National Policy is to be frittered away Session after Session, if after people have invested money in good faith to-day, protection is to be taken away from them to-morrow, I, for one, will ask this House to cease to delude and deceive those who are seeking investments in this country. If this measure is passed, it will drive investors of large capital, men of large means who employ a great deal of labor, to the United States. It will do so for this good reason, that every Canadian insurance company has now withdrawn from insuring the hulls of vessels, which business is now entirely in the hands of American underwriters. Most of the vessels wrecked are barges and sailing vessels. The few wrecks in Canadian waters that may occur will be assisted from the nearest point, but as soon as the vessel is abandoned, the American underwriters will send their own people to the wreck, and our people will have nothing to do. If this Bill should pass it would not only drive many good citizens out of the country, but also, I repeat, drive capital out of the country. It will not only do that, Mr. Speaker, but it will have a very bad effect upon capital seeking investment in this country. By adopting this Bill the House will show that there is no stability whatever in the policy which this Government has been sustaining for the past ten years. We, in this House must give that policy stability, we must declare by our vote and let it be known to foreign countries that capital seeking investment here will be treated in good faith; treated honestly and fairly. If we allow any other impression to go abroad capital will cease to come to the country altogether, and our resources will not be developed to the same extent as if we keep faith with those who invest their money with us. I hold in my hand a letter which I will not read as it is too long.

Mr. BOWELL. Read.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The Minister of Customs asks me to read it, and I will. It says:

"We see by the report from Ottawa that Mr. Kirkpatrick has again introduced his Bill in the Commons for reciprocity in wrecking. We think the Bill would be very detrimental to the wrecking interests here. You perhaps are aware that the last Canadian Marine Insurance Company (viz., The Western Assurance Company of Toronto) insuring vessels and steamers on the lakes has retired from the whole business, leaving that line of business wholly in the hands of American assurance companies, so that the whole patronage of the wrecking on both the Canadian and American shores will be at the disposal of the American insurance agents, and they will certainly throw it into the hands of the American wreckers and they will do most of the wrecking on this side if Mr. Kirkpatrick's Bill for reciprocity in wrecking becomes law. We know from experience when the Americans were allowed to wreck in Canadian waters that where vessels were insured in American companies, the American insurance agents would bring American wrecking tugs and though we would have our tugs at work on the vessel in trouble they would discharge us and continue the work

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

with their own tugs; but where a Canadian insurance company was interested we always got a share of the work. We do not think that there has been a time since the Americans were excluded from wrecking in our waters that it would have been more injurious to us to grant reciprocity in wrecking than the present. Most of the crafts that get in trouble now are the sailing vessels and barges, and as they are rather unprofitable, and usually insured for their whole value, they are at once abandoned to the insurance company, and that, of course, places the insurance company in a position to take any means they choose for their release. The only chance for us to make a living at wrecking, if this reciprocity in wrecking Bill becomes law, is for us to become American citizens, and then they cannot refuse us a job because we are not Americans. There are laborers and mechanics in this town that have lost good situations in Buffalo and had to return here because they would not move their families over there and take the oath of allegiance to the United States, while others have moved and taken the oath, and hold their places. If reciprocal wrecking privileges are granted we would be very badly handicapped on all sides."

The letter goes on to speak on the matter in the same terms but I have given you the main ideas advanced in the letter and I will not read further. There were 15 wrecks in 1887 at that end, on the Canadian shore of Lake Erie, and 10 of these got their assistance from Port Colborne. There was only one craft in trouble at this end of Lake Erie, on the American shore, in 1887; that was the schooner *Manzanilla* of St. Catharines and she became a total loss very soon after stranding, so that there was no American wrecking in 1887 at the end of Lake Erie that the Americans could have given us.

Mr. KIRK. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Carter & Bros, of Port Colborne. They are good Reformers too, and they vote against me every time, but I am supporting the amendment of the member for North Norfolk, not upon party lines but in the general interests of the country. In 1880 there were sixteen wrecks, and nearly all of them received assistance at the hands of Canadian wreckers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find the following item in a Windsor newspaper of a recent date:

"A plasterer who had secured work in Detroit a few days ago was turned back to Canada while more than a hundred workmen came over to work in Canada and were unmolested."

That is the reciprocity we receive at the hands of the American Government and that is the way in which we are treated. I ask in the name of my constituents, I ask in the name of the National Policy, I ask in the name of the people of this country that we shall not give this privilege to American wreckers unless we get something in return. We are willing to grant them reciprocity in everything that is fair and right; but I say, Sir, that we are not called upon to sacrifice every interest we possess in order to induce or to entice the American people to do something for us. We as Canadians ought to stand upon our rights and upon our privileges, and I would ask this House, that before passing a Bill of this kind an effort should be made—if it is necessary to have reciprocity of any kind—to see that something be done between the two Governments in the direction indicated by the amendment, in order to in some way modify the tone of the Bill which is now before the House. If that is not done and if this House will not consent to such a policy in this matter I will ask that this Parliament shall do the next best thing, and place the Canadian wrecker on the same footing as the American wrecker. I say, Sir, that the Canadian wrecker ought to be allowed to import all his materials free and that he should also get his coal free; privileges which are now extended to the American wreckers. I believe, Sir, that a modified treaty in this respect, which would be fair to both countries, could be ratified by mutual concessions and by mutual arrangement between the Governments of the two countries. I would therefore ask the House to support the amendment of my hon. friend from Norfolk.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. member whether he does not hold the opinion that the

consumer pays the duty on the coal, and if he does hold it I would ask him when did he change his opinion on the matter?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). That is a point of law which I will leave to the hon. member for Bothwell to decide. He appears to be the only member in the House who is able to deal with a question of that kind.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sure that after listening to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), all the members of this House must be pleased at one effect of the debate which concluded last night, for it cannot be denied that the speeches which have been delivered during that debate have made a convert of the member for North Norfolk. They have evidently converted him to a belief in the salutary benefits of the National Policy to this country, and have caused him to become an enthusiastic supporter of that policy. But like all converts he has "out Herodded Herod," and he has advocated the policy further than the advocates of the policy themselves. Hon. members on this side of the House believe that the National Policy, taken as a whole, is designed to promote the greatest good to the greatest number, but the hon. gentleman, in order to promote the good of two wrecking companies, wants to make subservient to their interests the interest of the ship owners of Ontario and Canada, and the whole of the shipping interests of the mariners of Canada. The hon. gentleman wants to make the interests of all the wreckers in Canada subservient to the interests of those two wrecking companies, one of which companies he has something to do with; he did not explain what.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. member says, that because those companies have invested some thousands of dollars in wrecking plant that therefore they should be protected. What is the policy that has been advocated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and what is the policy that the hon. gentleman has time and time again denounced with all his eloquence and all his vigor but that very policy? Because money has been invested in factories and industries of this country the hon. gentleman has time and again said: Sweep them away; let us go in for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union or anything to do away with that policy. But when the interests of two wrecking companies are concerned, the hon. gentleman changes his tune, and asks this House to adopt a different policy from that which he has advocated before. Now, I submit that, in the interest of those two companies themselves, this Bill should become law, because when it goes into force they will have a better chance to make money and to utilise the capital they have invested than they are able to do under the present law, and I will show you how. The hon. gentleman contrasts the action of the two Governments, and he says that the action of the Canadian Government has always been eminently humane, conciliatory and forgiving—that the Canadian Government has always been ready to give away and allow American tugs to come in and do business in Canadian waters, and he gave twenty or more instances in which that was done; but he says that you cannot refer to a single instance of the American Government reciprocating and allowing Canadian tugs to go into American waters. That is precisely what I say. Our Government allows American tugs to come into our waters, but our tugs and wrecking companies are debarred from going into their waters, and that is a right we want to obtain. Whenever we ask the American Government for it, they say: No; there is our offer, as soon as you accept it, you will get admission to our waters, and not before. This Act will give us that right; Americans will gain nothing from it, and Canadians will gain everything. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) argues with great

force, but he argues not merely against the Bill, but against the amendment as well. He seconds the amendment to allow reciprocity in towage, and he says what will be the consequence? This very reciprocity in towage which he asks us to give to the Americans will ruin the tug companies on the Welland Canal, because American tugs will come on the lakes and tow the vessels through the canal. I cannot understand the consistency or the logic of the hon. gentleman. To be consistent, he should have said that he would oppose both the Bill and the amendment. Now, I should like to tell this House, as I have told it before, that this Bill is not promoted in the interest of any one man or any one firm. It is true, there is a firm doing business near Kingston, which has recently invested a large amount of money in wrecking appurtenances, and it has to-day the most complete wrecking plant on the whole inland waters. Those men are in favor of this Bill, and say that they are able to compete with the Americans, and are desirous of gaining access to those waters where the greatest number of wrecks take place and where great riches are sunk fathoms deep. They are ready to operate not only on Lake Ontario, but on the upper lakes as well.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much capital have they invested?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I cannot tell, but I know that they have the most complete wrecking appliances on the inland waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. They have \$30,000 invested, about one-fifth of what Carter Bros. have.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No matter how much it is, it is quite ample to do all the business, and they are not afraid to compete with Carter Bros. or any other firm. But, Sir, they are not the only wrecking company we have. Donnelly & Son, Calvin & Co. and all the other wreckers on Lake Ontario are anxious for this Bill to become law. I hold in my hand a letter from the Lake Superior Tug Company of Port Arthur, in which they say:

"We approve of the stand you have taken in regard to reciprocity in wrecking; that is, that the wrecking question should be settled on its own merits, and, while we approve of reciprocity in coasting, we do not think the question should be combined as Mr. Patterson puts them. We might say that we are the only tug owners on the northern or Canadian shore of Lake Superior, and if we cannot hold our own in competition with American companies we deserve to go under."

I am told, Sir, that the capital of the company to which I have referred is \$100,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much paid up?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. All of it, I suppose. I am not a member of it, and do not know anything about it; I am only giving you the information which is conveyed to me. This Bill, I say, is not promoted in the interest of any one firm or any one wrecking company. It is promoted in the interest of the ship owners on the inland waters of Canada, in the interest of 35,000 mariners who plough the waters of our great lakes, who risk their lives in stormy weather in all seasons of the year, and whose association has petitioned this House unanimously in favor of the Bill. It is also in the interest of the insurance companies. We are told that the Western Insurance Company went out of business; perhaps it was because there was not in Canada any good wrecking company. The very company with which the hon. member for North Norfolk is so well acquainted at Windsor, knows that the system which has been in vogue, of keeping the Canadian waters for Canadians, except when the Minister of Customs allows American tugs to come in, has been so beneficial to that company that it is almost in liquidation; if it is not fully so, it ought to be, because it cannot pay its debts. Am I wrong in that statement? I pause for a reply. Now, I am not going to detain the House any longer than simply to ask them to reject this amendment, because if it is

tacked on to the Bill it will practically destroy it, because it will prevent our people from taking advantage of the offer made by the United States Government. I may say that this Bill was prepared in its present shape with the concurrence of the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Justice. The hon. Minister of Customs in the debate which took place at a previous stage of this Bill, said :

"If we are to have a Bill at all, let us have one in words precisely of the same effect as that which the Americans give us, and no more."

I ask the House now to vote down the amendment, and to give the Bill its third reading.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish simply to strip this case of all verbiage and side issues, and present the plain direct question. We have a proposition from the American Government to surrender to them the advantages we possess in the matter of wrecking, and my amendment simply takes the ground that it is proper for us to make a counter offer proposing modifications to the offer of the Americans. These modifications I believe, will be accepted; but if we accept their offer without making a counter offer we part with all the means we have of procuring any concession, and rule ourselves out of court. I moved this amendment for the purpose of placing ourselves in the position of securing, if possible, some concession in this matter which will be of advantage to us. I do not oppose reciprocity in wrecking. I do not say, if these concessions were refused, that I would oppose my hon. friend's Bill, but I do say it is desirable to get these concessions, and if we do not take this way to get them, we will not get them. For this purpose I move the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot understand why either my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) or my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should have used the language they did in regard to this matter, nor can I understand on what principle the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) can defend his amendment. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) says that we should not give anything without getting something in return. Well, nobody proposes to do that. The Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) proposes to accept the offer already made by the United States. We do not propose to give them anything. The existing state of things has been pointed out to be what our friends on the other side used to call in the old low tariff days, "one-sided reciprocity." American vessels are now allowed to wreck in Canadian waters, but Canadian tugs are not allowed wrecking facilities in American waters. This Bill will have the effect of removing the disability on Canadian tugs and of allowing them the same advantages in American waters which American tugs enjoy in ours. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says illogically that he proposes to make the acceptance of the American offer contingent on their giving something else, and he does this, not for the purpose of preventing reciprocity in wrecking, but for the purpose of getting larger privileges. The only result of tacking on anything to the counter offer would be to postpone, at all events, if not entirely prevent the concluding of an arrangement which even my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says he would not object to if it came up by itself, and the other offers were rejected. The hon. gentleman said if the offer of reciprocity in towing was rejected, he would be prepared to support this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I did not. What I did say was that if this counter offer was rejected, I would not say that I would oppose my hon. friend's Bill. I did not say I would support it or oppose it.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend leaves himself entirely in the clouds as to what he would do in case the offer of reciprocity in towing was rejected, so that by accepting my

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

hon. friend's proposal and making the counter offer, which we know will have the effect of postponing reciprocity in wrecking for a year, we do not know where our hon. friend will be should that proposal be rejected. He may oppose reciprocity in wrecking then as strongly as he does now. The common sense of the House will prefer to accept a definite proposal instead of postponing the matter and probably making an agreement impossible forever. I would have no objection at all to a Bill which contained this proposal, that we should accept the Americans offer of wrecking in coasting, and making the offer that whenever they would be willing to give us reciprocity in towing and coasting we would do the like with them. I would not care to accept the Bill in the sense of the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk, even if it were accepted by the United States, because if we are to have reciprocity in wrecking and towing only, the Americans having larger plant than we, would simply run us out of the business in our own waters. If you put coasting along with that and get it accepted, that would be a different story, and the Bill of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), as it stood, embodying these three features was preferable to this narrow resolution of my hon. friend from North Norfolk.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I rise to say a few words in support of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). The merits of the Bill have been discussed in all their bearings. I will content myself with alluding to that which has been urged upon me in the strongest way possible by those interested in the carrying trade and commercial interests of Montreal. One and all are in favor of this Bill, and they surely know what are their best interests and what would be most to their own advantage. I trust, therefore, the House will accept the Bill as it stands without amendment.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to continue this discussion, nor would I have risen to my feet had it not been for a remark from the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), which must have left the impression in the House that I concurred in the principle involved in the Bill when he stated that I had been consulted as to the wording of it. It is quite true that I was consulted. The hon. gentleman showed me his Bill in connection with the Minister of Justice, not the Bill as it is before the House, and I pointed out its defects, and told him if he intended to do anything in reference to wrecking he should not, without an equivalent, propose to this House any greater concessions than were given in the American Bill. That is what I stated without committing myself at all to the principle of the measure. The hon. gentleman, if he had read a little further the remarks I made, would find that they referred exclusively to the suggestions of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I said that if we adopted the suggestions made by the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that the Bill should apply also to the sea coast, there would be no probability of its being accepted. With reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Casey) he, not intentionally I am sure, misled the House when he said the Americans were permitted to wreck in our waters. In no case have they been permitted to wreck in Canadian waters except where life was in danger or property at stake. In such cases, the Government considered the question became one of humanity, in so far as it affected the life of those who were on board the vessels, and in order to save the property of the country, I have given the permission required with the consent of my colleagues, in every case, no matter how restrictive the law might be. If the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) will permit me, I will say if the tug to which he referred refused to tow his vessel, under the circumstances he laid before the House, into a Canadian port, it was not because it would have been interfered with in a

case of that kind. But I presume the reason for the course that the tug owner took was that he had a longer distance to take the vessel in order to get it into an American port, and would make more money thereby, and no doubt, patriotic as they are, he thought that, by taking it into an American port, all the repairs necessary to that vessel, and the benefits arising therefrom would go to American artisans.

Mr. LAURIER. When the Bill passes, he will not have that temptation.

Mr. BOWELL. That is unrestricted reciprocity. I am, not arguing that question at present, but I am giving what I presume to have been the reasons which actuated him. I differ altogether from the leader of the Opposition in his statement that the temptation would not have been there if this Bill were passed. It matters not whether there was reciprocity in wrecking or not, if the tug-owner were actuated by the feelings which I have suggested, the interests of his own country would have led him to take that course no matter what privileges he might have in Canadian waters. It would be a question for the owner of the vessel of saving his vessel, and if the tug-owner refused to come into Canadian waters, he could not compel him to do so.

Mr. LABELLE. I would ask the Minister of Customs, if that tug that took our steamer down the Sault Ste. Marie canal had taken her to Owen Sound, would he not have seized her, because he took her on Cariboo Island on the Canadian side of Lake Superior? Would not the Customs officers have seized her at Owen Sound?

Mr. BOWELL. Not under these representations. I do not say they would not have seized her.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course, Customs officials have a duty to perform, but the moment a representation of that kind had been made to the department, the vessel would have been released.

Mr. MITCHELL. The position, as I understand it, is that the Customs Department would have seized the vessel and that they had a right to seize the American tug—

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL,—if she brought the vessel into a Canadian port. What, then, is the position of the American tug-owner? He says, am I going to place my vessel, which may be worth \$15,000, \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000 at the mercy of a Canadian Minister of Customs, in view of all the vagaries which that peculiar department has exhibited during the last few years. This is a case of humanity, and I trust every man in the House will support the motion.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Charlton :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dewdney,	Moffat,
Boisvert,	Dupont,	Montplaisir,
Bowell,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Boyle,	Freeman,	Porter,
Brown,	Gordon,	Prior,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Putnam,
Burdett,	Hickey,	Smith (Ontario),
Cameron,	Ives,	Taylor,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Temple,
Carpenter,	Kenny,	Thompson (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper,
Charlton,	McDougald (Pictou),	Vanasse,
Chisholm,	McKay,	Wallace,
Cimon,	McMillan (Vandrenuil),	White (Uardwell),
Cochrane,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Colby,	Madill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Corby,	Mara,	Wilson (Lennox),
Coulombe,	Marshall,	Wood (West'm'land)—56.
Dessaulniers,	Mills (Annapolis),	

NAMES :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Flynn,	Masson,
Armstrong,	Gauthier,	Meigs,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gigault,	Mills (Bothwell),
Baird,	Godbout,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Grandbois,	Moncrieff,
Beausoleil,	Guay,	Mulock,
Béchar, d,	Guillet,	Nevau,
Bell,	Hale,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Hall,	Perry,
Bergin,	Holton,	Purcell,
Bernier,	Hudspeth,	Rinfret,
Borden,	Innes,	Riopel,
Bourassa,	Joncas,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Brien,	Kirk,	Rykert,
Campbell,	Kirkpatrick,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Labelle,	Scarth,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Scriver,
Choquette,	Lang,	Temple,
Cockburn,	Langelier (Montm'ency),	Shandy,
Couture,	Langelier (Quebec),	Skinner,
Curran,	Langewin (Sir Hector),	Small,
Daly,	La Rivière,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Davin,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Davis,	Livingston,	Sproule,
Dawson,	Lovitt,	Stevenson,
Denison,	Macdonald (Huron),	Sutherland,
De St. Georges,	Macdowall,	Trow,
Desjardins,	McCarthy,	Turcot,
Dessaint,	McOulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Dickey,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Waldie,
Doyon,	McGreedy,	Ward,
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Eisenhauer,	McKeen,	Weldon (Albert),
Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Fisher,	McMullen,	Yeo.—108.

Amendment negatived.

On the main motion,

Mr. CHARLTON. In order to give the House an opportunity to surrender most perfectly and unconditionally all chances of getting concessions from the American Government in this matter, I beg to complete this by moving the complement of the previous amendment. I move :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend it by adding to section 1 of the said Bill the following words:—  
"And United States tugs may tow vessels and rafts from one Canadian port to another in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States."

I regret very much the action of the House in this matter. I believe we have voluntarily and very absurdly surrendered our chances of obtaining reciprocity in wrecking.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. You must not reflect upon a vote of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Bill passes in its present shape, we have the satisfaction of going altogether without reciprocity in towing.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the acting leader of the Government what he proposes to do in the present exigency. It is a clear defeat of the Administration, though he himself voted for it as a saving clause, but I think it is a clear evidence of the condemnation of the course the Government have pursued, and the hon. gentleman should give an explanation of the action he intends to take.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like very much to know whether a decision has been arrived at between the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) and the Government with reference to the Bill standing in his name, that has been on

the Order Paper ever since the 4th of February. The Bill had an early birth, and it has been standing there from that day to this. It is a Bill of considerable importance, and seriously affects some of the industries of the country. I should like to know whether the promoter of the Bill intends to go on with it, and whether the Government intends to allow legislation of that kind. The Bill proposes to interfere with a trade in which many people are engaged. At this season of the year the nurserymen are under the necessity of making their purchases, of making arrangements for their supplies, and bringing from the United States the trees necessary to carry on their business during the coming year. I, therefore, think that it is only fair for the trade and for the country that we should have some statement from the promoter of the Bill, or from the Government, as to what is going to be done about it.

Mr. BOYLE. I do not think it will take so long a time to pass the Bill as the hon. gentleman has occupied just now in asking about it. I was prepared to go on with the Bill when it was reached on the last occasion, but the House desired to adjourn, and I could not move it. I am prepared to go on now, if the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me to do so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After the long sitting of yesterday, hon. members on both sides of the House with whom I have consulted, are of the opinion that we should adjourn now. To-morrow and Friday are Government days, when we shall have to sit much longer than we are sitting this evening, and unless we take a little rest we cannot do so.

Mr. LAURIER. On next Monday the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity, I presume, to move his Bill, as it is private members' day, and I understand that it will stand as the first order.

Mr. WALLACE. There are some other Bills immediately following this one, which I think the House has been promised an opportunity to discuss. I think we should proceed with the business to-night, and work a little later. I have brought a Bill before the House, and the Government have promised full opportunity for discussing it. I would like to know from the leader of the House when the Government proposes to take that up, because if the Bill is put off until next Monday, there will be no sitting of the House on that day, and these Bills that are on the list will have to be postponed until next Monday week, and the Bill of the hon. member for Monck, being the first on the list, it will throw mine back indefinitely. I would like to know from the Government when the Bill that I have introduced will have a chance of being considered.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say this evening, but I will mention the matter to the First Minister, so that when we meet again my hon. friend will be able to obtain an answer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. leader of the House has not answered my question, whether the Government intend to allow the Bill of the hon. member for Monck to go on and when. If it is to pass it certainly ought to be proceeded with, if it is not to pass, and I hope it will not, I think it is only due to the parties engaged in the line of business to which I have alluded, that the Government should make some announcement as to their intention in regard to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. This Bill is not in the hands of the Government. It is in the hands of a private member, and I understood from the promoter of the Bill that the first time it is reached again he will be ready to move the second reading.

Mr. BOYLE. I can scarcely understand the impetuosity of the hon. member for Elgin in respect to this matter.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

He is evidently suffering from congestion of the brain, or some such ailment. If he complains that the Bill is a detrimental one, surely in the natural order of things, the longer it is put off the better for him and his view of the subject. So far as I am concerned, there has been no unreasonable delay. The Bill unfortunately has been reached just at the time that the House desires to adjourn. Of course it is in the hands of the Government, because when they call for an adjournment the House must adjourn unless the Government are willing to sit longer. I will endeavor to meet the views of the hon. member for Elgin, and I will move the second reading at the earliest occasion. So far as I know, in order to correct some misapprehension, there is nothing in the way of its becoming law.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st March, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BELLEVILLE HARBOR.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) respecting the harbor of Belleville, in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of this Bill?

Mr. TUPPER. It is simply to put the harbor into commission.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will that involve any expenditure?

Mr. TUPPER. I understand that the hon. gentleman means that, in that case, the Bill should be introduced by resolution, but the Act which is repealed by this Bill provides that certain fees shall be collected by the town of Belleville. This Bill simply provides for putting the harbor in commission, and there is no change in regard to the fees. Therefore it does not require any resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill amending the Dominion Lands Act?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is the intention.

### EMPLOYÉES ON THE CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRK asked, Are William Stewart, Archibald Cameron, Wentworth McDonald, Joseph Freer and Daniel McGregor, or either of them, employed by the Government in connection with the Cape Breton Railway? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. William Stewart is not employed on the Cape Breton Railway. Cameron, McDonald, Freer and McGregor are employed by the Government in connection with the Cape Breton Railway: Cameron, as overseer, at \$75 per month; McDonald, as track boss, at \$115 a month; Freer, as masonry inspector, at \$80 a month, and McGregor, as walking boss, at \$115.

### JOLIETTE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. NEVEU asked, 1. When did the contract for carrying the mail between Lanoraie Station and Joliette expire, or when will it expire? 2. To whom has the new contract,

if any, for carrying the mail between those two places, been awarded, and what is the amount to be paid in money?

Mr. HAGGART. This contract will expire on the 31st March, 1889. The new contract has not been awarded.

ADULTERATION OF LARD.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the extensive adulteration of lard imported from the United States, as shown by the Report of the Chief Analyst in Bulletin No. 7 of the Inland Revenue Department, to provide against its being brought into this country, either by increased duty or otherwise?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is not in a position to give an explicit answer to this question at the present moment. It is engaging their consideration.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 98) to amend the "Winding-up Act," chapter one hundred and twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SALARIES TO POSTMASTERS.

Mr. HAGGART moved that Bill (No. 100) further to amend the "Civil Service Act," chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes, be read the third time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall not renew the discussion which took place in committee on this Bill, but I would simply say that the arguments which were used on that occasion, notably by the First Minister, have entirely failed to convince me, for one, that there is any propriety in giving our postmasters in the large cities a salary larger than that given to the permanent head of the department. I, therefore, move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed for the purpose of amending the same by providing "that the salaries of postmasters shall not exceed the sum of \$3,200, being the amount paid to the deputy head of the Post Office Department."

Mr. HAGGART. For a number of years, in fact since 1874, the salary paid to the postmaster at Montreal has been \$4,000 a year. In this Bill it is proposed to leave it optional to the Postmaster General to increase the salary of the postmaster at Toronto to the amount of salary paid to the postmaster in Montreal, and to increase the salary of the postmaster at Ottawa \$200 per annum. This Bill is for the purpose of giving power to introduce into the Estimates these increases. These sums will be placed in the Estimates, and a vote of the House can then be taken on it.

House divided on the amendment.

YEAS :  
Messieurs

- |                         |                        |                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Armstrong,              | Ellis,                 | Meigs,             |
| Bain (Wentworth),       | Fiset,                 | Mills (Bothwell),  |
| Barron,                 | Fisher,                | Mitchell,          |
| Béchar, d,              | Flynn,                 | Mulock,            |
| Bernier,                | Gauthier,              | Neveu,             |
| Borden,                 | Godbout,               | Paterson (Brant),  |
| Bourassa,               | Guay,                  | Platt,             |
| Bowman,                 | Holton,                | Rinfret,           |
| Brien,                  | Innes,                 | Robertson,         |
| Campbell,               | Jones (Halifax),       | Rowand,            |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich.), | Kirk,                  | St. Marie,         |
| Casey,                  | Landerkin,             | Scriver,           |
| Casgrain,               | Lar, g,                | Semple,            |
| Charlton,               | Langelier (Montm'ency) | Somerville,        |
| Choquette,              | Langelier (Quebec),    | Trow,              |
| Cook,                   | Laurier,               | Turcot,            |
| Couture,                | Lister,                | Waldie,            |
| De St. Georges,         | Livingston,            | Watson,            |
| Dessaint,               | Lovitt,                | Weldon (St. John), |
| Doyon,                  | Macdonald (Huron),     | Welsh,             |
| Edgar,                  | McIntyre,              | Wilson (Elgin),    |
| Edwards,                | McMillan (Huron),      | Yeo.—68.           |
| Eisenhauer,             | McMullen,              |                    |

NAYS :  
Messieurs

- |                           |                        |                      |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Archibald,                | Foster,                | Moffat,              |
| Audet,                    | Freeman,               | Moncrieff,           |
| Bain (Soulanges),         | Gigault,               | Montplaisir,         |
| Barnard,                  | Girouard,              | O'Brien,             |
| Bergeron,                 | Gurdon,                | Patterson (Essex),   |
| Bergin,                   | Grandbois,             | Perley,              |
| Boisvert,                 | Gillet,                | Porter,              |
| Bowell,                   | Haggart,               | Prior,               |
| Brown,                    | Hall,                  | Putnam,              |
| Bryson,                   | Hesson,                | Riopel,              |
| Burns,                    | Hickey,                | Robillard,           |
| Cameron,                  | Hudspeth,              | Ross,                |
| Cargill,                  | Joncas,                | Rykert,              |
| Carlug,                   | Jones (Digby),         | Soarsh,              |
| Carpenter,                | Kenny,                 | Shanly,              |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe),      | Kirkpatrick,           | Skinner,             |
| Chisholm,                 | Labelle,               | Small,               |
| Cimon,                    | Labrosse,              | Smith (Ontario),     |
| Cochrane,                 | Landry,                | Sproule,             |
| Colby,                    | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Stevenson,           |
| Corby,                    | LaRivière,             | Taylor,              |
| Costigan,                 | Lépine,                | Templ,               |
| Coughlin,                 | Macdonald (Sir John),  | Thérien,             |
| Coulombe,                 | Macdowall,             | Thompson (Sir John), |
| Curran,                   | McCulla,               | Tisdale,             |
| Daly,                     | McDonald (Victoria),   | Tupper,              |
| Daoust,                   | McDougald (Pictou),    | Tyrwhitt,            |
| David,                    | McDougall (U. Breton), | Vanasse,             |
| Davis,                    | McGreevy,              | Wallace,             |
| Dawson,                   | McKay,                 | Ward,                |
| Denison,                  | McKeen,                | We don (Albert),     |
| Desaulniers,              | McMillan (Vaudreuil),  | White (Kenfrew),     |
| Desjardins,               | McNeill,               | Wilmot,              |
| Dewdney,                  | Madill,                | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Dupont,                   | Mara,                  | Wilson (Lennox),     |
| Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), | Marshall,              | Wood (Brockville),   |
| Ferguson (Kenfrew),       | Masson,                | Wood (Westm'd)—113.  |
| Ferguson (Welland),       | Mills (Annapolis),     |                      |

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 469) amending the Customs Act.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister will require to give some explanation in regard to some portions of this resolution which are not very plain.

Mr. BOWELL. My intention was to allow the resolution to be read, and then to explain each of the sections if the committee desired it. I may say further, that my intention is, as soon as the Bill has been laid before the House, to place before each member an explanation of the reasons for making the changes in these different clauses, in order that hon. members may be in full possession of the reasons that actuated the department in asking a change in the Customs Act. If, however, it is the opinion of the committee that we should discuss the matter now, before hon. members have the Bill in its entirety, and the explanations before them, I shall be quite willing to give a synopsis of the changes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, at all events, an explanation should be given with respect to the clause that provides for the cost of transshipment being added in all cases to the value for duty, in order that we may know what the intention of the Minister is in respect to it.

Mr. BOWELL. If the committee desire, I will give a short explanation at the present time, and afterwards will lay a fuller explanation before the House, as I did when the amendment to the Customs Act was proposed two years ago. I may say that the changes which I propose are not of that radical character which one would suppose them to be, from having read the comments which have been made upon them by various newspapers in the country. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not find

fault with those comments, because the resolutions are so vague that I am not at all surprised they were misunderstood and misinterpreted. The proposition is to amend the 33rd section of the Customs Act, so as to prevent the bringing into the country, during the night, of goods in waggons and sleighs and placing the same restriction upon parties so bringing in goods—except it be with permission of the Customs officers, who of necessity would have a knowledge of what the goods were and where they were going to, so that they could follow them in the morning—as is applied to goods brought into the country by vessels or any other conveyance. At present goods are brought over at all hours of the night, just across the frontier, and particularly down in the Eastern Townships and other places where there is but an imaginary line between the two countries. If the parties are caught bringing them in, no matter at what hour of the night, they say, "Oh, we intended to go to the Custom house in the morning." When they were caught probably they would go, but if not, the probabilities are they would not go.

Mr. SCRIVER. Will the hon. Minister allow me to ask what is meant by "the night;" is it all the hours of darkness? If it becomes dark at five in the afternoon, as it does in the autumn, is "night" supposed to last from that hour until 8 o'clock the following morning? That is a very important consideration to the people of the Eastern Townships, and to the inhabitants living along that part of the frontier of whom the Minister seems to have such a poor opinion.

Mr. BOWELL. I have expressed no opinion of the gentlemen or the inhabitants who live along the frontier. So far as my remarks apply, they apply to a certain class of residents with whom my hon. friend who has just spoken is as intimate and as well acquainted as I am, and if I wanted a witness in this House to show the propriety of adopting a clause of this kind, the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) would be the man I would look to.

Mr. SCRIVER. I will have something to say on that hereafter.

Mr. BOWELL. What is intended by "night" in this resolution is after office hours, no matter what time that may be. But if the wording is not sufficient to cover that, I am quite prepared to make any amendment that may be suggested.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is the first time I ever knew you to be prepared to make an amendment to the Customs Act, and I have tried to get amendments pretty often.

Mr. BOWELL. I have been charged on more than one occasion by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), with making too many changes, of a restrictive rather than a liberal character.

Mr. MITCHELL. I said amendments, not changes.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood what you said perfectly well. An amendment is a change whether for good or bad. The 61st clause is to make the law applicable in respect to the "value for duty" on all goods, no matter from what part of the world they may be imported. It has been stated that the proposition was to add the transportation charges to the port of entry, but such is not the case. As the law reads at present the provision is as follows:—

"In determining the dutiable value of goods, except when imported from Great Britain and Ireland, there shall be added to the cost, or the actual wholesale price, 'for duty,' all the expenses included from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or by water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either *in transitu* to or direct to Canada."

The proposition simply is to strike out the words "except when imported from Great Britain and Ireland." Thus placing the goods purchased in Great Britain and Ireland

Mr. BOWELL.

in the same position as those which are bought in the interior of Russia, Germany or France.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is not loyal.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will wait until I am through my explanation, he may find it is strictly in the line of loyalty.

Mr. MULLOCK. All right, we will wait.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I will be able to make my remarks much shorter and my information better understood by the House if gentlemen will not interrupt quite so much. There is another proposition to change this clause so as to make it clearer what is really meant by the "value for duty." At present you will notice the Act says "there shall be added to the cost, or the actual wholesale price or fair market value." I propose to change that wording so that it shall more clearly bear the interpretation which has been given to it, that is, to make the value for duty the price which is paid in the country in which the goods are purchased; namely, in the proportions in which they are purchased. All merchants know that in going to a foreign market a wholesale purchaser who buys more extensively than another gets a larger discount, and as the law is based upon what is termed a fair market value, that in all cases has been ruled to be the "value for duty." I hope I have made myself understood upon that point?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Which clause are you explaining in your resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. Clause 61, of the Customs Act. I may state that the principal reason for striking out this exception as regards Great Britain, was from the fact, that the working of this clause was brought under the notice of the Imperial Government by Germany, calling attention to the fact that a treaty existed between Great Britain and the German Empire, which was entered into in 1866, before Confederation, and in which what is termed the "most favored nation clause" is accorded by Great Britain to Germany, and the other countries, which became a party to that treaty, and in that treaty the colonies are included.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How will that affect the bounty on sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. That cannot affect the bounty on sugar.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why not?

Mr. BOWELL. Because it is governed by another clause, and because the bounty on sugar is applicable to all countries, it matters not from where purchased. If England, to-morrow, were to grant a bounty on sugars exported from Great Britain to Canada, the amount of the bounty would be added to the value of the sugar for duty; consequently, the favored nation clause could not apply, because Great Britain would have no advantage in shipping sugar to Canada, over Germany, Hungary, or Austria.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman did not quite catch my idea. What I wanted to enquire was, in the case of sugar exported from Germany under the bounty system, how would this clause enable you to add the bounty?

Mr. BOWELL. As I have already explained, that is governed by another clause altogether. There is a special provision in the tariff, and also in this Act, which gives power to add the amount of a bounty or royalty, or any other commission or privilege granted by any country from which goods are imported.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is not important, I admit, under our system of testing by polariscope.

Mr. BOWELL. In that case it does not apply, but it does apply wherever the *ad valorem* principle is adopted,

even to sugar tested under the polariscope. However, this clause will not in any way interfere with that. As I was explaining, the attention of the Government having been called to the working of this provision of the law, there were but two courses to pursue: to abolish the principle of adding to the value for duty the inland transportation to the port whence the goods are shipped, or to take out the exemption in the clause. When the House learns that the charges upon goods coming from the interior of the continent add to the value of goods for duty about 50 per cent.—the German despatch says 60 per cent.—it will be apparent that the charges for inland transportation could not be repealed. Goods are purchased at such a very low price in the interior that the cost of transportation to the port of shipment is in many cases greater than the cost of the article itself; and those who have had any experience of the working of the Customs Act, and of the difficulties that always present themselves as to the true value, know that the safest way is to make the value for duty that at the last port of exportation. If that would raise the value too high, and make the duty too onerous, then it would be better to reduce *pro rata* the rate of duty imposed than to remove the cost of transportation altogether. The amendment of the 62nd clause is simply to place it in accord with the resolution to which I have already referred. The 64th clause is so amended as to make clear that the value for duty shall include the value of any royalty, rent or charge made for exclusive right to any territorial limit in which to sell or use any machine or goods, and to compel the addition of such value to the invoice. The only difference in that clause is the addition of the words, "or use." At present, if the importer of any foreign article is given any commission by a reduction of value or royalty, or if a bounty is given to those who export, that is now added to the value of the duty; but instances occur in which a person has his invoice made out to state that the goods are for use, and not for sale. Under these circumstances the law did not apply, though after the goods were entered, and after the purchaser used them for a short time, he could place them in the market for sale at an advantage over those who had the royalty added to the value of the goods they brought in for sale. The next provision is simply to give authority to the Board of Customs, that is, the Dominion Appraisers, over port appraisers. As the law now stands, it is in doubt whether the ruling of a port appraiser as to the value for duty of imported goods, however erroneous it may be, can be overruled. The amendment is in the interest of uniformity, and instances have occurred in which the Board of Customs knew goods to be undervalued, or overvalued, as the case might be, by a local appraiser; and under clause 62, it was doubtful whether he, being a sworn officer, could be overruled by the authorities at headquarters. For instance, the sugar inspector reports to the department that certain sugar is undervalued. The appraiser in Montreal said: "No, I have taken the oath of office; I believe the entry, as I allowed it to pass, is correct, and I will not change it." The intention of this amendment is to give power to the Board of Appraisers, consisting of the inspector, and such others as we might add to the board, to go and make a full investigation into a dispute of that kind, and report to the department; and if the department thought the evidence was sufficient to warrant the raising or lowering of the value, they would have authority to do so, and to relieve the local appraiser of any conscientious scruples he might have in the matter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is quite proper.

Mr. BOWELL. The 89th section of the Act is so amended as to make clear that goods entered for warehouse must be warehoused at once, some importers having claimed that there was no absolute law requiring immediate action,

they could take their time or save the trouble of removing the goods in case they could dispose of them before being called to account for the duty. Instances have occurred of this character. A man imports goods and puts them in the sufferance warehouse, refusing to put them at once in the bonded warehouse, where they would be under lock and key; and it has been claimed that he has a right to do that because the law gives him power to sell the goods without being placed in bond; and a dispute has arisen as to whether the Custom house authorities have the right to enforce bonding at once unless the duty is paid, and the goods are transferred to the buyer. I think merchants will see the importance of a clause of this kind, in order to make the law clear, and to prevent as much as possible disputes between Customs officials and the importer, as these cases are constantly cropping up.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What class of goods would that apply to?

Mr. BOWELL. It would apply to all classes of goods. If a merchant imports a chest of tea he can sell it immediately on its arrival, and transfer it at once. The entry has to be made whether there is duty or not. If the law permitted the merchants to hold the goods for two or three days, it would necessitate officers watching them all the time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is it going to reduce the time merchants now have for warehousing?

Mr. BOWELL. No, not as it has been practiced. I do not propose either to extend or restrict the time, but simply to make the provision so plain that the merchant, on reading it, will exactly understand what his privileges are. The next provision is a new one. It has been deemed advisable to have some means by which we can, as far as practicable, ascertain the actual transit trade of the country, and I ask for power to enable me to give instructions at the frontier ports to keep a record of all goods brought into the country and passed through it. I do not anticipate being able to obtain an accurate record. That could not be got without imposing onerous duties on those engaged in the trade. I want power, however, to enable the officer to compel either the steamboat owner or the railway proprietor to give us a statement of the number of cars entered at any one port, and, as near as he can, the contents.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have we not that power now?

Mr. BOWELL. It is doubtful, and I thought it better that it should be placed beyond peradventure. The object is to add to our Trade and Navigation Returns something similar to that which we find in the American Trade and Navigation Returns, that is, a statement of the inland transportation of goods. They have it, to a certain extent, through the interstate trade. But what I propose to find out at present is the transit trade through Canada.

Mr. SCRIVER. Would the collectors at the frontier ports be called on to obtain that information?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; we want, as far as possible, to have that done. If fifty cars are entered in one train, we want to have a report of the number of cars, and, as far as practicable, their contents. The next clause is to define the time at which goods are exported from a foreign country. The law now provides that the value for duty shall be the value at the time of exportation. It is contended that if a vessel is loading with sugar, for instance, in Jamaica, and she lies at the wharf for three months, and takes part of her cargo at the beginning of May, and does not sail until the 1st of August, the goods which were placed on board in August, as well as those taken on board the 1st of May, should be considered as having been exported at the time they were put on board the vessel. Instances have occurred when vessels commenced loading molasses, the



molasses was selling at from 14 to 15 cents, but by the time the vessel left molasses was selling at 18 cents per gallon. The price fluctuated from 14 to 18 cents during the whole three months. When the merchant made his entry the officer at the port said the value of the molasses at the time the vessel sailed should rule the whole cargo. He replied that the Act provides that if you export any article from this country to another, the date of exportation is the time at which the goods are placed on the vessel. In order to avoid any dispute in the future, I propose to adopt the clause which is in the American Act governing this point. Article 500 of the American Rules and Regulations is as follows:—

“The time of exportation must be deemed and taken to be the date at which the merchandise actually leaves the foreign port for its destination in the United States, which period may ordinarily be established by the production of the clearance granted to the vessel at the foreign port and the declaration of the master, under oath, at the time of the entry, and of the date when the vessel sailed.”

The insertion of a clause of that kind will prevent, in the future, all trouble between merchants and the Customs authorities.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You propose to take the value of the last port shipped, whether higher or lower?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. There have been many cases in which the merchant has purchased in a foreign country and the goods had fallen in price before the vessel left. Their invoices have been reduced for duty, and they paid the duty on the reduced value.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Done voluntarily by the Customs Department?

Mr. BOWELL. It has been done when the attention of the department was called to it. We are not such exacters as you think we are.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think, under the construction the hon. gentleman is going to place on the Act, it would be rather difficult or unfair to value the cargo at the highest rate. The importations of molasses now come chiefly from the British Islands and Porto Rico. We used to get a large quantity from Cuba, but, since we are importing from Porto Rico and the British Islands, there are various grades. For instance, there might be fifty puncheons at 20 cents, and more at 18 cents, and more at 24 cents. It would, therefore, be according to the different values that the duty should be levied, and it would not be fair to apply the principle to the whole cargo at the highest rate.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. That does not apply. My argument was on the general principle. If a merchant went to the West Indies and purchased fifty puncheons of molasses at 20 cents, and twenty puncheons at 10 cents, and sailed the next day, and the value the next day was 20 cents and 10 cents, that is the price which he could enter them at. The only object of the clause is to define the duty at the place of exportation. If you had purchased an article worth 20 cents, and it lay at the wharf for a month, and the price went up to 25 cents, then you would have to pay on the 25 cents. If, on the other hand, the price had declined to 15 cents, the value for duty would be 15 cents. The next two clauses are simply intended to place money which has been paid in lieu of goods which may have been seized in precisely the same position as the goods themselves would be in case they had been taken into the possession of the Customs Department. At present, if goods are seized for the crime of smuggling, they are held. If, on the contrary, the merchant says, I do not wish you to take these goods, but I will pay the duty-paid value of them, the proposition is to place that money in precisely the same position as the goods would be in case they were in the custody of the Customs.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will you sell the money at auction?

Mr. BOWELL. No, there is no necessity for that, because there is no difficulty in getting rid of the money. If under the law, goods will not sell for the amount of duty, they should be destroyed, but, as a rule, money is worth its face. These amendments are simple in their character, and are only intended to make the Act more workable, and to prevent, as much as possible, friction between the importers and the exporters. The only really important change which will affect the rate of duty which the merchant has to pay, is one to which I called attention at more length than any others, and that is the repeal of the exception as to Great Britain and Ireland, in reference to the adding to the value of an invoice the cost of inland transportation to find the value of the goods for duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Customs has largely drawn our Customs law from the Customs law of the United States, and, in some of the changes he is now proposing, he is availing himself of the arrangements which have been made over there in regard to the collection of the revenue. I would like the Minister to give us his views in regard to transshipment a little more fully, and I would ask him if it is not true that the United States law has been changed in that regard, and that, while at one time they added the inland transshipment charges in order to ascertain the value for duty, they have repealed that, and they are not added in that country now in any case? If that be so, I would ask the Minister, simply for information from his knowledge of the workings of this law, what are the advantages to be gained by adding these inland transshipment charges to the actual value of the goods? Is it for the mere purpose of securing greater revenue? Does he, or does he not, conceive that, by the maintenance of these charges, preference may be given to one market in a foreign country over another? Does he think that the United States have accomplished a reform when they abandon *in toto* the inland transshipment charges?

Mr. BOWELL. Have they abandoned them? Does the hon. gentleman say they have?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will not speak positively, but that is my impression.

Mr. BOWELL. The latest authority I have is that it is not so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My question is proceeding upon that supposition. I thought I saw a work in the library which led me to understand that it was so. There was an enquiry before a sub-committee, in which the officer at New York was summoned to give testimony, and he stated that it was his individual opinion that those charges should be re-imposed; so that I took it for granted that the charges had been abandoned. I ask this question, because, while it may strike a person not having the means of information which the Minister has, that while the adding of those charges might secure more revenue for the country, and might act more favorably to merchants in one port than in other ports in the same kingdom, that might be outweighed by other considerations.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot speak positively upon the question which the hon. gentleman has asked me, but I will make enquiry in regard to it. The latest authority I have on the subject, which I will not quote at length, says, amongst other things:

“All such merchandise, being manufactured of wool, or of which wool shall be a component part, shall, in every such appraisal, be estimated to have been that at the time of exportation, and at the place whence the same was imported into the United States.”

So I draw the conclusion from this, that the price at the last place of exportation, would be the value for duty.

Whether that has been changed or not, I am not prepared to say. In regard to the advantages or disadvantages to which the hon. gentleman referred, I may say, that this law has been upon the Statute-book for a good many years before I had anything to do with the Customs, and I have always understood that the object of making the value of the goods the value at the place whence they were last exported, was not so much from a revenue standpoint, but was, in order to obtain, as nearly as possible, a uniformity of price upon the same article. The great difficulty which presented itself in the past, was in reference to goods purchased in the interior of Russia, in the interior of Germany, and in many other continental countries, where the goods are purchased at so low a price that really they have scarcely any value. It was deemed advisable, in order to secure uniformity, to provide that the value for duties should be taken in the principal markets of the country where the goods are produced, and at the port of shipment. There is no doubt, however, that by adding the inland transportation to the face of the invoice, it increases the value of the article for duty, and to that extent increases the revenue. I called attention to that, I think, when I was referring to the question before. From my experience of this Act I am satisfied that to change it, or to repeal it, would lead to a great deal of trouble and a great deal of confusion with regard to the question of undervaluation. Since my hon. friend put that question to me, the Commissioner has sent me a note, in which he says:

"See 2907 of Revised Statutes of the United States, containing provisions for collection of duties on inland transportation. It includes also charges for packages, putting up and preparing the goods for transportation, with many other particulars."

I should judge from this that all the inland charges are added to the value of the goods for duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am still under the impression—and I speak subject to correction, as the Minister does not know—that while that law prevailed with reference to adding the inland charges, for many years, three or four years ago a change was made. However, that can be ascertained, but when the Bill is introduced I will try to be in a position to know more positively.

Mr. BOWELL. I will look it up.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand the position taken by the Minister of Customs with respect to the value of goods at the time of shipment, but I would like the Minister to say how he would construe the expense of placing the goods on board the vessel at the port of shipment. For instance, take a cargo of molasses of which the loading may cost 50 cents or \$1 a puncheon. There is an *ad valorem* duty on the barrel; would the hon. gentleman hold that to apply to the expense of placing it on board the vessel?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to make any change in the law as it stands at present, with reference to any country. I only define the time of exportation, and whatever would apply to an article as the law stands now with reference to the charges, whatever they may be, will continue in the future; there is no addition or diminution.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes; but the hon. gentleman says that he defines the value of the goods to be the value at the time of shipment at the place where the vessel lies, plus the inland expenses of bringing them to the port for shipment. I merely desire to know whether he would consider that the expense of placing them on board the vessel should also be included in their value?

Mr. BOWELL. Whatever is included in these words, section 61, without the exception:

"In determining the dutiable value of goods, there shall be added to the cost, or the actual wholesale price or fair market value at the time of exportation, in the principal markets of the country from whence the

same has been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transshipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth and production."

And so on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How would the hon. gentleman interpret that himself?

Mr. BOWELL. If you have a case in dispute, send it over to me and I will give you an answer.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would be glad to have an explanation from the hon. Minister concerning a case that is happening every day. I would like to know how this clause is going to work in the following case. We have in Quebec importers of furs; they purchase large quantities of furs in Nijni Novgorod, and Leipsic, and many other places in Europe. These furs are carried inland to a port in France, generally to Havre, to be imported to Quebec. Will the duty be charged on the whole cost of transportation inland, say, from Nijni Novgorod, or Leipsic, to Havre, in France, or to Liverpool—would the cost of transportation be added to the cost of purchase?—because the whole cost of inland transportation from any place in Russia where these furs are purchased, to the port of shipment, is very considerable. It would make the importation of these articles almost impossible. The purchase price is very low, but the cost of inland transportation to Havre or Liverpool is very high. I would like to know if, in that case, the cost of inland transportation is to be added under this new provision?

Mr. BOWELL. The cost of inland transportation that was paid in Russia to the port of shipment from Russia—

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). There is no port of shipment from Russia.

Mr. BOWELL. How do they get out? How do they get to England?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). They are carried by rail to Havre or to Liverpool. The distance is immense, as the hon. gentleman knows, and the cost would be a very serious item, because these people do a very large trade with Russia and Germany in these furs. I know, as a matter of fact, that they are carried by land to Havre or Liverpool and thence shipped to Quebec.

Mr. BOWELL. The value for duty would be that at the principal market of the country in which they are purchased. That is the law now, and I do not propose to change it. If they are bought at Leipsic, that would be the place from which they would be last shipped for Liverpool, and the price at Leipsic would be the price for duty. If they were purchased in St. Petersburg and then shipped to France or England for Canada, the price at St. Petersburg would be the value for the duty.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). But I cannot see how the resolution can be construed in that way. The resolution says that in every case the value, which includes the charges for transportation and shipment, shall be the value for duty. The charge for transportation would certainly include the price of transportation from Leipsic, for instance, to Havre, because there is no transshipment. Those goods come directly from Nijni Novgorod or Leipsic, which are the great fur markets of Europe, to Havre for transshipment, so that the port of shipment is generally Havre or Liverpool.

Mr. BOWELL. Does not the hon. gentleman see that the goods are not purchased at Havre, and the law strictly provides, and very pointedly, that it must be the principal market of the country in which the goods are purchased. If the hon. gentleman went to Paris, or to Havre, and purchased his furs, then the price he paid there would be the value for duty. That is the law, and I do not propose to change it.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). What would this clause mean? I want to know what is going to be the effect of the proposed law on the case I mentioned.

Mr. BOWELL. I thought I had explained half a dozen times that there is no proposal to change the law in that respect. The only change I have suggested is to strike out the exemption in the 61st clause, which applies to Great Britain and Ireland, and then the law stands precisely as it stood before.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think my hon. friend's proposition was this: Where would the value be taken? The idea of the Minister of Customs is that you take the goods at their original cost, plus the expenses of bringing them to the port of shipment, be it at Havre or at Liverpool.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I understand the point of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier). The difficulty has arisen from the wording of the Act, because it says, "to the vessel." Take for instance, a car load of coal, or a car load of iron from Pittsburg to Toronto. There is no transshipment, and in such cases there is nothing in the law enabling the department to add the inland transportation from Pittsburg to the bridge where it crosses. But if the car had gone to Buffalo, and it had been placed on a vessel, then the law provides for the case. I suppose it will apply to a certain extent to the case put by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I might, perhaps, now bring to the attention of the Minister of Customs a question in order that he may examine more closely into it, as he says he will do in regard to the whole subject; and I do so not in any captious spirit, but in order to obtain information. I may say that, although we have a large library, it appears there is only one copy of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and it is difficult to get information. I now desire to refer to an enquiry made by a sub-committee of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate to conduct investigations ordered by a certain resolution, the members of the committee being Senators Allison, Aldrich, Miller, Beck and McPherson. I notice that they commenced their examination on February 12th, 1886, in New York, and they had the collector of that port before them to give testimony. Touching the first subject on the list the collector said:

"We want a change of the principle entirely. I do not feel disposed to criticise the legislative body, but I expressed the opinion at the time, that it was a great mistake when the seven sections of the Act of March 3rd, 1883, was adopted, and the best thing that could be done now to remedy this evil of undervaluation is for Congress to repeal that section and re-enact section 2907 of the Revised Statutes."

I think this is the one given by the Minister of Customs as being in force in the United States. I continue to quote:

"Mr. BECK. I suggest that you read those sections.

"Mr. HEDDEN. Very well (reading):

"Section 7. That sections 2907 and 2908 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 14 of the Act intitled: 'An Act to amend the Customs-revenue laws and to repeal moietyies,' approved June 22nd, 1874, be and the same are hereby repealed, and hereafter none of the charges imposed by said sections or any other provisions of existing law shall be estimated in obtaining the value of goods to be imported, nor shall the value of the usual and necessary sacks, crates, boxes, or covering of any kind be estimated as part of a value in determining the amount of duties for which they are liable; provided, That if any packages, sacks, crates, boxes, or coverings of any kind, shall be of any material or form designed to evade duties thereon, or designed for use otherwise than in the *bona fide* transportation of goods to the United States, the same shall be subject to a duty of 100 per centum *ad valorem* upon the actual value of the same.

"Section 2907 reads as follows (reading):

"In determining the dutiable value of merchandise, there shall be added to the cost, or to the actual wholesale price or general market value at the time of exportation in the principal markets in the country from whence the same has been imported into the United States, the cost of transportation, shipment and transshipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made to the United States; the value of the sack, box, or covering of any kind in

Mr. BOWELL.

which such merchandise is contained, commission at the usual rates, but in no case less than 2½ per centum and brokerage, export duty, and all other actual and usual charges for putting up, repairing, and packing for transportation or shipment."

That was section 2907 of the Revised Statutes, which the Minister said enforced those provisions; but the Collector of Customs, New York, testified that subsequently section 7 of an Act passed in 1883 repealed that section, and it expressly declared in the words I have already read that section 2907, embodying the provisions we have in our Statute, was repealed. I was sure I had seen a statement to that effect, and that is why I present these facts now to the Minister. My question is this: The United States having adopted for years the provisions which are now on our Statute book, and having seen fit to repeal them, I ask the Minister of Customs to carefully consider the question as to whether it is in the interests of the public also to repeal these provisions here; as we have followed the United States very closely in imposing those conditions, we may follow them in relaxing the provisions.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman forgets that there is no proposition before the House to change that clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; but you are going to make it more stringent.

Mr. BOWELL. This clause has been on the Statute-book a great many years, long before the present policy was inaugurated. Whether it was copied from the statute of the United States—or they copied ours—I do not know, but the words are certainly alike. I quite agree with the collector of New York, who made that statement before the committee. It would be a great mistake and cause endless confusion and trouble if the clause were repealed in this country. The only effect so far as the importers are concerned is, that they have to pay a little more duty, while great confusion would arise if we were to determine the dutiable value of goods when the inland transportation was not added, or, in other words, to establish any other basis for value than that of the value of the goods in the principal markets of the country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to a practice prevailing in Montreal when horses for breeding purposes are brought into the country. A certificate of that fact, also a certificate of value and an affidavit is made by the individual when he goes to the Custom house, and the first statement made to him is to go and employ a Custom house broker. This is unjust to importers of stock. The charges made by these brokers are sometimes exorbitant, \$8 to \$10 for getting the papers passed through for two or three horses; I have also known not so much to be charged. But importers should not be compelled to make this payment. When they bring these papers and certificates they are all that should be asked, but it is an invariable custom of the Custom house officers to tell the importer to go and engage a broker. I am not speaking from hearsay, but from actual experience.

Mr. BOWELL. The complaint made is not a new one, I have heard it repeatedly, and instructions have been given that in no case should the Custom house officers refuse to take an entry from anyone. An officer is not allowed to make an entry, and he is not allowed to take a fee for it, for this reason: that if any mistake is made in the entries, whether designedly or not, if he made out the papers he would be held responsible for it, and if the importer gave wrong information designedly he would at once attribute the error to the Customs officials. Hence the Customs officials are not permitted to make out the papers, except in country places where parties perhaps cannot make them out themselves. But the officers have no right, as the hon. gentleman says, to tell anyone that he must get a broker. If my hon. friend went to Montreal, all he would

have to do is to demand the papers, for which he would pay for a duplicate copy, I think, five cents. He would have his pen and ink there, he could make out his entry without the aid of a broker, and the officials have no right to ask any importer to employ a broker.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The universal custom in my part of the country is to charge 50 cents for making out the papers. I do not so much object to that, but it is being ordered to employ a Custom house broker that I object to.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would like to ask if clause "b" of the resolution will provide for cases which must have come to the knowledge of the Minister of Customs, and which have caused a great deal of difficulty; that is, the difference in the manner of appraising goods at Quebec and Montreal. I have got several letters on this subject, and one, amongst others, states that Morocco skins undressed are to pay 10 per cent. by the tariff, but this same kind of goods if imported through Quebec pay 15 per cent., and if they are imported through Montreal 10 per cent. is only charged. Several complaints about this were made to the department by the importers in Quebec, but they got no satisfaction, and the result was that they found it to their advantage to import through Montreal, where they had to pay only 10 per cent. on the very same goods that 15 per cent. was charged on in Quebec. This is a discrimination against the importers of Quebec in favor of the importers of Montreal. It is quite possible that this was due to the circumstance mentioned by the hon. Minister a few moments ago, when he stated that until now the Minister or his deputy had no revision over the valuations made by the appraisers because they were under oath. If this clause is calculated to put an end to that system of irregular valuation, whereby the same goods are classified in one way in one port and in a different way in another port, it will be a great boon to the importers of the particular goods I have mentioned, as well as to importers of other goods. I think that this system whereby classification is not uniform should not be continued any longer.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) to further amend the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, What amount per annum has the Government paid, or is now paying, to the International Railway Company, or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any other parties, on account of the subsidy of \$250,000 granted by Parliament for the construction of a line from the St. Lawrence to Moncton, *via* Mattawamkeag and Harvey, and Fredericton to Salisbury? Do they intend to pay any portion of this subsidy for line completed to St. John, while the company fail to carry out the terms of their agreement by leaving that portion from Mattawamkeag to Harvey and Salisbury unfinished?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer to the first part of the question is; "The Government have not paid anything." As to the second part: "Do they intend to pay any portion of this subsidy for line completed to St. John, while the company fail to carry out the terms of their agreement by leaving that portion from Mattawamkeag to Harvey and Salisbury unfinished?" The answer is: "Yes, by an Order in Council dated the 31st September, 1888, the Government paid \$186,000 to the company for the sections from Caughnawaga to Sherbrooke and from the end of the section built by the International Railway, 11 miles long, which runs to the boundary at Mattawamkeag."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is \$186,000 per annum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

#### NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE—PENSIONS.

House resolved itself into Committee on resolution (p. 469) providing for pensions to certain members of the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, will state to the House generally what his reasons are for introducing this measure, which is somewhat of a new departure and requires careful consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object is to increase the efficiency of the Mounted Police. The hon. member for South Oxford has been in that country and has some idea of the duties thrown upon the Mounted Police Force, which is admitted to be as fine a body of men as can well be collected together. It has been found that for the first three or four years of service, as I have had occasion to say before, the men however qualified, physically or otherwise, to perform the duties, are really not completely efficient. In case of an insurrection or a riot, they would be very valuable as soldiers; but the duties of these men are those of peace officers; they are employed on the trail, on patrol, following law breakers of every kind, and keeping the peace over half a continent; and it has been found that until a man has been moved about from place to place and has performed the various duties which devolve on the force, he is not as efficient as he ought to be. The consequence is that as the term of enlistment is five years, the best men, seeing no hope of promotion, leave the service. Some of the men who are fit to hold commissions are promoted, but there are many men who make first-rate constables and non-commissioned officers who are not fit to hold commissions. They then leave the service, and their places are filled by new men, who have to learn the country, the nature of the Indians, how to overtake raiders and horse thieves, and how to perform all the duties imposed upon them. Therefore, it is thought a wise economy to give the members of the force some assistance. The Bill, which is based in principle on the Irish Constabulary Act, provides, that a man who has served not less than fifteen years, and has been incapacitated from injury to his health, or from bodily infirmity, shall receive a pension according to the ratio mentioned in the resolution; but, if a man serves twenty-five years, he shall have a right to retire, although fully able and healthy, on a pension mentioned in this list. It is believed, that if a man who takes up the service in the Mounted Police, has before him a certainty, that when he has served his twenty-five years, he will get a pension, the most valuable men will be retained in the force. I shall read a statement which has been furnished me, showing the number of men now in the force who, in the event of incapacity of mind or body, would have a pension in the next eight years. This statement was prepared last year, and it gives one man in 1888, four in 1889, five in 1890, two in 1891, two in 1892, three in 1893, seven in 1894, and none in 1895. Then the memorandum goes on to state:

"The present state of the health of the men included in the above summary justifies the expectation that very few of them will be incapacitated prior to having completed twenty five years' service. Should all remain for that period, the following will become entitled to long service pension between 1893 and 1905:—in 1894 one man; in 1895, four; in 1900, five; in 1901, two; in 1902, two; in 1903, three; in 1904, seven; and in 1905, none. The pension of a constable will vary from 22 cents per day for fifteen years, to 50 cents for twenty-seven years' service; the pension of a sergeant will vary from 30 cents per day for fifteen years' service to

66 cents per day for twenty-seven years' service. The pension of a staff-sergeant will vary from 37½ cents per day for fifteen years' service to one dollar per day for twenty-seven years' service. The Irish Constabulary pensions are calculated on full pay, which includes a constable's subsistence. The Mounted Police pensions are calculated on actual pay exclusive of subsistence, clothing or allowances. Liberal provision is made in the Irish Constabulary Bill for pensions for men incapacitated by infirmity of mind or body after five years' service. The Mounted Police Bill provides only for incapacity, after fifteen years' service: after fifteen years' service and under twenty, not exceeding one-half pay; after twenty years' service and under twenty-five, not exceeding two-thirds pay; after twenty-five years service, and under thirty, not exceeding three-fourths pay; after thirty years' service and over, full pay."

I think it will be found to be very wise economy to keep the fully trained men in the service. Of course, there are very few commissions for a thousand men, and if you do not provide for a system of pensions, you will lose your experienced men, because where the peace of the country is involved, where the efficient performance of their duties by the police officers is required, where enormous tracts of country have to be travelled over, where offenders against the law have to be tracked for hundreds of miles, one trained man is worth five recruits. Therefore, after full consideration, in the first place by the officers of the force, and then by myself as concurring with them, we venture to submit this provision to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I regret very much that the hon. gentleman has brought this proposition before the House. I think it is a great misfortune in this country to extend the principle of pensioning any portion of the community beyond its present limit. In fact, I think we ought to retrace our steps and undo a great deal of what has been done. The hon. gentleman has read a list of those who are now in the service, who would be entitled to pensions under this resolution. The number the hon. gentleman has given shows the Bill that he proposes could not, for many years to come, have any appreciable effect upon the efficiency of the service. The number now in the service who would be entitled to the pension, under the resolution, is very small. The right hon. gentleman intends that the number shall be very much increased, and the community burthened with a very large tax. I do not think it is in the public interest that men should be retained for a very long period in that service. On the contrary, it would be better that after five years those men should leave the force and engage in other industrial pursuits. There is no doubt that if they are kept in the service for a long period, they will become unfit for settling down to ordinary industrial pursuits. Should, however, they be compelled to leave the force after a short period, when industrial pursuits will no longer have lost their attraction, they can be replaced by younger men; and in the case of an emergency we would then have a species of reserve force composed of those who had retired from the service, which we would not have if the hon. gentleman's scheme could be successful in the way he indicates. The hon. gentleman has had no difficulty in securing a sufficient number of recruits. There have always been men ready to engage in this police service on the terms that now exist. Why, then, should we undertake to burden the public Treasury with a large sum, when such burden is wholly unnecessary to secure the number required? What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with those who have already retired and have had long service? It is something like fifteen years since the force was organised. Those who have served 14 years and 11 months are not entitled to anything, but if they served but a week longer than the fifteen years they would be entitled to pension. If the hon. gentleman would, instead, retain a certain percentage from the salaries of those men, and pay that over to them, with accumulated interest at 4 or 5 per cent., on their discharge, whether the time they served was long or short,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that would be a reasonable arrangement. The hon. gentleman says that the efficiency of the force will be increased by his scheme, that a man who has had many years experience in the service is worth four or five men or more who are new to the business. That is not the opinion of those who are acquainted with the police force. The men do not always improve according to the length of the period they have been engaged in the service. On the contrary, there is deterioration in some cases, and there would be a manifest interest on the part of a man to remain in the force when there might be a manifest interest on the part of the public that he should be got rid of. Admitting for a moment that the proposition of the hon. gentleman would increase the efficiency of the force, there are other considerations besides efficiency. There is the consideration of the public interest at large. If you are unfitting a large number of the community for industrial pursuits in the latter period of their lives, you are doing a positive injury to the community, and you are bound to take that into consideration as well as the simple question of the greater efficiency of the force. I say that a man who has served fifteen years, and much more, a man who has served twenty-five years in the force, would be utterly unfit for any other pursuit in life afterwards. The hon. gentleman knows that a man who has served a great many years in the idle life of a soldier or policeman becomes, as far as industrial pursuits are concerned, a poor member of the community. It is not desirable that young men should remain in this force for a long period. I deny altogether the statement that a man who has been ten years in the force is several times as efficient as a man who has been only five. If there is proper organisation and discipline and control on the part of the officers, if they are straightforward, law-abiding, energetic men, the man who has been but twelve months in the service under them has learned his business and is as well fitted to engage in it as a man who has been in it for years. One would suppose that the whole Territories were overrun by thieves and robbers, which these parties have to engage in the pursuit of, and that, like ordinary detectives, they require a very long experience to learn the business of tracing these people over the whole of the North-West Territories. I do not admit that. The hon. gentleman has given no information to the House to show that a condition such as that exists, and as the country becomes settled, there will be less and less chance of the lawless section of the people congregating in the Territories, and committing depredations upon industrious and law abiding people. I do not understand the police force are to any great extent performing functions of that sort. The police force, in a great portion of the Territories, have very little to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says, "Oh." I think he will have a good deal of difficulty in making plain to this committee that these people have very much to do. There are periods when there are indications of lawlessness on the part of the Indian population, when the police have to be on the alert. There may be occasionally horses and cattle stealing which requires the active exertions of the police to reclaim the property and catch the wrongdoers, but these must be rare cases. The report of the hon. gentleman does not disclose a very different state of things in the North-West Territories from what exists elsewhere in this respect, but however that may be, I submit we ought not to engage in the business of pensioning a large portion of the community in order that they may, for a great portion of their lives, be supported by the industry and hard labor of others. Who pensions the farmer? Who pensions the mechanic? Who pensions the men who are engaged in daily toil in order to obtain a daily subsistence? If these parties were not

getting as much or more than they could get in other avocations, they would not be there, or the Government would have to offer them more pay, and that would be an indication that higher salaries should be paid. But there is no difficulty found in getting the number of policemen who are required at the rate of pay which is offered. This system is opposed to the genius of democratic government, and I am opposed to pensioning one portion of the community at the expense of another portion who are just as much entitled to the product of their earnings as these men may be who have engaged in the public service. One would suppose that this is a sort of anti-hill government in which one portion are the masters and the others are the slaves. These may be neutral ants for whom the others have to labor. The hon. gentleman may bring his friends in here, and may cram the Government offices to repletion, and may pension them by giving them Indian timber and Indian lands, but, when he begins to pension them from the public Treasury, I think the House and the country will be disposed to resist such a proposition. I trust the hon. gentleman will not force the House to divide upon his proposed measure, but will be content to withdraw the proposition. When the police force cannot be adequately kept up for the salaries which have hitherto been paid to its members, he will be able to satisfy the House that they are entitled to something more. If he thinks they are entitled to a retiring allowance, he should provide for that by keeping back a part of their salary, and then, when they retire, whether it be at the end of five or ten or fifteen years, let that amount be paid over to them. If they have not the necessary prudence or the necessary economy to provide for themselves, that might be a proper provision, but I cannot agree to the proposition that the Government should be able to dismiss a man at the end of fourteen years and eleven months without anything, while a man who was dismissed at the end of fifteen years would receive a pension for life. At all events, the whole pension system, whether long or short, is grossly unfair to the great mass of the people of this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before discussing this measure, I would call the attention of the House to the system of pensions which we now have. We have a system by which we superannuate a number of our civil servants. It has been frequently pointed out that the salaries which are paid to Civil Service officers are equal, or in excess of those which are paid to people of equal ability throughout the country occupying other positions. As to the Mounted Police, I think we should look forward to the reduction in numbers of that service as soon as possible. It is evident that the increase was made in consequence of the trouble in the North-West, and now we should be hopeful that we will be able to reduce that number in a very short time. In that case, you will be able to dispense easily with the services of the men who are not efficient, but, if you inaugurate the pension system in connection with that service, you will have to make the country pay for those who leave the service. There are now about 1,000 men employed in that service, and the wages paid are about equal to those paid to men who would be able to fill any ordinary position, such as that of a laborer, a mechanic or an artisan. These men receive pay fully equal to that which is received by men occupying similar positions, except in the cases which require extra education. These men are receiving, on the average, \$300 a year, and I understand that they are provided with their clothing and their food. All they do is to discharge the duties of mounted police. I find that such things as carrying their supplies from the railway to the stations are not performed by them, but are paid for separately, and I think it is unwise to increase our pension system, for this reason, that, the moment you pass this law, the men who leave the service and have not served the full term will

press for a gratuity such as is now granted to the civil servants. There will be no end to that. A great many of them have gone into that service with the intention of eventually taking up land and becoming settlers in the North-West. While they are going round the country on their duties, they are inspecting the country and forming an idea of the best place in which to settle; and I think the best way for the Government to act is to offer them an inducement to become actual settlers rather than to continue in the service in the hope that they will be pensioned off at the expense of the country. I think we should do away with the pension system altogether. The country cannot afford to continue it, and, instead of the Government taking a step in the direction of restricting the amount of these pensions, this is a step in the direction of increasing the drain upon the country's resources for this purpose. I have never heard any complaints with regard to the Mounted Police in this matter. They are well taken care of, they are well fed, well clothed, and well paid for the service they perform, without its being necessary to offer any further inducement or to give them a retiring allowance when they leave the service. I do not think it is desirable to countenance this proposal, because we should allow those who are zealous and active in the discharge of their duty to understand that they are not the first who will be removed from the service when the Government think it desirable to reduce the number. That time cannot be far distant. We have got rid of a great many of our troubles in the North-West, and we hope that in a short time, as people get into the country and settle it, the necessity for the Mounted Police will grow less year after year. There is no reason, whatever, why we should put on the Statute-book an Act to allow these men to look forward to being pensioned at the country's expense, instead of retiring from the service and becoming citizens and depending upon their own resources. We want to educate our people to depend upon themselves, and not upon the state. I think it is unwise to institute a system of this kind in the North-West. There is no need for such a measure. If a man should be injured in the service, and his case should be looked into by the Government, I have no doubt that this House and the people of this country would agree to giving him proper consideration. I say, to inaugurate a system whereby every man that is now in the service may at some future day look forward to becoming a charge upon the resources of this Dominion, is a wrong course to adopt, and it will tend to lead those who are now in the service to suppose that they may look forward to living at the public expense, in ease, while at the same time they are drawing an annual allowance equal to that which they could earn in any other position in life. I say, if you take that force, man by man, there is not one of them who could find any other public position in which he could earn more than he is getting now, and perhaps in a great many cases, not as much. Now, why is it considered necessary to pension those men? I say it is unfair. The First Minister says that the system that he has about to introduce is modelled after the Irish Constabulary system. The police in Ireland are paid but a miserable pittance, when compared with the pay given to the Mounted Police in the North-West. The Irish Constabulary are barely paid, the pittance is a mere nothing. The result is that when they have put in twenty five years they are pensioned off, and allowed a small sum for the balance of their life. But these men in the North-West are getting every dollar they are capable of earning. They go into the Mounted Police, not because they are so absolutely devoted to the peace, prosperity and welfare of their country, or because they are willing to sacrifice their lives in defending the country; but they go into the force because they consider that it affords them an opportunity of posing themselves on the resources of the North-West, and of eventually becoming settlers, while at the same time they

are getting a fair allowance for the services they render. I have not the slightest doubt that if the First Minister, to-morrow, will put a notice in any well-known paper in this country that he wants to add 100 men to the Mounted Police force, he will have 500 applications.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why? Because the pay they are getting is a fair remuneration to them, and it is an easy job. There is very little to do, and a great many men would be willing to perform the duties they perform for the amount that is now paid. I hope that the First Minister will seriously consider before he decides to press this measure upon the House, because it is adding to the pension list already burdensome, and becoming more burdensome every year, and I believe that the people of this country will resent it when they get an opportunity.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to add my testimony in the same direction as the views that have been stated by my hon. friend. The right hon. gentleman has chosen, as he generally does choose, if he has got any very doubtful thing in view, to quote from the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial Acts, what is done in England, and what is done in the Irish Constabulary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And in Australia.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, Australia too. My hon. friend is always ready, when he has anything of a very doubtful character to propose, which adds to the charges upon the people of this country, to quote England and English precedents. Now, Sir, I must say that when some years ago the Superannuation Bill was introduced, no man who sat in Parliament at that time had the slightest idea that the charge would swell to the proportions that it has reached, or that it would become such a burden upon the country as it has become. Why, Sir, no one ever thought that men, such as have been superannuated, would ever be superannuated and be getting two-thirds of their regular salary, some of them even more, I believe; and these men, many of them, as healthy, yea, much more healthy, than the hon. gentleman or myself are to-day—just as fit to perform their duties in the departments here as they were ten years before they were superannuated. If this length of service, if this great experience, if the great advantages accruing from their knowledge of the duties of the departments amount to anything, surely they should not have been superannuated until they were unfit for public service. Let any man take up the blue-book containing the list of people superannuated, and he will find that many of these men, in the cities of Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and elsewhere, have been superannuated, not because the men were not fit for their duty, but because it suited the right hon. gentleman and the Cabinet to make vacancies, in order that they might put others in their places. That is the way the system has been carried out, and has been made to work injury to this country; it has become an enormous charge, which never ought to have been inflicted upon us. I must say, that I am one of those who do not believe in pensions. I believe that men who are getting a liberal salary, as almost every person employed by the Government is now getting, ought to save, out of their annual receipts, enough to keep them in their old days, and that the poor people of this country, should not have this enormous tax imposed upon them, while, at the same time, it increases what the poor people of the country have to pay for their food, for their clothing, and for the articles they require to use in their various industries, for the purpose of supporting a lot of men who, out of the liberal salaries that the country is giving them, should lay by enough to keep them in their old age. I believe that this system of pensioning the North-West police is all wrong. My hon. friend talks about men who, when they have been ten or

Mr. McMULLEN.

fifteen years in the service have become more efficient and we ought to retain them. I believe a man is as efficient in the police after two years' service, if he had any brains at all, as he will be after he has been ten years in the service. I perfectly agree with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that if an advertisement were put in the papers to-morrow for 100 men for the Mounted Police in the North-West, you would probably get applications from 500, and of a class of people who go to that country with a view of settling there. Therefore, I think the right hon. gentleman is carrying out a principle which is wrong, which is unfair, and which is a great injury to this country. It is taxing the people, in addition to the numerous taxes which have been imposed upon them by the tariff. The system of pensioning these policemen is one which ought not to be adopted, and the hon. gentleman would do well to pause before he intensifies the system by giving to the North-West Mounted Police the remuneration which he proposes to give in the Bill under consideration. I want to express my ardent conviction that the duty of this House is to sit upon that measure, to sit upon any measure that adds to the pension list of this country, and that we should receive with care any suggestion of the right hon. gentleman, when he points to England as a precedent, for any measure which will add to the taxation of the people.

Mr. ELLIS. I approve of the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that if the superannuation list is to be extended, it had better be extended so as to take in every industrious man who, for fifteen years, contributes to the wealth of the country. Now, what is the present position of the superannuation fund? For every dollar that is paid into the superannuation fund we pay out three; there has been received so far about \$800,000, while, as near as I can recollect, about \$2,400,000 have been paid out, and the disproportion is growing greater every day. When the Finance Minister made his budget speech, he promised that the expenses would not be increased, that he would be able to make both ends meet at the end of a year or so, and that at the end of three years, there would be no deficit. Yet hardly has the House ceased to echo his words, when there is another proposition to extend the charges for superannuation. Now, how is the country getting the money to meet this charge? We are borrowing it. Of course hon. gentlemen may cover it up by saying that they are borrowing the money for railways, or some other purpose, but if the money was not expended in this manner it would be left in the Treasury of the country; indeed, we would not have to borrow it at all. I think it is time for us to put an end to a system that is so entirely foreign to the genius of this country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. gentleman, by introducing a resolution of this kind, says, in effect, that he has not the confidence in the Mounted Police in the North-West which he formerly had. If the members have done good service, as has been declared in this House, why propose a system different from that which at present exists? If the statements made are correct, there has been no difficulty up to the present time in obtaining any number of Mounted Policemen for service in the North-West, and why, therefore, is this scheme required? I do not deny that the mounted police have performed their duties well, that they have been efficient during the past, and have discharged their duties to the satisfaction of the Government. Am I to understand that in the opinion of the First Minister the force has not been competent and efficient, and is it on that account that inducements must be held out to members to remain in the force for a long time and thus become competent? I do not think such is the case; but the announcement of the First Minister has been made for the first time that the system which has heretofore prevailed in the

management of the police has not been a system satisfactory to the Government and to the country. Will the hon. gentleman state whether such is the fact, and if that is one of the reasons for introducing the present resolution? I think it is not, and that the object is a very different one. It will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to expend more money and to impose more burdens on an already overburdened people. The hon. gentleman's proposition is that the men should remain in the service a number of years and thereby become more efficient. Do they require to be taught for twenty or twenty-five years before they understand the different trails, and be able to follow them? Is that a reasonable proposition for the hon. gentleman to submit to this House as a reason for bringing this measure down? We know that with advanced age and with the exposure such as they are stated to be obliged to endure, the men belonging to the force become less efficient and competent, for we know that exposure induces various kinds of disease. Again, I should like to know if the introduction of a pension system in the police force is merely a forerunner of a pension system for the whole of the militia force of Canada; it is the thin end of the wedge which in a short time will result in pensions being granted to various officers from one end of the Dominion to the other. I verily believe that if the right hon. gentleman remained in his present position very long he would see the necessity of holding out stronger inducements in the future, and he would be granting pensions all through the Dominion in order to retain power, because I do not believe it is necessary to introduce a system to ensure the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police. Under these circumstances the hon. gentleman should hesitate, especially when there has been no request, except, perhaps, from parties interested, for this legislation, before he imposed heavy burdens upon the Dominion for the sake of a class who are already well paid and amply compensated for the services performed, and when there is no difficulty whatever in securing as many men for the positions as are required. It is unreasonable that the hon. gentleman should make a proposal of this kind, and it is certainly not because he has been unable to get good men.

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

#### After Recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) allow me to make a suggestion? I know that he wants to get home as soon as he can, and as several of my hon. friends on the other side have called the attention of the committee to what they call the imperfections of this proposition, if the hon. gentleman will allow the resolution to pass, so that the Bill can be introduced, I promise him that we will have a full discussion on the second reading. Otherwise, we will have a discussion now, and a discussion on the second reading as well. If the hon. gentleman has no objection to this, it will expedite business and give every gentleman an opportunity of expressing his opinions on the Bill itself.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I have but a few remarks to make with reference to the resolution before the Chair, and perhaps, it would be the better plan for me to make them now. I was trying to induce, if possible, the Minister to understand that this Bill was not really required in the interest of the services of the North-West, and that, judging from the manner in which the police service has been performed during the number of years we have had mounted police in the North-West, the Bill was uncalled for. I do not think that any representations have been made—except by parties interested—from the North-West as a whole, that the Mounted Police service is in any way deficient, or that members of the force should be pensioned. If you observe

the progress of the increased expenditure which has taken place in the North-West for a number of years, I think you will agree with me that it is highly inexpedient that we should take any action to put an additional increase on the ordinary expenditure, which has been growing rapidly for a number of years. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the Public Accounts, in which he will see the rapidity of the increase in the expenses of this force from the first year it was established up to the present time. I do not think it is in the public interest that we should put any additional burdens on the country in connection with this force. The expense of that force for the year 1873-74, the year of its inauguration, was \$199,599.14. In 1874-75 the expenditure had increased to \$333,583.90. In 1875-76 it increased to \$369,519.39, and in 1876-77 we find the expenses had somewhat diminished. I think that, perhaps, the present Government was not in power at that time, or certainly we would not have found a decrease in any expenditure, as they are not troubled with any sins of that kind. However it may be, we find that in the year 1876-77 the expense had decreased to \$352,749.05. In 1877-78 it still had diminished, showing that economical individuals were at the head of the Government and that they tried to curtail expenses there as much as possible, for we find that in that year the expenditure was \$334,748.50. In 1878-79 the expenditure was \$331,823; in 1879-80, it was \$332,855.12; in 1880-81, it was \$389,485.33; in 1881-82, it was \$368,456.47; in 1882-83, it was \$477,825.45; in 1883-84, it was \$485,983.26; and in 1885-86, the expenditure was \$564,249.64. The year 1885-86 was an exceptional year, on account of the mismanagement on the part of the Government of the affairs of the North-West, and by reason of the neglect they displayed towards the people of the North-West, in allowing all manner of abuses to take place there and in refusing to pay any attention whatever to the representations made to them of wrongdoing on their part towards the people of the North-West. The result was, that in this year, an unfortunate rebellion took place, and I do not hold the Government responsible for the increase, any more than that it was brought about by their acts; but during that year, the expense of the North-West Mounted Police Force, amounted to the enormous sum of \$1,029,369.20, and in 1886-87, the following year, we find that the expenditure was \$781,664.42, and in 1887-88, the last financial year for which we have returns, we find that the expenditure was \$862,965.06. I would say, in all justice, that this expenditure on the force is ample and sufficient, without the First Minister coming down and asking us to vote an additional sum for pensions. We are liberally paying our mounted policemen, and it is unreasonable, unfair and unjust, to the rest of the Dominion, that we should be called upon to pension them as well. I repeat what has been stated before, that our Mounted Police Force is very different from the police force in Ireland. The Irish policemen serve for a mere pittance, whereas, in the North-West, we pay our men liberally. I say, that if the Government pursues this course, and holds out to the members of the North-West Mounted Police the pensioning system, that the men will not be inclined to leave the service, for the purpose of engaging in other pursuits, but that they will continue on for the sake of getting their pension. I would advise the First Minister, and I think it would be wiser for him to withdraw his resolution and not to introduce this Bill, particularly as it is so late in the Session. I think that the right hon. gentleman should try if he cannot retrench a little in the expenditure for the North-West Mounted Police, and set a sum aside to compensate such special cases as he may find absolutely necessary to pension. I hope the First Minister will take my advice, although I did not take his, and withdraw his resolution and not introduce this Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). As I am entirely opposed to the principle of superannuation I intended to speak on



this Bill, but as the hon. the First Minister wished us to allow this resolution to pass, and stated that he would give us an opportunity of discussing the matter when the Bill came before the House, I will, in deference to his request, postpone my remarks. I suppose the First Minister will give us an opportunity of discussing the whole system of superannuation on a future occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. Of course if this resolution be adopted, I can then introduce a Bill, which must get its first, second and third readings, besides being considered in the Committee of the Whole, so that the House will have half a dozen opportunities of discussing the Bill.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But my hon. friend is apprehensive that this Bill may be postponed till the last days of the Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will undertake to bring it up early enough to give every hon. gentleman an opportunity of discussing the whole question of superannuation, which can be brought up in Supply, as well as on other occasions; but there is no objection to bringing it up on this Bill.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I may say that there is a very general desire to discuss this question thoroughly. There is such a feeling of dissatisfaction with the present system of affairs, on this side of the House at least, that we are anxious to have the whole matter gone into, and if we yield to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman to-night, we expect to have an opportunity to do so at an early day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, I will undertake that.

Mr. McMULLEN. In my opinion the Opposition have not sufficiently discharged their duties in regard to important questions in the last two Parliaments. I sympathise with the hon. First Minister; he is always very courteous to the House, and when he makes a request, I feel like granting it; but, in my opinion, the Opposition have not been discharging their duty in failing to discuss thoroughly Bills of an objectionable character which have been brought before the House. I have noticed in the last two Sessions, when many members wanted to get away, Bills which were exceedingly objectionable in their character have been allowed to slip through without that criticism which they ought to have had. For my part I am not going to share the responsibility if that course is going to be adopted in future. I can well remember that last year things were rushed through concurrence like sheaves going through a threshing machine. It has been a mere farce, and I, for one, am not going to be responsible for it in future.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to authorise the granting of pensions to members of the North-West Mounted Police force.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Act, 36 Vic., chap. 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal. He said: The object of the Bill is to repeal section 19 of the Act. The harbor of Montreal, long ago, was charged with the responsibility and duty of placing and maintaining buoys and beacons, not only in the harbor, but in what was defined to be the port of Montreal, including a very large portion of the River St. Lawrence running from Montreal close to the city of Quebec; and Parliament, by subsequent legislation, enabled the commissioners to levy certain dues

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

upon shipping in order to obtain a fund for the maintenance and placing of these buoys. Since then, changes have occurred. In connection with the deepening of the channel, Parliament assumed the debt which fell upon the harbor of Montreal, and in the Act passed last Session, the clause enabling the commissioners to raise a revenue for all these purposes was repealed, so that, to-day, the taxes which the commissioners may impose to meet the different duties which devolve upon them are confined to wharfage dues and rates, and taxes on shipping for other purposes have since been removed. For some years anterior to this, Parliament made a grant of \$7,000 a year to enable the commissioners to carry out this responsibility. The position of the commissioners was, in this respect, anomalous, because no other port in Canada is chargeable with the maintenance of these buoys and beacons, the Act relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries imposing that duty upon the country at large, and an appropriation being made every year to meet the expense. The object of the present Bill is to remove the obligation remaining on the port of Montreal to maintain that service, outside the harbor of Montreal, which is some two miles in length, in the River St. Lawrence, and which comes within the definition of the port of Montreal. The Bill has no further object, and the clause to which I ask the consent of Parliament is to repeal that obligatory section of the Act relating to Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, so that instead of the clause reading that the Board of Harbor Commissioners shall maintain that service, it will read that "the buoys and beacons within the port of Montreal may, by order of the Governor in Council, be placed and maintained by the said corporation." If the Government could make a contract with the harbor commissioners of Montreal, as they make them with other people, for the performance of that service, the harbor commissioners would still have the power to make that contract, but the effect of this Bill would be to relieve them from the obligation of maintaining that service.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about the second section?

Mr. TUPPER. The second section follows, as a matter of course, the main section. It is that the buoys and beacons within the port of Montreal, and the plant used in connection therewith by the harbor commissioners, shall hereafter belong to the Government of Canada. There are some 500 buoys and considerable plant and material, and it follows that if the commissioners are relieved from the duty of maintaining the buoys and beacons, that property and plant shall become the property and plant of the Government, just as in the Act of last Session, when relieving them from the obligations in connection with the deepening of the channel, a clause of this kind was inserted transferring all the dredging plant to the Government of Canada. This Bill will leave us free either to make a contract with the harbor commissioners to carry on the service with this plant, or, in the event of our being able to make a better contract with other parties, we will be able to do so according to the practice of the department. The principle of the Bill has been virtually sanctioned by the course of Parliament in the last few years in appropriating the sum of \$7,000 to meet this expense, and which has been handed over to the harbor commissioners in a lump sum to carry on this service.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me this is a very inoffensive kind of Bill, and the explanation of the hon. Minister seems to be a reasonable one. The Government have agreed to relieve the port of Montreal from the burden of maintaining and placing these buoys and beacons, which hitherto devolved upon them, and for which they were allowed a sum of money by this Government. This seems reasonable and fair; and when I asked information about the second section of the Bill the hon. gentleman said the object was

that the Government should take over the plant and property for maintaining this service. This possibly follows, as a matter of course.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When the harbor resolutions were before the House, it was explained that the harbor commissioners paid a certain amount, \$7,000 I think, and the Government an equal amount, for the maintenance of these buoys and beacons. By relieving the commissioners from this duty, the Government are assuming a larger amount than they have been in the habit of paying. It was understood that the harbor commissioners had undertaken this duty at the expense of the port of Montreal, and I do not see upon what principle the Government are going to relieve them now.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must speak from recollection, for I do not think that that was ever contended by the harbor commissioners of Montreal, nor was it put forward, in any representation they made, that they would assume this obligation in consideration of the Government assuming the debt of deepening the channel. The tax was taken away out of which they formerly maintained that service.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 5) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The First Minister has expressed a desire that the House should get through the business before Easter. This Bill, which I have no doubt is a very proper one, is not one which there seems to be much immediate necessity for, and it will undoubtedly take a very considerable time in passing through committee. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice whether it would not be advisable to allow it to stand over to another Session, and take it up at an early part of that Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, notwithstanding this Bill is on the paper, we can get through by Easter. If we put it off till next Session, we may not be able to get through before Easter of next year, as there may be a great deal of important business.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) is a very good one. This is a very important Bill, because it is practically consolidating the law in respect to promissory notes. After looking over a portion of the Bill—and I have not had time to study it throughout—I notice that, in many respects, it would vary the law very materially, and I think that most gentlemen on this side of the House who are interested in subjects of this sort would like to have an opportunity, at their leisure, between this and the next Session, of comparing this Bill carefully with the law as it stands and with the various judicial decisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House has had the Bill before it for more than a month.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the House has been busy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not more than in other Sessions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is true, but this Bill requires a great deal of attention because, it is really an attempt at a code.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think this will be found to be the simplest Bill on the paper, because it is almost an exact transcript of the English Act and our own law. If there is any objection to going on with this Bill, I do not

understand under what circumstances any Bill can be introduced hereafter with a view to its consideration during the same Session. The Bill was not only announced in the Speech from the Throne, but it was introduced on the first available day. It has stood on the paper for six weeks, and I think plenty of time has been given for its consideration. I have taken pains to distribute it through the country, and I cannot see any reason for postponing it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree with the views which have been expressed on this side of the House, that this Bill should be allowed to stand over, in order to allow the country to consider it. The Minister of Justice has amended the Bill very considerably since its introduction, and he has issued copies in galley form, and very few members, I think, have their copies to refer to. I have not been able to get extra copies. Bankers, and brokers, and notaries have applied to me for copies, but I had only my own, and one which was given me by a friend. Now, we are asked to go into Committee on this Bill, without having copies of the actual Bill which the hon. gentleman proposes. This is practically, as my hon. friend has said, a commercial code for this country, and I do not think we should deal in a hasty or summary manner with a Bill of this nature, voluminous in its character, and very important in the way in which it affects commercial and trade relations. If the hon. gentlemen desire to get through before Easter, I think they should consider the propriety of allowing the Bill to be printed, and to go into the hands of members, and to go to the various commercial institutions of the country. I do not say this from any desire to oppose the reconstruction of the law in regard to this matter, but it is not a safe principle that, because it is an exact transcript of the English law on the subject, as the hon. gentleman says, that we should accept it. There are many things which take place in England, in the way of legislation, which are not at all fitted to a new country, such as Canada is, and this Bill should not be rushed through the House. I understand that we have very little more than 18 working days before Easter, with a mass of legislation before us, with the Estimates, nine-tenths of which have yet to be passed, with the Supplementary Estimates, and the railway legislation which is before us. I do not see how we can get through if we take up a Bill like this, which will occupy a great deal of time.

Mr. EDGAR. I entirely agree with the general objects of this Bill, and, I think, if it becomes law, it will greatly facilitate commercial transactions and, also, the work of the legal profession; but this is largely a codification of the law, and the House will recollect that, when we consolidated the Statutes, and when we have any important commercial piece of legislation, such as an Insolvency Law, we refer them to Special Committees who can give some attention to the minute and important details of that class of legislation. Now, the Minister of Justice will be the first, I think, to admit that the Committee of the Whole of this House is not exactly the place to give calm and careful consideration to the complex details of a commercial Bill like this. It has not been referred to any Committee, not even the Committee on Banking and Commerce, although I think that would be much too large to deal with it properly. The measure itself may satisfy the Minister of Justice, it may satisfy the very few members of this House who have not had an opportunity to study it, but most of the commercial and legal gentlemen of this House who can study the question will be utterly unable to do it in the Committee of the Whole. The confusion incident to such work we all understand, and I do press upon the Government, apart from the question of the lateness of the Session, to consider whether it would not be far better to have this measure referred to a Committee, either this Session, or, if it is too late, to a sub-Committee.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) This Bill being of a nature of a codification, is one which requires very careful examination in Committee. The hon. Minister of Justice well knows that a codification, when you introduce strict statutory provisions, requires to be done very carefully, and I think it would be well to refer it to a sub-Committee, as suggested by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Indeed I do not think the country would suffer very much if the Bill was allowed to remain over until next Session. In the meantime the members would have an opportunity of exchanging views with the bankers and other persons interested. No doubt one great and very proper object of this Bill is to render the law uniform throughout the Dominion, but while I would like to see that done, I think the necessity is not so great but that the Bill might be left over until another Session. I think that is the general feeling on both sides of the House, because if we go into this Bill now, every section would have to be carefully scanned in order that the law might be put in such a shape that it would create no difficulty, and no great change in the present system. I also agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that in following the English statute we have to be very careful, because the condition of affairs in England is so different from ours that frequently in following too slavishly English legislation, we are apt to pass laws which we find very difficult of application.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to remark that there has been placed in my hands a reprint of Bill No. 5, which was placed in the hands of the House some three or four weeks ago. I understand that a number of changes have been made in the reprint; and I also understand that it has been placed in the hands of the legal representatives in the House, while non-professional men, like myself, have not been favored with a copy. Now, if the important matters dealt with by this Bill are to be attended to only by the legal representatives in this Chamber, and that men from the rural districts, non-professional men, are not supposed to be worthy of receiving a copy of the Bill, I want to know it. I claim as a representative of a constituency that I have a right to be placed in possession of a copy of this Bill, as well as any other man in this House. I know there are other members who sit around me who have not received a copy. Now, I claim it is nothing but right, before you leave the Chair, and before this House goes into Committee on this Bill, that every member should have a copy of it. Changes have been made since it was first printed, and it is unfair that only professional men should have an opportunity of examining these changes. I applied to the distributing department for one of these reprints, and was told there were none to be had. My esteemed friend who sits beside me has obtained a copy by sending over to the Minister of Justice and requesting one. I suppose if anyone else wants to get a copy, he will have to send his compliments in a polite manner to the Minister of Justice in order to get it. This is an exceedingly important Bill, and it is one of a class that affects everyone in the country. The poor man who does an ordinary business of \$50 or \$100 a year, is just as much interested in the provisions of this Bill as another man who does his business by millions. I have no doubt that legal men are perhaps able to deal more satisfactorily with the peculiar clauses of this Bill than ordinary men; but sometimes other men that are not even possessed of a legal mind, may make suggestions with regard to the provisions of the Bill, that are perhaps even more valuable than the suggestions of a lawyer.

Mr. PATERSON (Bant). There is no blame attaching to the Minister for not introducing his Bill at a sufficiently early date. He did that, and it has been in the hands of members. The Minister says that he has received many

Mr. EDGAR,

suggestions in response to copies sent out, and that in deference to the opinions expressed, he has considerably altered the Bill; that fact shows that the Bill when first introduced was not entirely satisfactory. Now, it is not from a sense of hurt dignity that I speak, but although I am somewhat interested in this Bill as a commercial man, I have not seen any of the proposed changes at all. I agree with my hon. friend who spoke last that while in a great many matters legal gentlemen in this House are better fitted to deal with them than non-professional men, still, I am proud that my hon. friend has paid me the compliment of supposing that while it is necessary for legal gentlemen to have an opportunity of studying the amendments beforehand, he thinks a commercial man may take them up on the spur of a moment. From all that I can hear there has been no particular demand for this Bill, and it does seem to me that a Bill so important as this, and in which the Minister has discovered by enquiries that several amendments must be made, and seeing that no interest is suffering, perhaps it would be advisable to take the suggestion that was made, and let the representatives of the people go to their homes and, during the course of the year, ascertain the opinion of their constituents upon the measure. The boards of trade and bankers will consult in regard to it, and we shall be able to obtain a more perfect Bill. I do not desire to say more, nor do I desire to push objections from this side of the House in regard to it, but I hope the Minister will see that the suggestions offered are reasonable and perhaps in the public interest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As a matter of order, we have not this Bill before us at all; we cannot have it before us except informally. The Minister of Justice introduced another Bill, and that is the one under consideration. The hon. gentleman may have put this before us merely to show what changes he proposes, but this Bill could not be before us formally. He would have to begin again if he desired to put this Bill before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure no one would be more indisposed than I would be to force a Bill on the attention of the House if the House were not ready for it. If it was suggested that there was a strong feeling in the country against the principle of the Bill, against the policy of consolidating the laws respecting bills of exchange, I would not desire to press it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If any one were able to say that this subject being committed to us by the British North America Act, twenty-one years afterwards was too early a period to legislate upon it, I would hesitate about pressing the Bill upon the attention of the House. Or if any one could suggest an earlier period of the Session at which it could possibly have been laid before the House, I might think something had occurred to delay the Bill this year; but I have listened to the suggestions of the hon. gentlemen opposite as regards the reasons for letting it stand until next year, and I fail to see in what Session of this Parliament such a Bill can ever be considered if not now. But least of all did I expect to be reproached because, having intended to propose certain amendments in Committee of the Whole, as we always do in reference to a Bill of any importance, especially a Bill of any length, I committed the indiscretion of announcing pretty generally to the House the nature of the amendments which I intended to submit. I have enjoyed the advantage of conferring with different gentlemen occupying seats in this House, who take an interest in this subject, who are more or less entrusted with or at all events are acquainted with the interests of bankers and merchants in so far as they might be affected by this Bill, and to those gentlemen I thought it only proper and fair to give an intimation of the kind of

amendments I had to propose in Committee of the Whole. That would not have stood in my way if the House had gone into Committee, and I had moved these amendments without notice in manuscript, and had the Bill afterwards reprinted. As regards the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I have only to remind him of what he probably knows already, that this Bill was read a second time and was laid on his desk five weeks ago. It was read a second time, printed in English and French on 5th February, which is considerably more than five weeks ago, and, under these circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman, if he takes any umbrage at the circumstance of my having distributed something else, will lay it aside and give his attention to the Bill that has been five weeks on his desk. The Bill will be reprinted before the third reading. What I ask the House to do to-night is not to consider simply at the outset that this is a large Bill and a somewhat abstruse subject, but to take up the Bill and pass it so far as the Committee is prepared to do so to-night. I think it will be found that we will make substantial progress with the Bill. If there be any amendment which I propose that the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) or anyone else is not prepared for or does not understand, it will stand over until there is ample opportunity to consider it; but I ask the House to go into Committee, and pass some of these clauses, and we can make substantial progress and not delay the prorogation of the Session. I have done the best I could to make the nature of this Bill as well known as possible, and I have received information from all parts of the Dominion, from business men, boards of trade, banking institutions and private persons intimating that their opinion is favorable to the principle of the Bill—to the proposal that we should codify and make uniform as far as can possibly be done the laws relating to this important subject all through the Dominion; and I think that, inasmuch as the principle is accepted and there are no abstruse details in the Bill and the changes in the law are very slight and very few, the sooner the codification is accomplished the better, and I can promise no better means of disseminating the information or making the provisions better known to the House next Session than I have adopted this Session.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has rightly apprehended the spirit of the objections that have come from this side of the House. There is certainly no fault to be found with the hon. gentleman in regard to the introduction of this Bill and pressing it forward; but the objection raised by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is one which I think cannot be successfully met. It is that the desire prevails on both sides of the House, as was expressed the other day by the First Minister, to have prorogation before Easter. Now, there are not more than about twenty-two or twenty-three working days, and considering that we have part of the Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates for the current year and Supplementary Estimates for next year, and we have already on the paper nineteen different subjects to go through, it is almost impossible to prorogue before Easter if this measure is taken up and considered. The hon. Minister has asked at what Session this subject can be taken up, if not at this Session. Perhaps next Session Parliament will be called at such a time that Easter will not happen to fall about the tenth week of the Session. If we do not prorogue before Easter, the Session may be prolonged for some time afterwards. There is, however, a commendable desire to prorogue before Easter. We on this side of the House desire to do so, and we will help the Government in that respect; but I am afraid if the hon. gentleman persists in pushing this Bill, which is a heavy one, we will not realise our hope. No doubt the Bill is an essential one, but it is not an urgent

one, and the community can wait twelve months without suffering.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think I can put the case any better than the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has done, and perhaps not quite so well; but I endorse every word he has uttered in relation to the general desire for an early prorogation, and I think both sides of the House will agree in that sentiment. I agree that if we take up this Bill, a Bill every line of which involves a lawsuit, and there is a great many lines in the Bill, there may be doubt as to proroging before Easter; and as it is one which requires the greatest consideration, I think it is unwise for the Government to press the consideration of it at this stage of the Session, which everyone expects to be short. The hon. Minister has said that if he thought the principle of the Bill did not meet with the approbation of the country at large, he would not press it. Everyone who has expressed their opinions about the Bill admit that its principle will be approved by the country at large, but what I object to is this, that this Bill which the hon. gentleman has laid before the House at the very earliest stage he could lay it before the House—and nobody blames him for delay—but that he has, at a subsequent stage, made amendments to the Bill, which, as he says himself, have been the result of correspondence with bankers, brokers, notaries, boards of trade and individuals of the general public, and which amendments we have no notice of. The fact of those representations being made to him shows that important interests are involved and that the public are anxious about the measure. I believe that it is almost a certainty that discussions of a very extended and lengthy character will arise upon this Bill. What I object to particularly, and what my hon. friends the Minister does not refer to sufficiently in his answers to the objection, is that the public have endeavored to get information about the amendments, and that they have been unable to obtain it. I have sent for those amendments every day last week to the Distribution Office, but I was unable to get them. The only copy I could get was one sent me by the hon. gentleman himself and which I sent away to a person who had asked me for it. On every occasion on which I visited Montreal during this Session I have had people asking me to get a copy of this Bill for them, and since this amended Bill has come in enquiries for the amended Bill have been made over and over again. Nobody denies the necessity of codifying our laws in this respect, but none will pretend that the question of dealing with promissory notes, the manner of meeting them, their dates, the liability of individuals, the liability of partners and the course pursued by banks, and matters of that kind, does not involve an important principle and that therefore time should be given for its consideration. While the country does approve of the codification of the laws controlling the financial affairs of the country, yet, before old lines of business are disturbed, and new issues created, the people interested have a right to feel that they fully understand the changes that are to be made, and they should have ample time to deliberate on and consider them. I repeat again, what has been so frequently stated from this side of the House, that it is important that a Bill of this nature should receive the most ample consideration, and that gentlemen who sit here representing the public should have a full opportunity of consulting the people as to the provisions of this Bill. There is no measure which could be brought before this House on which so much correspondence could arise, and on which so many suggestions could be obtained from people interested. If hon. gentlemen wish to close the Session at the time they say, and we are all anxious that they should, they should have this Bill reprinted, in order that the public may be aware of the changes which are proposed, and defer a consideration of

the Bill to an early stage of next Session. I believe, that this will meet with the approval of the country, and I am sure it will meet with the approval of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that the request I have made is a reasonable one, notwithstanding the repetition of the objections for our making progress with the Bill. The fact that the Bill was a re-cast in galley form, and the amendments I intended to make embraced in it, has given the hon. gentleman an idea that the Bill has been entirely remodelled. Such is not the case. What I propose is that the Bill should proceed, and, if we think there are such changes introduced in the galley form as will require a reconstruction of the Bill or a protracted discussion, I am quite willing that such a clause should stand over, and I am ready to listen to any representations as to the necessity for making these changes at all. So far as this being a Bill that will involve serious changes in the present system the hon. gentleman will be surprised when he finds out, as I am sure he will, how much there is of it which is the present law, and a law known to every one interested in the business.

Mr. MITCHELL. The point I make is that as there are important changes proposed we should have an opportunity of sending copies of that Bill to the business men of the country, in order that they may discover and point out to us what changes are desirable, and how far the changes that are suggested are such as are required by the needs of the case. The members of the House ought certainly to have notification of those changes before they go into the consideration of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is "notification?" I do not quite understand that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that actual acceptance on the face of the bill may be waived.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I can understand it if the acceptance had been, as it can be sometimes, by letter. Acceptances are not necessary under our present law, but now the acceptance must be on the face of the bill itself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In section 21 there is a provision as to how the acceptance is to be made. The acceptance implies not only the writing of the name on the face of the bill, but delivery.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know what acceptance by delivery means? Does it merely mean presenting a draft at a man's office or to his servant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If a bill should be drawn on the hon. gentleman, and he desires to accept it, his acceptance is not completed by his merely writing the word "accepted" on the bill and signing his name under it, but he must deliver it back to the holder before his acceptance is complete. But the object of this Bill is to provide that while that completes an acceptance, the hon. gentleman, if he accepted the bill, could send his notification by letter, which would have the same effect as delivery. It is intended to make that a binding contract of acceptance, although the bill itself may remain in the possession of the acceptor, and not have been delivered.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask, in the case of a person accepting a bill and signing his name upon it, does this bill make provision that he can complete the acceptance by telephone—by notifying the bank that he accepts it?

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. I intend to propose instead of the definition of banker in the Bill, that the expression banker means an incorporated bank or a savings bank carrying on business in Canada. Hon. members will fully understand that it is necessary in this country that we should have a different definition of banker from that in the English Act. In the United Kingdom there are very few incorporated banks, the business of banking being principally carried on by firms and private banks. In this country I think it would be more convenient, and would answer all purposes, to limit the definition to incorporated banks and savings banks. If we adopted the English definition, viz., all persons who carry on the business of banking, it would be very difficult to determine who are bankers and who are not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know the object of limiting these transactions to chartered banks and excluding private banks. There are a great many places in the Province of Ontario where there are none but private banks, and I would like to know whether this provision will interfere with the business of those banks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will not restrict business at all, but certain special provisions are made in the Act with respect to bankers in this country, and we all understand a banker to mean in this country an incorporated bank. It would take me a long time to explain the operation of these definitions, and therefore I am quite willing to let the interpretation clause stand so that as we go through the Bill hon. gentlemen will see the force of these various definitions.

Mr. AMYOT. I would suggest that the following subsection be added to section 2:—

The expression "signature" means the name in full of the party signing, or his ordinary signature, or his usual cross in the presence of one or more witnesses.

On section 3,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I think the article in the Quebec Civil Code is much shorter and more satisfactory than this section. The article reads:

"A bill of exchange is a written order by one person to another for the payment of money absolutely and at all events."

That definition has always been found very satisfactory.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It means the same thing. The language is very terse and expressive, but it has the disadvantage of being mere code language in contradistinction to the usual language of statutes. It is better to follow the English definition.

Mr. McMULLEN. The section reads that a bill of exchange is an unconditional order in writing. Suppose a bill is half in writing and half printed, will it be covered by that section?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section is precisely in the words of the English statute, which certainly applies to bills partly written and partly printed.

Mr. LAURIER. The word "writing" is simply in contradistinction to verbal agreement.

Mr. GIROUARD. This section defines a bill of exchange to be an order payable to a specified person or to bearer. Supposing there is an order to pay to blank. Will that be a bill of exchange?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; not without some further provision. It may be so in its effect, but it will not be so under this clause.

Sub-section 2,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the 9th section a party is allowed to draw a bill of exchange payable at the current

rate of exchange. That has been held not to be a bill of exchange, and as this 9th section would appear to be contradictory to the sub-section we are now on, that contradiction should be removed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will add the words "unless hereinafter otherwise provided."

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that under this Act a bill will not be payable to order, but payable to a person named, and will be negotiable?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it is not payable to order or to bearer it is not negotiable except by sub-section 4. We define that a negotiable bill must be made payable to order or to bearer.

Mr. GIROUARD. I presume an I.O.U. without order or bearer, would be negotiable under this clause. That is a change in the law. It is a serious thing to change the mode of doing business in this way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that is the law of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. No; in the Province of Quebec, unless it is made to order, it is not negotiable. If it has not one of these two qualities certainly it is not negotiable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is right, but the object of the main section is to establish the validity of the instrument, to make plain and simple the law relating to bills of exchange, and to abolish the magic effect of certain words, or the omission of certain words, in the instrument itself.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the magic effect of words should be retained as far as practicable.

Mr. LISTER. I think the clause as it stands now is the proper legislation. According to the law in the Province of Ontario, if we want to make a bill payable at a certain place, we must put the words "not elsewhere."

Mr. McMULLEN. I am satisfied that advantage will be taken of simple-minded people if this provision becomes the law as it is at present drawn. It is desirable to change the law as little as possible.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never saw any simple-minded person who was so well acquainted with the law as to understand that notes were not negotiable unless the words "or order" were upon them, although, of course, there may be such cases. The whole object of the Bill is to make the law broad and plain, and a contract should be just what it purports to be on its face. We should do away with collateral arrangements by word of mouth and compel persons who give notes and wish any restriction to put the restriction on their face. This was the law of Scotland, and it has now been adopted as the law of the United Kingdom.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I can see no objection to the provision, which will not make much difference as regards the law of the Province of Quebec. Under the Code, if a bill is negotiable it is payable from bearer to bearer, but it can be transferred by a notarial deed of assignment.

Mr. LOVITT. Supposing there is no rate of exchange named in a bill, what would be the rate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The law at present provides that it should be paid at the rate of exchange on the day that the bill is payable.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Suppose a bill is drawn in France, and no rate of interest is mentioned, would the Canadian rate or the French rate obtain?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It would be a foreign draft, and, probably, the rate would be according to the rate of the country in which the bill was drawn.

On section 10,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As I understand it is proposed by this section to make a sight bill payable on demand, that bill would cause a change which would be very inconvenient to a great many people.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that the present custom of three days' grace should be maintained. It is now quite customary to allow those three days on bills payable on sight.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That is the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not settled to be the law, but the practice is so. This is to make it clear what the law on the subject is.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not see how in face of the custom of giving three days' grace we should interfere with it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let the clause stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the custom of allowing three days' grace is one of great importance between banks and merchants, and I hope the Minister will see his way clear to continue the custom we have now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course it would be an advantage to those who have to pay. At present there is no obligation to give the three days' grace; some do and some do not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the present system is interfered with, it will cause a great deal of inconvenience—it would make sharp and short payments.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think the present system is much the better one, and I would not like to see it changed as regards sight drafts. Suppose a bank has a draft payable on demand, it would be inconvenient for the holder of the draft to wait for its payment. The distinction between sight drafts and demand drafts is that a sight draft is understood to be a draft payable three days after it is accepted, and I think that custom should be continued. I think it ought to be so expressed in the Bill, if the law does not already express it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Most business with merchants is done through the banks. An arrangement is made to pay on demand or in cash. The draft is presented to the merchant, and if he were not ready there and then to pay the cash, the note would be protested; but where three days' grace are allowed, he accepts the bill and has three days' in which to provide for payment, and that arrangement meets all practical purposes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Now that attention is called to the matter, I will allow the section to stand so that it can be looked into.

On section 13

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is not wise to make a bill a legal instrument when it is dated on Sunday. The present law is that when a note is dated on Sunday it is not collectable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not change the law regarding the validity of notes made on Sunday. This is simply the present law, but in order to remove doubts we declare that a note is not valid by reason of being dated on Sunday, which may have been done by mistake.

On section 14,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would suggest the propriety of doing away with those days of grace. They have been done away with in France, Italy, Germany, and I think in Spain. It seems to be childish that when a bill is payable

on a certain day three days additional should be given. This used to exist in the French law, but they abolished it in the code of commerce.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It presents a great anomaly as compared with other contracts, but I think the custom is too old and too well established to be now changed.

Mr. GIROUARD. I think we should add civic holidays to the list. It is inconvenient for banks to have to keep their doors open on those days when other places of business are closed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). It is unfair on a civic holiday to oblige the banks to keep open. Bank clerks should have a respite on that day as well as others. I have known of cases where, on such days, it has been difficult to get men to protest a note. The notaries were away and the notes have had to be protested at a late hour at night, after their return, in order to hold the endorsers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That subject is dealt with in the Act relating to banks. We are only dealing with one class of contracts, and even if we adopted the suggestion just made, that would not make those days bank holidays. It would be inconvenient for the bank when its doors were open, to have to throw over all bills and notes until the following day on the mere proclamation of the mayor of a town.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the mayor were a debtor he might proclaim a good many holidays.

Mr. DALY. The custom with banks is when a civic holiday is proclaimed for the manager to arrange with his customers several days beforehand to meet their bills, or to arrange with their solicitors to attend at three o'clock in the afternoon, and one clerk is kept on hand to receive payments of these bills.

Mr. GIROUARD. Under our Code, article 2290, if a bill is refused by the drawee in case of need, it must be presented to the referee.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That is a very good provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the United Kingdom that matter was unsettled, but in the United States the presentment is obligatory. It seems that by the German law it is obligatory. It is a question whether we should adopt the provision of the Quebec Code or the English system, and certainly the suggestion as to the inconvenience which may result from the necessity to present the bill to the referee is a serious question.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Statute should remain as it is. The referee may live a long distance away from the place where it would be impossible in point of time to reach him, and therefore both trouble and expense would be saved by adopting this provision.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not think that is a correct position to take. If the holder accepts that, he knows what he is doing. If the referee lives at too great a distance, he should not accept the bill in that form.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I think it would be well to take the law as we have it in Quebec. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has stated both parties to the bill should be equally responsible.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) that a great deal of inconvenience might be caused by the adoption of this provision.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Then why should the referee accept the responsibility?

Mr. LISTER. Probably he could not get anything better.  
Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Then it is for him to decide when the bill is made.

Mr. GIROUARD. There may be two drawers and the Bill may be payable in two places, and if the holder could not go to the two places it would be a serious inconvenience.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it would be a serious inconvenience, as the reference in case of need will not be much used, because the bill proposes to prevent damages for dishonor as it does.

On section 19,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I know that this is the English law, but their banking system is different from ours, and I cannot see any reason or argument why that practice should be introduced in this Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the English law, and it is the law of Canada as regards bills of exchange, and it seems much better to make it applicable to promissory notes as well. I do not see why there should be any distinction between promissory notes and bills of exchange, and it seems to me that it would be much better to make the law uniform unless there is some serious objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In Ontario a great many people make their bills payable at their business offices or at their bank. The bill has to be presented there before it is protested, and I would like to know whether this clause interferes with that or not?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that it might place the acceptor in a very awkward position. Suppose a person at Halifax accepts a bill payable at a bank and provides the funds to meet it. He may be away, and if this alteration is made in the law the bill need not be presented to the bank and the party may be sued unless he hunts up the bill himself. Suppose my friend from Bothwell lives in London, Ontario, and he makes a bill payable at a branch of the Bank of Montreal in London, the first thing he knows is that a lawyer in Ottawa may have the case in hand to sue him, although if the bill were presented at the proper bank the funds were there to meet it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the reason for the change in England was, that in a great many of those transactions the person in whose favor the Bill is drawn requires, for the convenience of protest, notice of presentment, that some place be designated in which he can perform those duties, and in very many cases it is intended only as an address.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that if a party makes a bill so payable he ought to be bound by it. The words "not elsewhere" would be regarded as superfluous in any other case than that of a bill or promissory note. If a party designates a particular place as the place of payment surely he means "not elsewhere." You give no meaning to those words under the present interpretation of the law. If a man makes a note payable at the Bank of Commerce in Toronto, and if he does not add the words "not elsewhere," the holder can make it payable where he pleases. That makes the words "payable at the Bank of Commerce in Toronto" perfectly meaningless. It seems to me most absurd that we should persist in inserting words that in any other document in the world would be regarded as superfluous.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am only arguing in favor of the present statute, not only of England, but of Canada as well, on that subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before this section is passed, I would like distinctly to understand whether, if a merchant makes a bill payable at his office or at a bank in a certain town or city where he does business, it is necessary to

present that bill at that place. In the great majority of cases the custom is to make notes or drafts payable at the bank where the maker of the note does business, and it is not necessary for him to be there when the note falls due, because it is usual for the bank to charge the note to his account. That is a great convenience, because when people are away from home, their bank in that way protects them. To make the law such that a note would be placed in the solicitor's hands and costs incurred if the maker were not present when it falls due at the place where it is made payable, would be changing the whole custom of business and would be a great injury to the business of the country. I hope the Minister will take this into consideration, and ask any merchant or bank whether it would be to the interest of the business community to make this change.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that the hon. gentleman is perfectly satisfied with the present system. Well, this Bill does not change it. It is true, under the present law, the bill need not be presented at the particular place, and an action may be brought or a protest made without its being presented there. It may be an inconvenience to have the law so; but the hon. member will see how slight the inconvenience is when he urges that that system is carried on everywhere now and is a good one. But the inconvenience, on the other hand, is the inconvenience affecting the liability of the parties, and imposing the necessity of presenting the bill at that place, in order to charge the parties at all, in order to enable them to be sued at all, even though there may be no funds there, or the place may not be accessible or it may be a place where no body lives. It is necessary to go through the form of presenting them before an action can be brought against the maker of a note.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will guarantee that you will not find these words in the printed form of any bank in Canada.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These addresses are given mostly for the convenience of the banks, especially in the case of persons living in the suburbs or at a distance from the town. They say, you must give us the address of someone in town where we can present the note for acceptance or payment.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think this provision was first put in the Act of 1886, having been taken from the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada, but until that Act was passed the practice in New Brunswick was very different. There the acceptor made the bill payable at a particular place, and that was done for the convenience of all parties, and it must be presented at that place when it falls due. The effect of this provision is that an acceptor must hunt up the parties to the note or else he is liable to be sued, and I agree with the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that those words are never used. I never saw a bill accepted yet with those words; and I am told by gentlemen cognisant with the system in England that it is more the exception than the rule there. What additional inconvenience is it to present the bill where it can be charged to the acceptor? The majority of bills in this country are payable at a bank, and if the party has good credit or funds at the bank, the bank meets the draft, and thus conveniences him, no matter where he may be. But the effect of the present system is to make the acceptor liable to be sued without being called on to pay the note at all, and it seems to me that it would work unjustly. It works no injustice or inconvenience, because, when presented, he must pay it. So far as this country is concerned, the old doctrine was a great deal better, and it is a doctrine we always held in New Brunswick until the Revised Statutes were passed.

Mr. GIROUARD. I find this is another change in our Code, but I presume it is useless to notice it. It is very

desirable to have uniformity in the English law, but we ought to act carefully when we come to make so many changes in the business relations of the community. Article 327 of our Code says:

"If a bill of exchange be made payable at any stated place, either by its original tenor or by a qualified acceptance, presentment must be made at such place."

By this Bill, in order that presentment should be made at a particular place, the words "only and not elsewhere" must be inserted. This clause is to be found in the statute of 1849, which was the first statute of importance concerning bills of exchange and promissory notes, but after a few years it was found to be so inconvenient, and gave rise to such misunderstanding, that the law was repealed. The Code promulgated in 1866 did not contain those words. It is very much to be regretted that so many changes should be made just to have uniformity with the laws of England. We ought to be more careful to have uniformity among the different Provinces, especially as these words "not elsewhere" are not to be found in the laws of any nation on the continent of Europe or in the United States.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was taken from the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada.

Mr. GIROUARD. Where it applies to Ontario only.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to let that clause stand, but I hope it will not be supposed I do so because I do not see the necessity of making that clause. I am open to conviction as to that or anything else in the Bill, but it will be in more uniformity with the whole Bill that if there is any limitation in the contract it should appear on the face of it. The theory is, the acceptor owes a debt; he agrees to pay the debt at a certain place on a certain day, but he should pay the debt anyway, and it is no answer for him to say that he has given the address of a particular place, and that the creditor must be obliged to go there or lose the debt. I have known cases where a note was made payable at a particular place where it was impossible to present it for payment.

Mr. GIROUARD. In our Province the acceptor must have funds at the place named, and there is no presentment unless he proves he has funds there and kept them there afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not so elsewhere.

Mr. GIROUARD. It ought to be so everywhere else, instead of taking the law of England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know of cases where parties sold lightning-rods to farmers and took notes payable at the farmers' residences. Later on these parties received notices from a solicitor in Toronto that those notes were in his possession and asking payment there with costs, although they understood the notes were payable at their residences.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let the clause stand, on condition that the hon. gentleman will banish from his mind these notes for lightning-rods. I would not like the law of bills and notes to be settled to suit the hard cases of lightning-rods.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I quite agree with the hon. the Minister that these parties should not be relieved of the liability to pay because the notes were not presented at a particular place, but I object to the makers of the notes being put to costs through no fault of their own. If my note is payable in the town where I live, a notary in a distant place should not have the power of putting me to the expense of paying the costs of that note because the holder did not choose to present it at the place where it was made payable.



Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Suppose you take the converse case, where an acceptance is made payable at a particular place and before it falls due the agency of the bank is withdrawn from that place. You will not allow the acceptor to escape liability from the impossibility of the holder presenting it at the agency where it was made payable.

Mr. DALY. In Manitoba the Ontario Bank had an agency at Portage la Prairie which they afterwards closed, although a great many notes were made payable there. The court held that presentation there was not necessary.

On section 20,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The provision in England is the same as it was at Common Law, that the signature to a blank paper stamped was an authority to the holder to fill it up to the amount which the stamp justified. We have no regulation as to stamps, but I propose to adopt the same principle, and to provide that:

Where a simple signature on a blank paper is delivered by the signer in order that it may be converted into a bill, it operates as a *prima facie* authority to fill it up as a complete bill for any amount, using the signature for that of the drawer, or the acceptor, or an indorser; and, in like manner, when a bill is wanting in any material particular, the person in possession of it has a *prima facie* authority to fill up the omission in any way he thinks fit: In order that any such instrument when completed may be enforceable against any person who became a party thereto prior to its completion, it must be filled up within a reasonable time, and strictly in accordance with the authority given; reasonable time for this purpose is a question of fact: Provided that if any such instrument, after completion, is negotiated to a holder in due course, it shall be valid and effectual for all purposes in his hands, and he may enforce it as if it had been filled up within a reasonable time and strictly in accordance with the authority given.

Of course, that proceeds on the principle that the man who signs and authorizes another to fill up the blank is negligent and must bear the consequences of his negligence. As to the first parties to the contract, it must be shown to be according to the authority given, but the innocent holder may be misled, and the provision is therefore necessary.

On section 21,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Suppose a bill was stolen from the acceptor?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then it would not have been delivered.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then, in the hands of an innocent holder, it would not be valid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd March, 1889.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ADJOURNMENT—ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when this House adjourns to-day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday next at three o'clock.

Mr. TROW. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if it would make any difference that the House should adjourn until eight o'clock on Tuesday evening instead of at three o'clock? There are many members who want to go

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

home and to whom it would be inconvenient to get back at three o'clock.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Let them stay here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to prorogue before Easter, and if we adjourn until eight o'clock on Tuesday we lose half a day. It is not likely that during that half-day there will be many divisions which hon. members would miss; therefore, I think we had better say three o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. I think these remarks will commend themselves to my hon. friend. If we want the blessing of prorogation at an early day we must work hard and every minute.

Motion agreed to.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

### LEGISLATION—JOINT COMMITTEE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to act with the committee appointed by the Senate to enquire into the expenditure of the country in respect of legislation, and the practicability of reducing it, and that the said committee do consist of Sir Hector Langevin, Messrs. Bowell, Charlton, Foster and White (Renfrew), and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors therewith.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the whole of the explanation which the hon. gentleman intends to make in reference to this very important movement. I would expect that some different course should be pursued from this.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason why the other House has appointed a committee and asked us to join in that committee so as to make it a Joint Committee of both Houses, is that they desire to enquire with respect to the expenses connected with both Houses of Parliament. The expenses in the Upper House and in this House are different, and we thought it would be a proper thing to ascertain whether there could not be an assimilation of the expenses between the two Houses, and whether the expenses could be reduced as regards the general expenditure connected with legislation. That is the reason why the committee is asked for.

Mr. EDGAR. May I ask the Government if the step taken in this direction is with the object of abolishing one of the branches of the legislature, for, in my opinion, that would be the simplest way of reducing the expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no intention of abolishing the hon. gentleman and this House, or the Upper House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think this is a question that the Government ought to undertake itself, if it is necessary, and not intercept a buffer composed of a committee of this House, on which I may say there are to be three Ministers, one supporter of the Conservative party and one member of the Opposition, who, I may add, is not present to say whether he is prepared to sit on that committee or not. I have no opinion whatever of the value of these committees, for I hold that the responsibility should be assumed by the Government of the day. I do not believe the slightest good will result from a committee of this sort being appointed, or, for the matter of that, can it be said to be in any shape or way a representative committee of this House, as there is but one member of the Opposition upon it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me this is an extraordinary proposition to come from the Senate. If we are to have a committee of investigation in regard to the management of the finances of the two Houses, it seems to me that proposition should originate in this House. Not only is it the duty of the Government to assume responsibility for any such proposition, but the Government should initiate such a proposition in this House. This proposition comes from the other Chamber, which has no constitutional control over the finances, and yet this proposition is one to consider the propriety of reducing the expenditure. This is a most unconstitutional proposition, and it is one which this House should not entertain. Why, the Senate might as well propose to amend the Supply Bill as to initiate such a proceeding as that which they have initiated in this case.

Mr. LAURIER. Before this motion goes further, I would ask the ruling of the Speaker as to whether it is in order or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot see how this proposition is out of order. If this Honorable House chooses to waive their undisputed right to initiate measures for the control of the expenditure of public moneys, and consent to the joining themselves to the Senate in such measures, it is for them to say so.

Mr. LAURIER. The reason why I asked your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this proposition is, that it is one dealing with the finances of the country, and, therefore, under all constitutional rules it should be initiated in this House and not in the other House, which is not responsible for the finances. That, I repeat, is the constitutional method of procedure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of the Senate, of course, is to ascertain whether by joint action we cannot make reductions in the expenditure connected with the affairs connected with the two branches of Parliament. The other House has control over its own expenditure, and we cannot, without quarreling with one of the estates of the realm, interfere with their expenditure, and they make this proposition in order to ascertain if the expenses for the working of the machinery of Parliament can be reduced, and how it can be reduced and re-arranged. I see nothing unconstitutional in the matter, for it is admitted they have a right to regulate their own expenditure.

Mr. MILLS. They propose to come here to assist us in regulating ours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object is, as everyone will admit, a worthy one, and the point raised is one of those constitutional fads which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) always takes up. I am very glad, indeed, to see that the Senate are inclined to enter into this subject, because, if hon. gentlemen will look at the Public Accounts they will find that the expenditure in the Upper House—perhaps it is on account of their superior dignity—is considerably more per man than it is here, and, I repeat, I am very glad to see that they desire, by concerted and common action, to consider and report on this subject. I do not think the Constitution can be degraded if this committee sits.

Mr. BLAKE. Had they not better take the beam out of their own eye before they take the mote out of ours?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to see there is a beam in the hon. gentleman's eye that is gleaming brightly.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is in error in saying that we cannot interfere with the expenditure of the Senate. The other House spends the money voted by this House, but it cannot compel us to vote any particular amount for their expenses. We can thus compel the Senate to economise by reducing the amount of contingencies

voted to them. It would be more constitutional if any movement tending towards economy were made by the Government itself instead of by an irresponsible committee. The Government should take the responsibility of action in this matter, instead of throwing it on a committee.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the leader of the Government think the committee fairly constituted, having regard to the members of the Opposition and the supporters of the Government in this House? Although I admit there is a Government majority, I think it is hardly so large as four or five to one. If we are going to have a committee, I think the number should have some proportion to the strength of parties in the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot appoint a larger number on the Committee than the Senate have appointed. There is only one representative of the Opposition, but I do not think they can have two; and then it must be remembered that the representative of the Opposition is a very strong man, in fact he is a hoist in himself, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. LAURIER. I do not apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution will suffer very, very much if this motion is carried, because I am sure that the Constitution is so strong that it will resist any assaults of this kind. At all events I think that the principle is well defined that all questions concerning public expenditure should originate with the Government and in the House. The right hon. gentleman is too familiar with the Constitution not to agree with me that in this I am altogether right, and that this principle is one that cannot be successfully assailed. I may say that I believe the hon. gentleman has departed from the true spirit of the British Constitution in this respect to try to shield himself, because he does not dare to grapple with the questions he has himself raised. I cannot help seeing that his end must be somewhat in that direction, since it has originated in his own motion on the other side of the House. However, I am glad to see that the right hon. gentleman is somewhat appalled at the enormous public expenditure of this country. There was a time when the hon. gentleman said he thought he could govern the country for \$22,000,000 a year, but now it has reached \$37,000,000, and he has to ask the aid of the Opposition in order to stem the current of public expenditure which he has thrown upon this side of the House. I think it would be much better if the hon. gentleman had asked the assistance of the House when he was raising the expenditure, instead of asking its assistance now to stem the rising tide and to decrease it. The hon. gentleman should take the responsibility of stemming the expenditure himself, because practically he is responsible that the expenditure has reached the extraordinary amount which it has reached now. The increase is his own act and he is responsible for it. The hon. gentleman has now asked the Opposition to come to the rescue, and he says in effect, We are powerless to stem the current, give us a help: Would it not be more manly for the hon. gentleman, who is responsible to the country, to assume that responsibility boldly, since he has also the emoluments and profits of his office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not think this little innocent motion of mine was going to give rise to a great constitutional question. I quite agree with the statement of my hon. friend opposite that all the expenditures of the country must originate here, but the expenses of the machinery of the legislation is quite a different thing, and it stands all of itself. My hon. friend says that we do not interfere with the expenditure of the Upper House, and if we do not interfere why should they interfere with us. Well, there has been considerable discussion about this question of expenditure. They are willing to

have that considered, and I think a committee chosen in this way would be able to reduce the expense very largely in this House, for, practically, the expenditure must be under you, Mr. Speaker, and your subordinate officer, the Clerk of the House, and for all the minor appointments under the Sergeant-at arms. If we have a joint committee to look into these things we might be able to introduce order into matters in which there is considerable disorder, and to make a considerable retrenchment. I may take the complete responsibility of saying that I would like to have this joint committee, and the sooner it sits the better for the House and the better for the country. I hope that my hon. friend, being an economist himself, will let this joint committee sit. We are a retrenched Government, as the hon. gentleman knows, and we would like to have expenses cut down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know very well what you are in practice.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It seems to me, that the appointment of this joint committee is really, by inference, admitting the right of their Honors at the other end of the building, to interfere with the expenses of this House. If the right hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts, he will see that the expenditure at the other end of the building is much larger in proportion than it is at this end; but perhaps that is in accordance with the dignity of the other body. However, if their Honors desire to reduce the expenditure, they have it in their own power to do so, and if they have any real desire to reduce the expenses, let them commence by reducing expenses in the Senate. By appointing a joint committee, we are virtually admitting that their Honors have some right to interfere with the expenditure in this House. We should not forget that we are the representatives of the people, and our duty is to try and keep down the expenditure here. I believe we try to do so, and we ought to do so, without any interference from their Honors in the other end of the building.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman forgets, that if the other House is going to interfere with our expenditure, we are going to interfere with theirs, because this is to be a joint committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Therefore, you are putting them on an equality.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are on an equality.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not in this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there are matters of considerable importance to come before this committee. We are overloaded with a separate staff in the two Houses now—law clerks and things of that kind, as well as with the expense of separate printing for each House. There are a great many other matters which can be attended to by this committee for the benefit of both branches of the Legislature, and which would save considerable expense if the expenses were joined together. That is the object of this committee, and it is so good an object that I think we might allow the joint committee to act.

Mr. BLAKE. The end justifies the means.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much, Mr. Speaker. It is not carried yet, for I want to say something in this matter. I agree with the hon. gentleman in my eye; I don't know what constituency he represents.

An hon. MEMBER. Frontenac.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). We know that this Government is very extravagant, and I must say that while there is a good deal in what that hon. gentleman says, that any proceeding which bears on an increase of expenditure ought to be originated in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I knew my right hon. friend would approve of that. He says "hear, hear," to the whole of my statement, I suppose, including the charge of extravagance. I may be excused if I say that there is in this House a great absence of independent criticism in relation to the expenditure of the country, but what I object to now is the composition of this committee which my right hon. friend has submitted to the House. Now, Sir, when we look at the composition of that committee, what does it mean? It means that his extravagant Government, that we have been complaining against for years and years, propose that the committee shall consist of the following gentlemen: First, Sir Hector Langevin. I might just say here, that I have a great deal of confidence in that hon. gentleman whose name I have mentioned, because I think he is one of the best members we have in the Cabinet.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I do think so; and I say it sincerely and honestly that I believe Sir Hector does his duty well and faithfully. Then another member of the committee is Mr. Bowell. Well, I have very little confidence in Mr. Bowell, very little indeed. He will collect every dollar that he can scoop out of the industries of the people and construe the Customs Act in a way to get every shilling he can, whether it is legal or not, and he will then appeal to the majority behind him to sustain him, so that I have little confidence in Mr. Bowell. I come to the next member of the committee, Mr. Foster. I described a man to-day as a fledgling politician with the pen-feathers sticking out of him yet and that might apply to Mr. Foster, because he has not much experience. What he may develop into we cannot tell, because we have not seen any signs as yet of economy or anything else from him. Now as to another member of the committee—Mr. White, of Renfrew. He is a coming Minister; he is a disappointed man because he was not made a Minister before, and, therefore, I have not a great deal of confidence in him.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). May be you might have.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will give you a chance to speak just now. You are a coming Minister, and no doubt you are very anxious for the position; and the next fellow that dies or gets out of the way, you will succeed him in the Cabinet. The only man who is named at all on that committee on this side of the House is my respected friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I must say that the very fact of the right hon. the Premier naming him has created a good deal of suspicion in my mind in relation to a member of this House whom I esteem very much. I always suspect the right hon. gentleman when he talks about economising or about making changes, and refers to the practice in England and Ireland, as he did the other night when he proposed to pension the Mounted Police, I always have great suspicion that there is some little job behind. What I want to say is this: There is another party in this House who are apt to speak out their minds and say what they think—the Third party; and if the Government really want suggestions about economy in that committee, they ought to appoint a member of the Third party on it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one.

Mr. MITCHELL. Myself, Sir. There is no money or pay attached to the position, but I think—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him one moment? I move that the motion be amended by striking out the name of Mr. Bowell, in whom the hon. gentleman has no confidence, and inserting the name of the Hon. Mr. Mitchell instead.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House any longer. I think if there is anything to be done by a minority of the committee, my hon. friend from North Norfolk and myself will accomplish something.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I may point out to the House that I felt certain, on general principles, that the action of the Senate was constitutional; but I sent to the Library for May, and I find, according to him, that the constitutionality of the motion could be perfectly maintained.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Act 36 Vic., chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Tupper.)

### THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON** moved second reading of Bill (No. 108) to amend chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes, intitled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

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

(In the Committee.)

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** It has been considered expedient by the Treasury Board that the credits which are placed at the disposal of the various departments of the Government should be placed at the disposal of more than one officer, so that the cheques drawn from time to time shall be drawn by two, and a check will be had upon the drawing of accounts. In respect to all the departments of the public service, except the Senate and the House of Commons, that matter is subject to the control of the Treasury Board; but inasmuch as the expenditure in connection with the Senate and the House of Commons is regulated by Statute, it is necessary, in order to make the same change there, to have the statute amended; and the purpose of this Bill is to provide that credit may be made in favor of the accountant and the assistant accountant, or any other two officers who may be designated by the Commissioners of Internal Economy.

**Mr. LAURIER.** What is the present law?

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** The present law is that the credit shall be made to the accountant alone.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** I would like to ask the Government under what authority these payments by the accountants are made, and what rule governs their conduct in making them? The reason I put this question is this: It will be remembered that in 1883, I think it was, the party who was held to be improperly returned for Bothwell, in my place, sat here for a part of the Session before the Supreme Court finally disposed of the case. He was paid for a portion of the Session that he was here, and I was paid for that portion of the Session that I sat here after the Supreme Court upheld the decision of Mr. Justice Galt. In the Session before that, there was, I think, a Mr. Brecken returned here for one of the constituencies in Prince Edward Island. A Mr. Jenkins claimed the seat, and was ultimately given the seat by the Supreme Court. Mr. Jenkins took his seat near the end of the Session; I am not sure whether he sat a week or not, but he was paid for the full Session.

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK.** No, no.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** Yes; he was paid for the full sessional allowance, and a part payment was made to Mr. Brecken. It was reported to me by the accountant at the time.

**Mr. KIRKPATRICK.** Is that the case in which there was a double return?

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** No, there was not a double return; and the accountant undertook to justify his conduct by stating that he had paid under the order of the First Minister. Now, I would like to know whether any member of the Government has a right to interfere and give instructions to the accountant. The question is whether he has the right to order the full payment to one member and the partial payment to another, under exactly the same circumstances. Now, I am not complaining, and I never did complain, of the payment made to me when my opponent continued to sit here in opposition to the decision of Mr. Justice Galt, because he had taken an appeal to the Supreme Court, and retained his seat until the final decision was given; but I do object to one rule being applied to members on this side and a wholly different rule to hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe the payment to Mr. Jenkins was made through the interference of the First Minister, and I call on him to tell this committee by what authority he interfered with the accountant, and upon what principle of law or justice he proposed to pay \$1,000 to a member who sat here four or five days at the conclusion of the Session, while he applied a different rule to hon. gentlemen on this side. This Bill is based on a good principle, and if it will improve the law it is a step in the right direction. I hope the improvement will be such as to prevent the improper interference by any member of the Cabinet with any officer of this House in the discharge of his duty.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the officers of this House could not be interfered with improperly, but I really do not remember any of the circumstances which the hon. gentleman refers to.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** I do.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** My hon. friend has a very good memory, but not perhaps altogether an accurate one. But I am quite sure I never interfered, so far as I am aware, in any of these matters, and I think I am the last man chargeable with trying to deprive an hon. member, who sits on the other side, of his rightful dues, or drawing a distinction between members on this side and on that.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** Well, it was done.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** We have always dealt with anything connected with the compensation of members without reference to party. I do not mean to say that the accountant, or his deputy, would not be given my opinion if he asked me for it. No doubt, if he asked me, I told him what I thought was right, and I would do so again if he came to me. The accountant should get his opinion, however, from some legal authority—for instance, the Minister of Justice, although he is a member of the Government. If this law will prevent any such interference as that suggested, I would be only too glad, and the hon. gentleman may put in a clause providing that the accountant shall in no case ask the advice of the First Minister.

**Mr. LAURIER.** It is of little importance whether the hon. gentleman interfered in the case referred to or not. The Ministry is responsible, because the Government practically control the whole expenditure of this House. The Commission of Internal Economy is altogether in the hands of the Government, and, therefore, practically, the Government may shield themselves behind the Commission; still they are the parties who are responsible. If the accountant did not consult the hon. gentleman, or some member of the Internal Commission, where did he get his authority? If he has to consult anybody, he should consult the Internal Commission.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Commission of Internal Economy have nothing to do with the salaries of members.

Mr. LAURIER. But, according to the admissions of the accountant, if he consults anybody, he should consult the Commission of Internal Economy. Of whom is composed this Commission? It is composed of members of the Government altogether, so that whenever a case occurs in which the accountant is in doubt, he should bring the question before the Commission. Mr. Brecken had been sitting part of the Session. He was not entitled to the seat, still he was in the House. Then Mr. Jenkins came in at the end of the Session, and, practically, he had been all the time a member of the House. The question might arise as to how the indemnity ought to be distributed. Were they both entitled to part of it or not? I apprehend the accountant then required advice, and I suppose he went to the Speaker, or some other member of the Commission. What I maintain is that this Commission is useless, because, practically, the whole expenditure is in the hands of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I pointed out was that in my case one rule was adopted, and in the case of Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Brecken another and a wholly different rule was followed. A man who came within a week of the close of the Session was paid his whole sessional indemnity.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If I understand the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) rightly, he says this occurred in the Session of 1883. I have no recollection of any such case occurring. I do not think the accountant would consult anyone but his superior officer, who is the Speaker of the House. I am very sure he received no such order to pay any member that came the last week of the Session the whole sessional indemnity. The law would not justify it. If the accountant took orders from the First Minister or any other Minister, he deserves severe censure. I know of some other cases where the question of indemnity came up, and which were referred to the Speaker, and in the only case where there was any doubt, and in which the Speaker gave his decision, his decision was referred by the Auditor General to Mr. Christopher Robinson, of Toronto, who endorsed the Speaker's decision. The law is plain that a new member takes his sessional indemnity only from the day he takes his seat, deducting the days when he was absent. I am sure there is no case of Mr. Jenkins being paid his full sessional indemnity. With regard to the Bill under discussion, we have appointed a joint committee to act with the Senate. Why should we make a law with regard to the House of Commons, and say that the money shall be paid out here by cheques signed by the accountant and his assistant, when we do not know anything as to the way in which they pay out in the Senate? How do they pay out the money in the Senate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The cheques are paid out of the credit.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Paid by the Clerk on his own authority?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, but I am proposing a Bill to amend that.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There should be the same law for both Chambers, and if it is salutary that two officers should sign these cheques, the same law should apply to both Houses alike.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose a slight amendment giving power to the Commissioners to designate any two officers from time to time to sign these cheques, and providing that any officer who may be so designated shall give security.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. EDGAR. When two officers are to be appointed to perform the duties which were formerly carried out by one officer, I do not see why it is necessary to take power to dispense with the services of those gentlemen, and appoint other persons to do this work.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is to have always two. At present there is but one, and that is the accountant. The assistant accountant is not recognised in the Act. One of these officers may be absent from duty or may be ill, and it may be desirable to have power to appoint another in his place.

Mr. EDGAR. That is, in place of one of them?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This would enable the Commissioners to dispense with the services of both.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it the intention by the provisions of this Bill, to dispense with money payments to members altogether, and only to pay them by cheque?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not a necessary consequence of this Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be most inconvenient if that course were adopted; and, if there has been no loss sustained by the Government in this respect, the present system should be continued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before this Bill is reported, I desire to refer to a case which has been mentioned by an hon. member in reference to the member for West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet). A year or two ago, that hon. member was unseated during the Session; he drew his full allowance, less the number of days he would have to put in from that time to the end of the Session. A writ was issued, and he was re-elected, and then he drew his sessional allowance less the number of days he was absent. He thus drew two sessional allowances for one Session of Parliament; and I think, when we are considering a Bill of this kind, we should make provision that that should not be repeated. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who came here last year, but a few days before the House rose, was only permitted to draw for the few days he was here, and not for the whole Session less the number of days he was absent. What is sauce for one should be sauce for the other, and if our law is so vague as to permit a man to take an advantage of the kind to which I have referred, and to draw two sessional allowances for one Session of Parliament, there should be a change made so that all parties should be treated alike.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The case to which the hon. gentleman refers, was an exceptional one. The reason for it was, that there was an extra indemnity voted during that year. It was the year 1885, when we had the long Session, and it was the reading of the Members' Indemnity Act, coupled with the Act granting the extra indemnity, that gave the extra amount to the hon. member. Mr. Christopher Robinson endorsed the decision which was come to, and such a case could not occur again, under the ordinary circumstances, when an indemnity is granted.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are to have another Franchise Act, and we may sit for six months again. The Government has given notice, every Session, of a new Franchise Act, and we cannot tell when we may have to sit six months. We are to have a new Franchise Act this year, and we have not got to the consideration of the first clause yet; but I tell hon. gentlemen that, if we are to have a Franchise Bill this Session, they will not see their homes at Easter. We know that the last time we had a Franchise Bill to consider it was held over until the end of the Session, and we were asked to consent to a hurried review of its provisions; but

we did not consent to that, and in consequence the Session was lengthened out to nearly six months.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### EXCHEQUER COURT OF CANADA.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 109) to amend the law respecting the Exchequer Court of Canada.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would it not be well to unite the Chief Justice, say, of the Supreme Court, along with the Judge of the Exchequer Court, to make these rules? If there were a court of more than one, it would be different, but when you have a court consisting of a single judge there would be more responsibility if the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court were united with the Judge of the Exchequer Court. It is a large power to give to one man; he has no one to consult.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be awkward to have a judge of another court; but I have no objection to having some other control. I would be willing to make it subject to ratification by the Governor General in Council, or to put in a provision that the rules should be laid before Parliament and could be negatived at any time during that Session.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 105) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act. He said: This Bill involves a principle which I do not propose to press on the House—that is, the principle contained in the first section, namely, that a judge who sat on the trial should not sit, or take part in, or adjudicate upon the proceedings in the Supreme Court. If we had intended to pass the Bill it would have been necessary to have proceeded with it with more expedition than has been observed, because the sitting of the court to which it was especially intended to apply, has already commenced. I understand that the necessity is not so great as I supposed, and that the opinion of the judges, as to the necessity of legislation of this kind, is not what I was led to understand it was. I will not, therefore, press upon the committee the first clause. I think it would be undesirable to legislate in this connection, and thereby disturb the arrangement in regard to the quorum, except more urgency is shown. The view I understood to be taken was this: that the learned judge who has recently come to that court, having heard a large number of cases in the Appeal Court in Toronto, held that he should not sit on hearing appeals, and he was obliged to sit for the lack of any provision of the law to relieve him. I have had the benefit of communicating with the learned judge, and I understand that is not his view, and that he thinks legislation of this kind is not necessary. For that reason I do not propose to proceed with the first section. I would not have moved the second reading of the Bill except to give the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) an opportunity to move some amendments which he desires to have incorporated in the Supreme Court Act, and which he thinks are necessary. I now, however, move the second section. The facts which led to the framing of this section are these: Courts are actually constituted in various Provinces for the purpose of regulating the assessment of property in those Provinces, and it has been the practice in two or three of the Provinces of late years to give those courts, although they are not in the ordinary sense courts of justice, and although sometimes

they are not presided over by professional men, very large jurisdiction indeed. In some cases it has been brought to our notice that adjudications have been made by those courts involving taxation to the amount of tens of thousands of dollars a year. There is no appeal to the Supreme Court, by reason of the fact that those courts are not in any sense superior courts, and it is provided that there shall only be an appeal from a superior court. In the North-West Territories we found it necessary to give a very liberal interpretation in regard to appeals, and an appeal can be had whenever a judge of the Supreme Court thinks it proper to allow an appeal to be taken. The provision made in this Bill is intended specially to apply to the Province of British Columbia, which has established a provincial tax and authorised an assessment court in which there have been adjudications involving payment by a single company to the extent of between \$60,000 and \$70,000 a year. It is proper, under these circumstances, that an appeal should be permitted, and I may say its provincial Legislature has so far concurred in that view, that they are prepared to permit an appeal from the assessment court, and, therefore, all that is required is authority to appeal to the Supreme Court here. I propose to take the view of the committee as to the amount which shall regulate an appeal.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON (St. John). With regard to the second section I propose to add another clause to that Bill with regard to appeals from the Court of Probate. Suits involving millions may come before these courts, and I think it is very important in these matters, especially as regards our Province, that there should be an appeal in cases before the Probate Courts. I beg to move in amendment the words:

(K) From any judgment on appeal from a case or proceedings instituted in any Court of Probate in any of the Provinces of Canada, other than the Province of Quebec.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That amendment may be added.

Amendment concurred in, and Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### PAYMENT OF SESSIONAL ALLOWANCES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that there shall be granted to Her Majesty, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, an annual sum sufficient to enable Her Majesty to pay the estimated amount of sessional allowances awarded by law to Senators and Members of the House of Commons; and that all moneys expended for such purpose shall be expended and accounted for in like manner as moneys are expended and accounted for in respect of the contingent expenses of the House of Commons under the Act respecting the House of Commons as amended by any subsequent Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for this?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is a measure like the one we have just passed relating to the House of Commons, and is intended to provide that cheques shall be drawn in like manner by two officers of the Senate. Perhaps the Bill did not require to be preceded by a resolution, but having the appearance of a measure involving the expenditure of public money, I thought, to avoid any objection, we had better proceed by resolution.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in committee, reported, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120), to amend chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes,

intituled: "An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

**BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.**

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 5) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Before we take up this Bill, I would once more call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the objections raised on this side of the House, yesterday, to going into this Bill at all. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will be as obdurate to-day as he was yesterday, but I must say, at the rate we progressed last night, it will take three or four days more to go through with this measure. The hon. gentleman would do well to consider the propriety of postponing it until next Session. Though the Bill is an important one, we can well go one year longer without it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we made very substantial progress with the Bill last night. In two hours we passed twenty clauses, and very valuable assistance was given me by members of the House. I am not so obdurate as the hon. gentleman's remarks would imply, but I am not yet prepared to abandon the Bill. I do not think we have arrived at such serious difficulties that they cannot be removed. I will, however, promise to consider the representations of the hon. gentleman and consult my colleagues.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no intention to criticise the Bill in any hostile spirit. I only speak from the point of view that, even with every desire to assist the hon. gentleman, it must take still a very long time to go through with it, and, at this time of the Session, time is valuable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

**SUPPLY.**

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Pensions payable on account of Fenian Raid ..... \$3,036

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this I see there is an increase in the shape of a pension to Mr. James Bryan, amounting to \$109.50. That requires explanation, seeing that it is now 20 years since these Fenian claims accrued. How does this occur now for the first time? What are the circumstances which induced the Government to recommend this pension at this distant date?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am informed that James Bryan is a regular pensioner, but he was not paid last year because the department could not pay him without the regular voucher, which he did not send in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of his pension?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. \$109.50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose he was paid for last year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; that is true.

Veterans of War 1812..... \$3,150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the average age of these old gentlemen? Speaking generally, it cannot be very far short of 96 years apiece.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have been endeavoring for some years to ascertain the average age, and it is rather doubtful still.

Compensation to Pensioners in lieu of land..... \$1,800

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the hon. gentleman tell us anything in reference to the pension awarded by the department to Sergeant Valiquette?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Sergeant Primat Valiquette, No. 4 Company, 65th Battalion, entered the active militia at about the age of 18 years and was 22 when he left with his battalion for the North-West, 2nd April, 1885. Was most robust. Had never been sick. Wages between \$1.50 and \$2 *per diem*, all went to his father. On the march from Beaver River to Fort Pitt, 37 miles marched in one day, 25th June, 1885; took sick with gastric enteritis of which he died on the 4th July, 1885. His father, Antoine Valiquette, is 58 or 68 years old. He is unable to work since 20 years, on account of chronic asthma. His wife is 50 years old, manages all the affairs of the family, and works outside for their living. Children: 4 girls, 16, 18, 20, 22 years; 2 boys, 12, 14 years old. All with father and mother working the best they can, but family is poor and at times has been depending on public charity. Board (4th March, 1887) recommended pensions as per sections 15, 16, 17 of Order in Council of the 8th July, 1885. Father; half widow's pension, that is, \$51.33 per annum, and a pension at the same rate to the two boys until they attain the age of 18, and a pension at the same rate to the three youngest girls until the age of 21. Then, in regard to the case of Ryan, I have this: Gunner John F. Ryan, No. 2 Battery, Montreal Brigade Garrison Artillery, enjoyed good health up to 23rd May, 1885. When at Regina, he was seized with symptoms of acute bronchitis which resisted treatment owing to unfavorable weather. The patient growing worse was admitted to the hospital on the 13th June, 1885, improved there, returned to camp and fell ill again. He was discharged and arrived in Montreal on the 29th June, 1885. He is now permanently disabled—tubercular disease of the lungs. Cannot follow his ordinary occupation as a moulder nor any heavy work. Was paid up to the 31st July, 1885. Has no means of support except his parents. Married man, wife 26 years old; he is now 28 years old; no children. His salary was \$10 to \$12 per week when working. The Board (26th October, 1885) recommended that he be put in the second class, Regulation Orders 1009. By Order in Council of the 21st January, 1887, the widow was granted an annual pension of \$68.44, being the three-eighths of a daily pay of a gunner during twelve months, and, as it was afterwards found that she had a daughter, the Minister of Militia and Defence had an Order in Council passed (23rd August, 1887) granting to Mary Elizabeth Ryan, the daughter in question, a pension of \$14.60 per annum, being calculated at the rate of one-thirteenth of a pay of a gunner. Paragraph 7 of General Order No. 14 of the 19th July, 1885, contains two scales of pensions, first in the case of a soldier killed in action or who died from wounds received in action, and second in the case of a soldier who died from illness which can be traced to exposure in the active service. This last scale is the lowest and applies to both Valiquette and Ryan, but Mrs. Ryan's question was calculated upon the rate of pay of a gunner, whilst that of Valiquette's father on sergeant's pay, at the rate of half the pension given to a widow; and the brothers and sisters of Valiquette received the same rate of pension as per Paragraph 16 of General Order 12,214.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What change has been made in the amount awarded to Valiquette last year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no change.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year exception was taken to the fact that the department had awarded to Valiquette

more than it had to Ryan, and even more than the man himself received when he was in the service; and, further, that it had awarded to members of the Valiquette family who were brothers and sisters, and not children, a pension. The Minister then, and the First Minister, also, agreed with the views which were expressed from this side of the House that that appeared to be irregular and should be looked into.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has been looked into, and this is the report which I have read. That shows that Valiquette was paid as a sergeant under the Order in Council, and the other man was paid under the same Order in Council, according to the rates fixed to be paid to a gunner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the sum total paid to the Valiquette family?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The amount paid to the Valiquette family was entirely contrary to law. By the rules and orders the family of his brothers and sisters cannot receive any pension from Parliament, and the amount awarded to them is in excess of his pay during the time he was in the service. The Minister promised to bring down a report last year on this point, and he brought down nothing more than the report which is read to-day. When the discussion took place it was so generally concurred in, and appeared to be such a ridiculous departure from the rules of the department, and appeared to be such gross favoritism, and so contrary to law, that the First Minister said that it should be looked into.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will repeat again to the hon. gentlemen the amounts which were paid to the Valiquette family upon the Order in Council which was passed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is not what we want.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I make it, over \$300 are paid to Valiquette's surviving relatives.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give the hon. gentleman the figures which have been reported to me as being the amounts paid. The father gets half a widow's pension, \$51.33 per annum, and a pension at the same rate is paid to the two boys until they attain the age of 18, and a pension at the same rate to the three youngest girls until the age of 21, all the pensions to date from the Order in Council. The brothers and sisters are treated in the light of children.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Under what authority?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Under the authority of the Order in Council, and under the authority of the regulations which were laid down.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No; no.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg your pardon. It was considered that the family were exclusively dependent upon the work and labor of Sergeant Valiquette who was killed. The matter was tried by the Commission, like every other pension claim, and the Order in Council was passed upon the report of the Commission which I have just read.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here you pay, not to the wife, not to the widow and the children, but you pay to the father, to the brothers and sisters of Sergeant Valiquette, \$319 a year, if I have made the addition correctly. Another man—not in the same rank, it is true, a private gunner, while the other man was a sergeant in the same regiment—another man dies leaving a wife and child, and she is only to get \$98 dollars a year. The objection was taken from both sides of the House, not altogether in making a liberal provision to Sergeant Valiquette's relatives, but to an extravagant disproportion. It did seem to us, and in spite of the explanations, it seems to me still, that to give \$98 to a widow and child, and to give \$300 to the brothers

and sisters and father, is a very extravagant difference, far more than the difference in rank between the two, or the income lost by the death of either of these parties, justified. The hon. gentleman will know that, according to his own statement, Gunner Ryan was in receipt of, I think, \$10 or \$12 a week, that is precisely the same income that Valiquette was receiving, \$1.50 or \$2 per day; so that the losses to the family of Gunner Ryan were quite as great as any possible loss that could be sustained by Sergeant Valiquette's death, and the widow and infant child are, presumably, not as well qualified to support themselves as the brothers and sisters of Sergeant Valiquette. The father, the hon. gentleman states, was quite dependent upon his sons, but the brothers and sisters were of reasonable age.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Let me read the paragraph:

"Paragraphe 7 of General Order No 14, of 19th July, 1885, contains two scales of pensions; first, in the case of a soldier killed in action, or who died from wounds received in action."

This is Valiquette's case—

"And, second, in the case of a soldier who died from illness which can be traced to be from exposure in actual service."

The last scale is the lowest, and applies to both Valiquette and Ryan, but Mrs. Ryan's pension was calculated upon the rate of pay of a gunner, whilst that of Valiquette's father, on sergeant's pay, at the rate of half the pension given to a widow; and the brothers and sister of Valiquette received the same rate of pension as per paragraph 16 of above quoted General Orders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think paragraph 16 involves that. It seems to me that Mrs. Ryan should get more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the pension list has been increased since last year by the sum of \$2,275. What is the cause of that increase?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I remember that it is strictly laid down in the Act that no pension can be granted under authority of that Act, to the brothers and sisters of the party, but in this case we have granted a pension to the brothers and sisters of Valiquette. It was discussed very generally in the House last year, and the hon. Minister, as I have said before, promised to inspect and report, but there was no report except his own statement of the case. When that was very fully discussed here Sir John A. Macdonald said:

"I think the circumstances mentioned by the hon. gentleman require some investigation. I will undertake that the matter shall be fully investigated."

Now, the only investigation the hon. gentleman appears to have undertaken, is to repeat the same explanation that he gave us last year, which was no explanation at all. I say that he had no authority under the law to grant these pensions to the brothers and sisters of Valiquette, and that he exceeded his authority and transgressed the laws in so doing. The hon. gentleman will have to give some better explanation than that before he can satisfy this House on that subject.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I consider that regulations 16 and 17 warrant the action that was taken. I can state that the cases now under discussion came before the Board and had every consideration as to the facts. The matter came before Council, and an Order in Council was passed, and the cases were taken into consideration, one being that of a sergeant and the other that of a gunner.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is strictly laid down that if there is a daughter or brother living there shall not be a pension given, and in one of these cases there was a brother, sister and father living.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The regulation has been carried out.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But the father was living.



Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But the Governor in Council is able to consider the special circumstances of a case. Although the father was alive, he was reported to be absolutely dependent upon the earnings of Valiquette, and by his death the father was deprived of his livelihood, and it was considered that under that provision and under clause 17, after the report was made by the Commission, that Sergeant Valiquette's family were entitled to the pension mentioned.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is distinctly laid down that the department cannot give a pension in such a case. It is an improper act and an unlawful exercise of the Minister's authority. So much is that the case that the First Minister declared last year that he would have the matter investigated. The Minister of Militia has been unable to afford any other explanation of his action than that furnished last year, when the First Minister, as I have said, thought it was such an extraordinary proposal that he would have the matter looked into.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fail to see anything improper in what has been done. It is stated by the regulations which have been passed by Council that, in instances where the regulations do not meet the circumstances of an individual case, those circumstances may be specially considered by the Governor General in Council. I have told the hon. gentleman as frankly as possible the nature of the report made by the Board on the circumstances of Sergeant Valiquette's family. All the details came before Council, and Council decided that under clause 17—of course there must be some one to judge what the special circumstances are—and on the report of the Commission, they would grant the pensions.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Those children were not orphans, for they had brother and father living.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The brother is young and unable to render help.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I regard this as a highly improper and illegal proceeding, and it was so considered at the time the promise was made by the First Minister that the matter would be investigated. The result is that these have been made permanent charges on the pension list. I protest against this action, and I think those hon. members who take an interest in this question should mark their sense of what has been done. I am quite willing that any man who was unfortunate in the services of his country should be rewarded as the law provides, but I am not willing to allow the Minister of Militia to interpret the Act to suit himself, which he has done in this case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I repeat there was been an improper exercise of authority.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman has so interpreted the law that the amount received by the family is in excess of the actual earnings of the deceased when in public service. Surely that cannot be an exact interpretation of the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the exact pay of a sergeant per day?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The pay of a sergeant, 75 cents; of a gunner, 40 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the sergeant would have been in receipt of about \$280 per year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And this sum is \$319?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; but the hon. gentleman is not considering the question fairly. If the man had been alive he would have been receiving a much smaller pension

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

than the united pensions which were allowed to his mother and his sisters and brother. The individual pensions granted to each are very much smaller sums than he would have got himself, while altogether they make a larger sum.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that if a case does not come within rule 17 it might be considered by the Governor in Council as to whether it was a favorable one in which to grant a pension or not? I understand the hon. gentleman to find his authority in rule 17, that it authorises him to look into the special circumstances, and if the special circumstances appear to him favorable, although the case could not fall under any other rule, he would in such a case grant a pension.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is asking a question that is answered by article 17. It states that if the regulations do not meet the circumstances of an individual case, those circumstances may be considered by Council upon the report of the Commission stating that certain circumstances existed in regard to the possibility of the father or mother earning a livelihood for their children. These matters would come up in connection with the case, and it would be considered by the Governor in Council. The only interpretation that could be given to clause 17 was that the Governor in Council could judge of the special circumstances of the case, and if Council decided that a pension should be paid, it would be paid.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not familiar with these rules, but rule 17 seems to be very wide, and very liable to be abused. It appears to be left optional with the Minister to consider whether there are special circumstances in a case or not, and if, in his opinion, there are special circumstances which are not covered by any rule that warrant a pension being given, it is granted. The rule is a very wide one.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My authority cannot be questioned under that rule; but, of course, the rule itself can be attacked.

Mr. LAURIER. I repeat that I am not sufficiently familiar with the rules to say whether the Minister has gone too far or not, but he should not be placed in a position where he is liable to exercise the full authority given by that rule.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member says his authority cannot be contradicted. I beg to point out what the law provides. It says:

"The sisters collectively of the officer or soldier killed in action or dying of wounds received in action, within twelve months after such wounds, without leaving widow, legitimate child and provided there be an orphan or orphans without surviving brothers."

Now these were not "orphan or orphans," and they had a surviving brother. Both of those circumstances placed them beyond the consideration of the department. The Act further says:

"And mainly depending for support on the officer or soldier deceased may under special circumstances to be determined by the Minister of Militia, be granted an allowance equal to half of the rate of the widow's pension."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman would go on and read section 17.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have not it here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, that is just it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is the rule.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the rule; that is clause 16. We will allow the item to stand over.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Very well, let it stand over until I get my authority. I have sent into the Library for it and could not get it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to say now, because I may not have an opportunity of doing so when this matter is up again, that I was in this House when the matter was brought forward last year, and I certainly do agree with the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that this would *prima facie* appear to be a gross case of injustice. I do not think that the Minister of Militia has at all improved on it by his explanation. I know that a pledge was given by the First Minister, that this matter would be looked into, but this Session we have the same injustice repeated. It does seem a most monstrous doctrine that a man's family should be allowed a larger amount than he could earn if he were alive. That makes the pension system ridiculous, and what emphasises it is that the Minister of Militia refused a pension in a case where the facts were all in favor of granting a pension, on a technical rule, whereas in this case he stretches the technical rule and, as I believe, goes beyond it in order to justify a pension in another case. It seems like a gross case of favoritism, and it appears to be an extraordinary thing that in one case the rule should be stretched even beyond a technical point—where in another case, when all the facts were in favor of the technical rule being superseded, it is not done. I think this item should not be allowed to pass.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was another case in which explanations were demanded and also promised last year, that was the case of Mr. Swinford, of Winnipeg. He was killed in action or died from disease contracted on the field, I do not know which, but at any rate his father received a grant of \$752 a year. Captain Brown was killed in action and his widow received a pension of only \$259 a year. Now I call the attention of the Minister to what would appear to me to be a most extraordinary decision of the Board, viz., that the widow of an officer killed in action, of superior rank, only received \$259 a year, while the father of an officer, of inferior rank, was assigned just three times as much. I cannot see that the explanation that we have got appears to me to justify the Board, on whose recommendation the Minister acted, in deciding upon those different amounts. There certainly is an extraordinary difference between the case of a widow and the case of a father surviving a son, even though the son had been, and I suppose he may have been, largely assisting in the support of his father. In that case, also, an explanation should be given to the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON, I remember the circumstances perfectly. I have the report of the Board by me, but I have not the explanation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want the explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot explain anything more than what the Board lays before me. All these pensions were granted without any reference to the Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me the point was taken last year, and the reason that the discussion passed over for the time being was that we admitted that the hon. gentleman was not acquainted with the facts, but we thought there was a clear discrepancy in the decision of the Board, and that the Minister should give reasons for this extraordinary action on the part of the Board. These reasons we expected the hon. gentleman would provide to-day.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will allow the item to pass, or to stand for the present, I will give all the explanation that I can get, from the report which has been made to me, that is all I can produce.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We wanted you to get the full particulars.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We will let this item stand.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will get full particulars and give them to the hon. gentlemen.

Pensions on accounts of Rebellion to North-West Mounted Police, &c. .... \$4,324 91

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In connection with this item, I must express my regret that the Minister of Militia has not seen his way to make a provision for the men who performed useful services to the country in 1837. I called the attention of the House to this matter a year ago, and I think that then I did not receive that satisfaction from the First Minister which I thought I ought to receive. I notice, Sir, that a case has been related where a man had been in service, and had caught cold, through which he got bronchitis, which rendered him unfit to perform his manual labor, and not being able to provide for his family the Government gave him an allowance. I have a case exactly similar to that, of a veteran of 1837. I know that it is a disputed point between the Dominion Government and the Local Government as to the responsibility of giving justice to those men who served in 1837; yet it is very unfair, in making provisions for the veterans of 1812 and for those who served during the Fenian Raid, that you should not compensate those who served in 1837. It is not for me to say who was at fault on account of that rebellion, but we know that there was a rebellion, that the citizens were called out and ordered to go to the front and serve their country. No doubt some may have gone unwillingly, but they took the field, and they should be compensated for any disabilities they sustained while on duty. I hold that it is an injustice to those men that they should not be compensated, whether it be the Government of Ontario, or Quebec, or the Dominion Government that is responsible. These men were true and loyal. It does not concern me now whether the rebellion was justified or not; all I ask is that simple justice should be done to those men who served the country faithfully, many of whom received injuries which left them cripples for the remainder of their lives. I can well understand that the First Minister might not wish this question to be brought up; I can understand that there are many who would not wish to have recalled to their minds that time when the people in their desperation rose in arms for responsible government, and tried to overcome those who were oppressing them. We might perhaps say that those who rebelled at that time were justified; but whether it was right or wrong, those who were called out to put down that rebellion ought to receive consideration at the hands of the Government, and as the Government are now so generous in being ready to pension everybody who comes along, even those who are well compensated at the present time, I say it is their duty to consider the cases of those unfortunate men, who, through difficulty, privation and neglect of their families, went to the front and assisted in repressing the rebellion, which, perhaps, was instigated by those who had charge of the administration of the affairs of the country. I regret exceedingly that the Minister of Militia has not been able to suggest some scheme for granting to these men that justice which they have been demanding. It is quite indifferent to me whether they belong to one class or the other, whether they were forced to go to the front or went freely of their own accord. I say they ought to receive the consideration of this House, and so long as I have a seat here and have an opportunity to call the attention of the Government to the fact that these men have claims, so long will I continue to raise my voice in the interest of those who are entitled to justice.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I believe they have been denied justice since 1837. My hon. friend says, "hear, hear." I will guarantee that, if he had served the country half as faithfully as these men have done, and anything happened

to him, we would find an item in the Estimates which would enable him to luxuriate for the balance of his life. But those true and loyal citizens of Canada, who have served their country faithfully, and did their duty as well as the Minister of War has done, are to receive nothing, while he, forsooth, is to be knighted, honored, and respected. I say it is a burning shame and disgrace to the Dominion of Canada that these poor men should be allowed to remain in that position, without a single effort being made, or a single proposition being presented to the House for affording just recognition to these men for their services. Sir, I would advise the First Minister to put off his pensions to the Mounted Police in the North-West, and do justice to these poor old unfortunate men who aided in putting down the rebellion that very likely he had a little hand in instigating. I appeal to the House to grant the justice to which they are entitled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I congratulate my hon. friend on his speech. I hope it will be carefully reported, and it will do him a good deal of good in his county, which, I have no doubt, was his object in being so very eloquent. The difficulty in this case is that the Dominion of Canada had nothing to do with the rebellion of 1837, and that is a point the hon. gentleman must consider. He says he is not going to decide the question whether those who rebelled or those who put down the rebellion were right. But the hon. gentleman said that those who put down the rebellion and suffered so much in doing so, ought to be pensioned; but do you not think that the others who took arms to defend the liberties of the people ought to be pensioned as well? I think the hon. gentleman must see from what he is saying that the rebels and those who put down the rebels ought both to be pensioned; and considering the state of our finances, in consequence of the enormous extravagance of the present Government, I think the Exchequer would not stand paying pensions to both sides. Then, I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider for a moment the rebellion in Lower Canada, where I think there were more rebels than there were men employed to put the rebellion down; we would have to pension them also—both sides. I think economists, like my hon. friend, who are so much against superannuations and pensions, would find their hair standing erect, like men distraught, if they found that we were going to pension all the rebels and those who put them down in both Upper and Lower Canada. But, joking apart, these matters belong to the Provinces where those unfortunate events took place. If there is any reward to be given to those men who fought on one side or the other, the Province of Ontario, which was not then joined to the Provinces of Lower Canada, must attend to its own soldiers; and so in the Province of Quebec. Then, we must remember that on several occasions the volunteers in the Maritime Province were called out and did service on the frontier, not only in 1837, but also when there was great danger of war with the United States. They would all have claims, but their claims must *ex necessitate* call upon the different Provinces to which they belonged when they were called upon.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must congratulate the Premier upon his high appreciation of what he considers to be the duty and responsibilities of a representative in this House, as shown by his insinuation that I ought to get this speech reported and distributed through the riding I have the honor to represent, as it might do me a great deal of good there. Sir, if such base and sordid motives influence the hon. Premier, I give him to understand that these men have rights; they have a just claim against their country; and if he is induced to act for the purpose of making himself popular in the country, and disregards what is honest, and right, and just to these men, such motives do not influence me. Sir, we have a duty to perform here higher than  
Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

that, and I am satisfied that there are few in this House who would take the responsibility of speaking, and having their speeches reported in *Hansard*, if they were influenced by such base motives as a desire of gaining a local popularity, regardless of the just rights of those who faithfully, honestly, and valiantly defended their country. I can hardly expect those were the motives influencing the First Minister. Many of these men I know were of the hon. gentleman's own leaning, but I guarantee that after they have heard the remarks the hon. gentleman has made here, they will feel it their bounden duty in the future to refuse any longer to support a man who treats their just claims in the flippant manner in which the hon. gentleman has treated them. These men have just claims and the First Minister knows this. Let him twist any way he likes. By no light jesting can he possibly remove the impression from these men and the country that they have just claims which should be considered.

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

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Pension to Mrs. Gowanlock..... \$400

Mr. BARRON. In regard to that item, it will be remembered that last Session the House voted a pension to Mrs. Gowanlock, which was unanimously consented to by both sides. I am informed that she has not yet received one cent of that pension. She naturally complains of that, and I think we should know why it is that she has not received the money.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make enquiry in regard to that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I made some enquiries as to the large pension of \$4,724 which appears to have been paid to one family under the head of Mounted Police.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is my hon. friend right in saying that \$4,700 is paid annually to one family?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This sum is in different items for gratuities and pensions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wanted to know on what basis these gratuities and pensions were granted.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is not in my department, and the Prime Minister has promised to get the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the item been carried?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it stands.

Brigade Majors, salaries, transport expenses, &c..... \$15,100

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This vote brings up a question in connection with the staff who are doing duty in Ontario, and I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that he has recently amalgamated the 3rd and 4th Military Districts, and that in those districts there are only two staff officers, Col. Straubenzie, the Deputy Adjutant General, and Col. Lewis, the Brigade Major. These districts extend from Bowmanville east to the provincial line, and include about 6,000 volunteers, scattered over a very large tract of country. The Deputy Adjutant General is occupied most of the time at Kingston, where he is employed on boards, and on courts of enquiry, and on courts-

martial, and I believe he is unable to give that attention to the duties of the district which is necessary. Very much the same was the case with his predecessor, Col. Villiers. As the result of this the regiments in that district are not visited and inspected with that regularity and frequency which is expected; and, as a matter of fact, for years past there has not been the regular inspection of arms and clothing which is required by the orders and regulations. I submit to the hon. gentleman that he should appoint another staff officer for these two districts. At present there is practically only one staff officer who is available for the purpose in that extensive district, and I think another brigade major should be appointed there. When I state that the rifles and the arms and accoutrements in that district are not inspected as they should be, and that there is Government property which is not looked after with the regularity which is required, I submit that the Minister should look into the matter, and, should not, from any false motives of economy, say: I will not appoint another staff officer there; because I believe the House would willingly vote the money in order to have the Government property, which should be under the care of Government officers, efficiently looked after. I know many cases where the arms are in such condition that they should be called in and repaired; and there is no use, as we all know, in putting in the hands of our volunteers arms in which the locks, when they are taken out to the butts, are so useless that the men cannot fire with them.

Mr. GUILLET. I endorse and corroborate everything which has been said by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), as to the pressing necessity for another staff officer in these districts to look after the proper condition of the arms and accoutrements of the men. In all the other districts in the Dominion there are two staff officers in each, while in this case there are only two for the two districts. I do not understand on what ground this can be justified. There are just as many men in the service in each of these districts as in the other districts of the country, and I do not understand how it can be expected that the work can be looked after by only two officers. The result is that the work is not done, and serious damages are resulting to the equipment of the different regiments. Pressing representations have been made to the Minister of Militia by every member representing those districts, and I am sure that a change is urgently needed; and, if it is of any importance at all to have the arms properly looked after, the change should be speedily made. I can assure the Minister of Militia that the matter requires his earnest consideration in order that he may find a remedy. The fact that the brigade major, upon whom this duty devolves, lives at Brockville, makes it necessary that when he does, once a year, or less frequently, visit the other district, he has to travel a long distance and at considerable expense. Therefore, on the score of economy the work could be done much cheaper if another officer was appointed, or at least, without much additional expense, as a large portion of the expenditure for travel would be saved. I hope the Minister will take this matter into his favorable consideration and have the appointment made.

Ammunition and manufacture of small arm ammunition at the Cartridge Factory at Quebec, clothing and military stores.....\$200,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think we will have to ask the Minister to let that stand to-night. We want some information about that, and we want to discuss it at considerable length.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, let it stand.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think it would also be well to hold over the item relating to the Royal Military College, for I shall have considerable to say upon that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was going to suggest to the Minister that this item of clothing and great coats, and the item of the Royal Military College stand over. I know there will be a long discussion on both.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether the Deputy Adjutant General at Kingston has requested the appointment of an assistant of the staff?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Heretofore I have had difficulty to keep down the expenses of the staff. Hon. gentlemen who take an interest in militia matters, have told me time and again that it was far better to reduce the staff and give the amount thus saved to the rank and file, and I have tried to comply with those suggestions. Now, as soon as the staff is reduced in one district, hon. gentlemen in Parliament who, no doubt, know the locality where they live, are subjected to pressure to have deserving officers appointed to those positions. Occasionally gentleman come to me and ask that the staff be increased. We cannot properly admit that the service is not sufficiently carried out as it is. The Deputy Adjutant at Kingston is one of the most efficient officers that we have in the service. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman if he has made any representation to that effect; if he has, he did so to the Major General, and it has not come before me. But I cannot at all admit that the service is not efficiently carried out with the present staff in those districts. To-day the facilities for travelling from one place to another are very different to what they were a few years ago. There are railways in every direction, and it is much easier now than formerly for officers of the staff to perform their duties. Until I am convinced that it is necessary to increase the staff, I cannot recommend any change.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. How often have the different company armories been inspected within the last five years in that district?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman who is much more of a military man than I am, would, I think, find it very difficult, the question being put to him, to answer with mathematical exactitude how many times those armories have been inspected. That they have been sufficiently inspected is clear from the efficiency of the service, otherwise orders would have been sent to the inspector to inspect them.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Will the hon. gentleman ascertain that from his department and bring down the information before concurrence?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Public armories and care of arms, including pay of storekeepers, caretakers, storemen and armorers. \$60,000

Mr. BARRON. I do not think there is a weaker spot in the whole management of the department than the care given to the arms throughout the country. My information comes from all quarters that the care and custody of the arms are such that rifles and guns, when taken out occasionally, are absolutely useless. I had occasion lately to see some gentlemen in Peterborough who gave me the information that, by reason of the policy pursued by the Minister of Militia, in regard to the volunteers in that part of Ontario, no care whatever was taken of the arms. They complain that proper accommodation has not been given, and they lay the blame entirely upon the department. Now, it is perfectly nonsensical to my mind to go to an enormous expense in having a militia force, and to find the arms insufficient when occasion may require to use them. I, therefore, think that more attention should be given to the care of the arms, and that the Minister should see that throughout the country such care is taken of them as that they may be useful when occasion arises.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the experience of the past has shown that when we required to use the arms, they were found to be in very serviceable order. Whenever we were called upon to draw upon the resources of the department, we found the arms were in very good order. But I must admit frankly that all the arms which we have in the Dominion of Canada are not in perfect order; but I claim that for the amount of money which Parliament has put at the disposal of the Militia Department, everything possible has been done to keep the arms in proper repair. Some complaints occasionally come in after a camp, that certain stands of arms are not in as perfect a condition as they might be, but it must be remembered that we have the most experienced armorers all over the Dominion, men brought out from England and placed at large centres like Toronto, Quebec and Halifax, and the arms are at once sent to them to be repaired. Of course that takes some little time; but hon. gentlemen on considering the amount of money voted by Parliament, will, I am sure, be sufficiently fair to admit that with the amount voted it is impossible to do any better than has been done in the past and is being done now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I called the Minister's attention to the fact that the armory in Chatham, belonging to the 24th Battalion, is in a very bad state. I have already called the Minister's attention to it, and he promised to look into it. I trust it will not be forgotten. I am told that had it not been for the caretaker removing the arms to another building, which he rented, they would have been rendered entirely useless. The account he had rendered for the rent of the building, however, has not yet been paid, and I should like to learn from the Minister why it has not yet been settled.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I promised to look after the arms and the repairing of them, and I have given instructions accordingly. I made no promise, however, in regard to paying rent. The hon. gentleman knows that we pay a certain amount to companies for looking after the arms. Of course, I will look into the matter. I cannot say whether it is a special case or not. If so, it will be treated as a special case, but, judging at first blush, I should imagine that the arms should have been taken care of by the captains of companies who received a certain amount for the purpose. I will ascertain how the matter stands.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The account has been rendered for some time, but has not been paid.

Mr. TROW. I understood the Minister to say that the arms were everything that could be desired in regard to efficiency. Judging from our past experience I should doubt whether such is the case. If the arms are so satisfactory and the ammunition is unsatisfactory, surely the latter should be looked after as well as the arms themselves.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In justice to the Minister of Militia I should say that, from all the accounts I have received, the ammunition made at the cartridge factory at Quebec, is as perfect as it can be made. The riflemen of the Dominion support my statement that it is better than any ammunition imported from the old country. There were great complaints in respect to the ammunition turned out from the cartridge factory at first, but I have had some dealings with riflemen all over the Dominion, and from all sides I receive reports that the ammunition made this year has been as good as can be manufactured; in fact, that it has reached perfection.

Mr. PRIOR. I endorse what has been stated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). We have tried this ammunition in British Columbia lately, and we have found, without doubt, that the ammunition manufactured by the Canadian Government is far ahead of any we have ever had from Great Britain. No doubt there was a time when it was very bad, but, I believe, that at the present time, it is as good as can possibly be made.

Mr. BARRON.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know roughly how many thousand stands of arms are under the care of the storekeepers at the various armories?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is very large. We have depots at Toronto, Quebec and other cities where arms are issued to the militia force; but beyond those corps we have large depots of arms at the different centres. I can procure from the storekeeper at Ottawa a correct statement, if the hon. gentleman wishes it. The whole force of Canada is armed, and that would be about 42,000 men. Outside of that number we have depots at Quebec, Toronto, Kingston and Halifax.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What are the arms?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Most of them are Snider-Enfield and Martini-Henry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what proportion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The proportion of the Snider-Enfield is much greater than the Martini-Henry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like the hon. gentleman to bring down a statement showing the number of stands of arms in serviceable condition, distinguishing the number of Martini-Henry and Snider.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And add the cost of each.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will bring it down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated the number of men at 42,000. Am I to understand that that is the number actually enrolled at the present moment, or is it the number when all the companies are filled?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the actual force is about 34,000 men.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice in the Auditor General's accounts an item of \$20,676 for transport. That seems to be a large sum.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The transport is carried out by tender, and it forms the most expensive item in connection with the camps. Every general who has been out here has advised us to have these camps of instruction for the rural companies, and I should be very sorry to see one disappear. I think they do good service; but the conveyance of the troops from one point to another runs away with a good deal of money. The items are sent in and can be discussed in detail, but the amount is large I admit.

Improved Rifled Ordnance..... \$3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many guns is that intended to buy?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not very many. I wish we could have a larger number brought out every year. It is intended to purchase two 64-pounder rifle guns with standing carriages to cost £300 sterling each, including freight and transport, from England. These guns are intended for the armament of fortifications. Every year we are trying to get out a few of these guns which are considered of the first importance, in so far as arming the fortifications of the country is concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I ask that question because I desire to know whether the Government has any scheme or plan for protecting our seaboard. It occurs to me that 64-pounder guns would be very little better than pop-guns as against an ironclad squadron which might possibly bear down on our seaboard, either on the Pacific or the Atlantic. I am not very familiar with the power of penetration of the modern rifled ordnance, but I have seen some of those first-class ironclads, and I cannot conceive it possible that the 64-pounders could produce the smallest possible effect on them at any imaginable range that they might come within.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must admit they are not the most improved ordnance, which, as my hon. friend knows, are very expensive. The question of the defence of the country has been given to a commission, which will report to the Government, and when the report is made it will be easier to explain what the policy of the Government will be on that point. It would hardly be prudent for me to give any opinion until the report of the experts composing the commission is made to the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite aware that it is not within the power of the Government, on a vote of \$3,000, to obtain arms that would be of any effect against a hostile fleet. If that be the case, is it wise to expend our money on these 64-pounders?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The report of Colonel Irwin, who is Inspector of Artillery, as well as the report of the General, agree that those guns are valuable for our purposes. It is considered that if we buy a few of those guns every year they will very much improve our defence.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Might I ask the Minister of Militia what has been the result of the experiments carried on by Captain Palliser with regard to the rifling of some of our old guns. Have those experiments been a success or not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We entered into a contract for remodeling the guns, but it was not as satisfactory as we expected. The firm which we gave the contract to for the experiment got into difficulties and we could not carry out the experiments.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Did the plan itself succeed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The plan was reported as a good one by General Strange.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If it is practicable to turn our old guns into modern ones it would be better than importing second class guns from England.

Construction and Repairs of Drill Sheds, &c..... \$75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does the hon. gentleman propose to expend this \$75,000. I suppose it is for the construction of drill sheds.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes; and for repairs to military property. I can give the hon. gentleman the details of the amounts which is to be distributed over the Dominion. London, \$500; Toronto, \$1,700; Kingston, \$16,920; Ottawa, \$2,277; St. John, P.Q., and Montreal, \$3,970; Quebec, \$19,625; Fredericton, \$4,115; Halifax, \$385; Winnipeg, \$3,872; Victoria, \$650; Charlottetown, \$940.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to construct a new drill shed at Kingston?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may explain to the hon. gentleman that in Kingston and Quebec, where we have large military establishments, the cost of keeping them in repair is very much greater than in other places where we have not such establishments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, this is for repairs?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, this is for repairs. Any amounts for new buildings will be found in the Estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice in the list which the Minister of Militia has read that he has made no provision for the town of Chatham. I hope he has not forgotten that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I promised the hon. gentleman to look after the drill shed at Chatham and I mean to do so. The amount needed for that purpose will be taken out of the vote of \$22,000 for drill sheds and rifle ranges.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would ask the hon. Minister if he proposed to add an hospital to the Royal Military College at Kingston, because I believe that it is a very necessary building in the college. If we are to have young men there we ought to have proper provision made for them in case of illness, and we ought to take steps to see that they are properly taken care of.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Any amount for a building of that nature would have to be provided for in the Estimates by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have a company at Mount Forest in my constituency, but we have no drill shed. That company has been in existence a number of years, and I am rather induced to make an application on its behalf after hearing the reply the Minister made to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell). I quite agree that in order to care for military stores it is necessary that there should be an armory. Some years ago we had something that answered the purpose, but it has not been in proper condition for a number of years, and a portion of the town hall has been used for that purpose, but it is not at all satisfactory, as there are not proper opportunities for drilling. That company has had a very good record, and I would like something to be done to secure it a drill shed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would cause the expenditure of money.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We do not generally give a drill shed for one company, but there is an Order in Council applying to all such cases, in which it is stated that if the locality gives a lot and contributes a certain amount of money, the Government will contribute a certain portion of the expenditure. I shall be very glad to send the hon. gentleman a copy of that Order in Council, so that he can see if it is possible to apply it to the case he mentions, and we can then talk the matter over together.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say, in reply to the remark of the First Minister, that the hon. gentleman has never failed to be kind to his political friends, and I can assure him that he has a number of friends there who would appreciate a drill shed. If he happened to come around there in his car "Jamaica" at any time, we have not a building large enough to accommodate those who would wish to hear him. I am sure that if we had a drill shed, they would be glad to hear him, and I would have no objection at all to his coming.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I shall have to use the language of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson)—to think I would be influenced by such base and sordid motives as to erect a drill shed for my friends.

Mr. TROW. I hope when the Minister of Militia is considering the subject of drill sheds he will not forget what promises to be the greatest railway centre in the Dominion of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Where is it?

Mr. TROW. The city of Stratford. Our drill shed is out of repair, and our volunteers have to go to other quarters to drill.

Mr. BARRON. I hope when the Minister sends the Order in Council to some gentlemen on this side of the House, he will not forget me, because in my riding there is a place which, though not celebrated as a railway centre, is celebrated as possessing a university of which the hon. gentleman has no doubt heard. I refer to the village of Cobocok; and I have no doubt that place is entitled to a drill shed as much as some other places to which the hon. gentleman has granted money for that purpose. But I just want to read the remarks of Colonel Straubenzie re-

garding Peterborough in reference to the matter I spoke of a few moments ago. He said:

"I found the rifles much out of repair and have ordered them to be sent to Kingston for repairs. This corps is also under great disadvantages in having very bad armories. A plan for a new armory has already been submitted and which I hope will meet with the approval and sanction of the Honorable the Minister. There is great *esprit de corps* in this regiment, and officers and men are deserving of encouragement in a substantial form."

That bears out the private information I received, and I think the Minister of Militia ought to give this particular item his constant attention.

Permanent Forces and Cavalry and Infantry Schools...\$484,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is the hon. gentleman effecting this reduction of \$38,700?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If we establish a cavalry school in Toronto, we shall not require the whole amount this year, and there is a small amount remaining unexpended from last year. I hope to be able to keep within the reduced amount in the Estimates.

Mr. DENISON. I did not quite understand whether the Minister said that the reduction was on the cavalry school at Toronto or not; but if it is a reduction of the expenditure for permanent schools, I am rather pleased to see it, and I am in hopes that it may be transferred to the credit of the militia in general. The sum of \$38,000 would be sufficient to drill a great many more rural battalions which have in past years been neglected for want of funds. I think there is no expenditure in the country which would be more cheerfully granted than a sum to drill all the rural corps every year; and I hope the Minister of Militia, if he strikes this amount out of this item, will use it for general militia purposes. While on my feet, I would like to say a word or two in reference to the schools. Under the present arrangement no person can enter one of these military schools without being either an officer of the force or a private. I think it would be in the interest of the militia of Canada, if we reverted to the old system which we had in force some twenty years ago. Then it was possible for a gentleman to enter a school as a sort of cadet and get his certificate, and on his passing out he received the sum of \$50, failing he got nothing. This enabled him to pay for his board during the time he was in school, and on leaving he had quite as good a knowledge in almost every respect as a man leaving one of the existing schools. But what do we find now? If a young lad desires to get a certificate from the school, he has either to go to the expense of getting a uniform on obtaining a commission, or else to put on a private's uniform and go into barracks, where he will have to associate with those who belong to the permanent force. It is not always desirable—I need not point out why—for young lads to be thrown into a barrack room along with men older than themselves, who sometimes contract habits which are not very good. Under the old system numbers of young fellows went through the schools, got their certificates, and, having acquired a taste for soldiering, afterwards joined the militia as officers or otherwise; and, even though they did not find their places in the militia, it was a great advantage to the country to have a large number of men who were drilled sufficiently to take command of companies or battalions in camp or barracks. At present there are only the two classes. If they go into the ranks, they are taught the duties of non-commissioned officers or privates. What we want is to have men with certificates in the country, so that in case of trouble in the land, they could be given commissions and could drill the yeoman of the country. I see that Col. Smith, who commands No. 1 District, has made some very practical remarks in this connection. He says:

"For many years to come our militia must be our main defence, and it should be placed on the best footing possible both as to efficiency and  
Mr. BARRON,

numbers, but numbers or corps rather than numbers of men. If we have a large number of well organised and expansive bodies, they can be rapidly filled up when the need arrives, but it is a difficult task to organise the bodies in the case of danger."

These remarks are somewhat in the line of the argument I made in this House last year in favor of our militia being increased. I then advocated an increase of 100,000, and I hope still the Government will see their way clear to having a considerable increase. I would like to have some opinion from the Minister of Militia as to what he considers can be done with reference to the idea I have thrown out, of allowing the men to obtain certificates in the schools without having to live in barracks as officers or privates.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There is a great deal in what the hon. and gallant colonel from West Toronto states. The great difficulty at present is to get qualified officers for our rural battalions. If we have qualified officers and good non-commissioned officers, it is easy enough to get the men, as there is plenty of martial spirit in the country, and in time of danger any number of volunteers can be got. But what we are deficient in is competent officers and non-commissioned officers, and it is to train these that the schools were established. Do the schools fulfil that duty? Well, the officers and non-commissioned officers who go through the schools are very well trained, but we have not a sufficient number going through. I have tried to find out why it is that the officers and men from the rural battalions hesitate to go to these schools, and I find the reason is the expense. First of all, they have to provide themselves with uniforms, and then they have to provide mess uniforms. It is not necessary under the regulations to provide the latter. I believe they can wear their tunics, but they do not, as a rule, care to go to mess in buttoned up tunics, and they like to have this mess uniform which costs a great deal of money. Then they join the mess, which adds to their expense, so that parents object to their sons going to these schools on this account and on account of the danger the cadets run of contracting idle habits while living in barracks. I believe if the men attending the schools were allowed to board outside, and to attend their drills during drill hours, there would be a better attendance. It would be better if the compulsory attendance was done away with, and the officers could go to these schools without being compelled to remain in barracks. Mothers do not want to send their young sons, from 15 to 18 years of age, just when they feel this martial spirit and want to qualify for a commission to barrack life, but prefer to send them to board with friends where they might be looked after and to whom they could go home at night. If that system were adopted, we would have a larger attendance in the schools and a more useful military force than at present, for if we can get plenty of competent officers and non-commissioned officers, we can get the men at any time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It would not be practicable to carry out the scheme suggested by the hon. and gallant colonel from Toronto (Mr. Denison). The schools are not numerous enough, and we can only train men who go in for the long and the short course. There would be great difficulty in maintaining discipline if those attending the schools were not bound by the regulations of the militia force of Canada. As to what the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has said about the expense of living in barracks, I do not see how it could be possible to give proper training to the militia men in the batteries and infantry schools if they were not obliged to live in barracks. One of the important branches of their studies is the internal economy of a regiment, and they can only learn that in barracks. As to the uniform, there is no reason why there should be expense. A man wears the uniform of his corps, no matter to what branch of the service he belongs, so that really I do not see any very great expense incurred. As to the loss of time in barracks, judging by the reports we

have, the men who follow the course are kept busy pretty near all the time. The hon. member for South Oxford has asked me the details of expenditure incurred in the different schools and batteries of the Dominion. First, there is a Lieutenant Colonel commanding, pay of \$4 a day; allowance, Inspector of Artillery, \$1.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was asking in reference chiefly to the hon. gentleman's proposed reduction, and as he had taken a vote for \$522,700, I want to know the total expenditure incurred on those services last year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Last year we expended \$431,983. A deduction of \$30,700 has been made in the amount of the total estimate for the forts. This, however, does not imply any proposed reduction in the numerical strength of the artillery, cavalry, and military schools, as at present ordered.

Mr. DENISON. I entirely disagree with the hon. the Minister of Militia in his remarks. I attended one of these schools some 20 odd years ago, and I know the discipline of the men while in the schools was just as good as it is in the schools to-day, the only difference being that instead of the cadets going to barracks at night and sleeping there, they went to their homes or boarding houses. And during the days when they had their ordinary duties to perform and to learn the interior economy of the force, they went with the officer or non-commissioned officers, and obtained a knowledge of that interior economy as they do now. The only difference was that, instead of sleeping in barracks each night they slept in their own quarters, and I do not see why there should be any difficulty in regard to the number. At that time four or five non-commissioned officers were told off from the regular army, as they could now be told off from the schools, and they formed the staff of the school. They did the drilling, and that was all that was required, and what is done now. At that time they generally had in the Toronto School 200 or 300 at a time, while now I believe they never have more than 50 or 60, if even that number.

Mr. BARRON. I cannot speak of my own knowledge in regard to the discipline to-day, but I know from my own experience that the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), as to the past are correct. When I went through a military school, I went to my own lodgings at night, and I know that during the day the military discipline was thoroughly carried out, and no fault was ever found with it. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has referred to the necessity of having additional competent officers, and that seems to be the view of the Major General, who says in his report:

"One thing necessary is an increase of competent officers with a view to the discipline and efficiency of the force."

I would ask the Minister of Militia whether he has taken any steps to carry out that recommendation. We import the Major-General at great expense from the old country, though I think that is unnecessary, because we have just as competent men here, but, if we have him here, we should carry out his recommendations.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We are carrying out every year the recommendations of the Major General by training each year a larger number of competent officers in our schools. The Major General does not attack the present system, but says that the number of competent officers should be increased, and we are doing the best we can through our schools to get a greater number of competent officers.

Mr. PRIOR. Before this item passes, I desire to say a few words as to "C" Battery, which is now stationed in British Columbia. I am sorry to see that the Minister of Militia has not seen fit to place an amount in the Estimates sufficient to complete the barracks for that battery.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That does not come under my Estimates. That is under Public Works.

Mr. PRIOR. It is now some years ago since we were promised the advent of that battery, but we had almost given up all hopes of seeing them when at last they arrived, and we were very glad to welcome our brothers in arms from the East. At that time there were no proper barracks for them, and there are not yet. The only place which was at all fit to receive them, even for temporary accommodation, was what is called the agricultural hall, which is not at all suited to the purpose for which it is now being used. It is simply a board shed, battened. When the weather is good, as every one knows it always is in British Columbia in the summer, it is all well enough, but in the winter it is altogether unfit for the purpose of barracks. The battery arrived in Victoria in October, 1887, and I think it was in December, 1887, that the Minister of Militia paid us a visit, and inspected "C" Battery and the local militia. At a banquet which was given to him there, the hon. gentleman stated to those who were present that he had bought a site for the erection of the barracks, that a contract had been let, and that the barracks would be completed at once. No doubt the hon. gentleman meant what he said at the time, but his promise, like a good many more promises, has been broken, for up to the present time the only thing which has been done has been to erect three huts for the gunners. There are no quarters for the officers, there is no cook house, or guard room, there are no cells, there are no married sergeants' quarters, no married men's quarters, no parade ground, but simply three huts in the midst of a dense wood. I do not blame the Minister of Militia, because there may be circumstances over which he has no control. Last year he told us he was in the hands of the Finance Minister. I trust the Finance Minister and the Minister of Militia will put their heads together and see if they cannot do more justice to those men, for it is a manifest injustice to treat them—as fine a body of men as can be found in the world—in the manner in which they are being treated. I have heard it said that, if they do not like to put up with it, they can resign. I do not think any hon. gentleman on the floor of this House would make that remark if he thought of what he was saying, because these men contracted to give their services to the Government for certain considerations, in the same way as any clerk who is engaged by a merchant. They contracted to give their services for a certain amount of money per day, certain quarters, and certain allowances, which are all laid down by the rules and regulations of the militia. I believe these men have faithfully done their duty and have carried out their contract, but I regret to say that I do not think the Government have carried out theirs in this particular. In regard to the pay of these men, the officers particularly are laboring under great disadvantages in being stationed in British Columbia, because of the great difference in the cost of living between British Columbia and the East. I have here a scale of prices of certain things and of certain services rendered which I will not detain the House by reading, but this statement of prices was compiled by the contractor who supplies the battery with groceries. He gives a long list of the articles which he supplies, and proves that the prices paid in British Columbia over the prices paid for the same articles in the East are from 25 to 40 per cent. more. I have another list here of services and labor. This has been compiled by a gentleman who lived many years in Eastern Canada, and has lived five or six years in British Columbia, and he knows what he is talking about. I will mention only a few of the items. He says that repairs to boots and shoes cost 100 per cent. more, tailoring 100 per cent. more, milk 100 per cent. more, cab hire 75 per cent. more, horse hire 75 per cent. more; and there is another item which is of great importance in a country like ours where we want population, and, as he has a large family, I have no doubt he is competent to speak in regard to it, and that is that



monthly nurse charges are 125 per cent. more. I do not know anything about that myself, but I am sure he would not have put that down unless he had proved it. I know that all Imperial officers who have been stationed in Victoria or Esquimalt have got an extra allowance on account of the extra cost of living there. I have a letter from a gentleman who has been for the last two years an Imperial army officer, in which he says :

"DEAR SIR,—With reference to your enquiry about my extra pay while on duty at the station, I have to say that I practically receive double the pay, over and above all allowances, when on ordinary pay. There are several precedents of this recognition by the Imperial authorities, that owing to the high price of everything in the Province, some compensation should be made for the additional expenses, unavoidably incurred by officers on duty. I think I am correct in stating, that all the officers of the Imperial service, who have visited Esquimalt on duty, have invariably been granted extra pay."

Now, Sir, this is from an Imperial officer who was on duty at Esquimalt for a long time. I may state that even the banks agree that their officers should have more. Here is a letter from the manager of one of the banks in Victoria :

"DEAR SIR,—In answer to your letter of the 1st instant, I would inform you that an allowance pay, \$500 per annum, is made to our clerks while serving the bank in Victoria, to compensate them for the additional cost of living here, as compared with Ontario and Quebec."

Now, when you take that into consideration, and also the fact that the post office officials who are in the pay of this Government at the present time in British Columbia, are allowed, I think, 25 per cent. extra for provisional allowances, and also taking into consideration the fact that the Government have acknowledged the necessity of this allowance by giving the gunners of "C" Battery an extra 25 per cent. advance on their wages—their wages reaching the enormous sum of 50 cents a day—I think that when you look at all these facts, you must agree that if it is necessary for the gunners to have that increase, it must be far more necessary for the officers to have an increase. I may say that the officers find that the heavy expense of living is a great hardship at the present time, owing to their not having proper quarters. It must be remembered that they are brought into contact with officers in the Imperial service, and they have to keep up a certain appearance; and I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House would for a moment expect an officer of Canada to behave otherwise, or live differently, from any officer of any other country. It is very difficult to-day for an officer, unless he has private means, to live on the pay they get from this Government, and the only way they can do it is to allow them free fuel, and free quarters and cheap soldier servants. An officer must come to grief unless he has either the one or the other; that is the only way he can get on. I do not ask you to take my unsupported opinion, but I will refer you to the report of the general officer commanding the militia in Canada, in which, reporting to the Minister of Militia, he says :

"I hope the barracks for this school will be finished next year—"  
This is in regard to "C" Battery—

"—as they are at a great disadvantage at present. I still think that some addition should be granted to the allowances of this battery as a special case, the general cost of living in Victoria being greater than in the rest of the Dominion, the addition being in the shape of an allowance to cover increased cost of messing, and to be regulated by a sliding scale for the several ranks."

I am perfectly aware that the officers are allowed a certain small allowance at the present time for lodgings, but it is simply nothing for a place like Victoria. I may also state that some of the married sergeants, and some of the married men, are living in sheds that were put up on the fair grounds for the accommodation of the horses exhibited at the agricultural show. I have seen them on a rainy day nearly drowned out. I do not think this is the right way to treat our militiamen who are serving the country, and no wonder there is a good deal of grumbling and many desertions. I will not take up the time of the House in stating what build-

M. PRIOR.

ings I think are necessary to be put up by the Minister of Militia, because I believe that after he has read the reports again he will do what is right. But I think he ought to give the men exactly what they are entitled to, nothing more and nothing less. I have asked him before, I am asking him now, and I shall continue to ask until he either gives me a very good reason why he should not give an extra allowance, or else yields to our reasonable request. Last summer I was very glad to see both the members from Hamilton visiting Victoria, and I hope they will endorse what I have said as to the barracks which they visited. I can state without hesitation that if the Minister will confer with the General commanding, or with any of the permanent heads, or others who ought to know, and who do know, he will find that they will all agree in saying that it is imperatively necessary that the barracks should be built for that battery, and that the battery should have some extra allowance.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend was rather severe, I think, when he stated in his opening remarks, that my promises were made to be broken.

Mr. PRIOR. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the only difficulty between my hon. friend and myself is that he fancies, possibly, that I may take a little more time than I should in carrying out my promises, but it is certainly my intention to carry out all the promises I have made to the hon. gentleman. With reference to the barracks, it is true that the quarters of the battery at present are not what I should like them to be. As the hon. gentleman stated, I went to Victoria and selected a site, and I gave orders to commence building the huts. The Estimates which the Minister of Public Works will bring down will show that I never considered that what had been done was all that we intended to do so far as "C" Battery is concerned. The hon. gentleman speaks of the expense of living being far greater in Victoria than in Ontario or Quebec. Well, that is an evil which is being cured with the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by means of which communication is easily had with the East. The difference in the expenses are being reduced every day. I think it would be a very invidious distinction to make any difference in the pay between the batteries in the Dominion of Canada. The principle upon which all the military forces are organized is that the same pay shall be given to all members of the force of equal grade. The hon. gentleman states that we have made a difference in so far as the rank and file are concerned. We made this difference, that if they carried out their term of engagement for three years they should receive at the end of the period a bonus of 10 cents per head per diem in addition to the ordinary payment, or 60 cents. At that time it was considered an inducement to get some members of the other batteries who enlisted in "C" Battery, to go out to British Columbia. I was very glad indeed to see how well "C" Battery was received by all the members of our military force in British Columbia. They were treated as comrades, and the good feeling shown them has increased ever since they have been serving with the ordinary militia in British Columbia. I think when the plan which is contemplated is carried out, the hon. gentleman will agree that we desire to treat "C" Battery in Victoria fully as well as any other battery in Canada. I know very well that they have to put up with very many inconveniences, but the new barracks will be so perfect that I hope it will make them forget the little inconveniences which they have suffered. I am sure the hon. gentleman has shown a great deal of interest, he has spoken to me time and again about the matter, and I think he will find that what I have promised to do for "C" Battery, will be fully carried out.

Mr. PRIOR. The Minister misunderstood me when he supposed that I said that his promises had been made to be broken. I said that his promises had been broken—there is a

great deal of difference. In regard to the difference in the cost of living, I may state that although the hon. gentleman says that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway brings down the prices, Mr. Smith, the Deputy Minister of Marine, told me, after he had taken a trip down the coast to San Francisco, that he had come to the conclusion that it was not a question of Victoria or Vancouver being the dearest places to live in, but it was a question of the whole Pacific coast. They are higher, and they will continue to be higher.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to supplies, we find that the prices in the contracts for supplies in British Columbia are about the same as in other districts. I do not know whether the contractor was so anxious to supply "C" Battery that he reduced his prices, but the contracts are at about the same prices as in other districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that \$28,000 were expended last year on "C" Battery. \$300 is down for six months' ground rent. To whom was that paid? I was looking over the place when I visited there, and I thought it a very high rent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not for ground rent. It is for the barracks which "C" Battery are now occupying.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What amount was appropriated to "C" Battery last Session, and what amount has been expended to date?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. \$50,000 for payment of staff, officers, men and maintenance, and for the maintenance of the battery.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the total sum been expended?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I presented a return in answer to a question put by the hon. member. I think about \$7,000 has been expended upon the new building, and an appropriation will appear in the Estimates brought down by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is clear that the department had money with which it could have improved the condition of "C" Battery. There appears to be no reason why the work was not carried on more rapidly. Can the Minister give any reasonable explanation? If he cannot, the hon. member had just cause to complain that the men should be compelled to live in barracks such as he described. As to the question of expenses of living, that is a different question; but the House should know why "C" Battery had not the amount appropriated devoted to the purpose for which it was voted.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The sole reason why a balance remained was that we could not have commenced without a further appropriation to carry out the work of constructing the barracks to be put up for the force.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I endorse everything that has been said by my colleague from British Columbia (Mr. Prior), in regard to the higher cost of living in British Columbia. I desire to enquire whether it is the intention of the Government to do this year something towards fortifying the city of Vancouver, which is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the port of landing of the Chinese steamers?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can only answer the hon. gentleman, as I have already replied to another hon. gentleman, that the question of defence is now being studied by a commission that has been appointed, and the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government have been in communication in regard to the same question. I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman any further information at present.

Additional Public Building, Ottawa..... \$90,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been spent on the new public building on Wellington street to date, and what is it estimated to cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount expended up to December last is \$519,000; balance due on contract \$35,000; balance on iron roof \$10,000 and so on. When the building is completed it will have cost, including the cost of land, \$714,000. The amount of \$90,000 asked for now will nearly complete the expenditure and we will require probably only \$6,000 more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of curiosity, how many clerks does the Minister intend to accommodate in that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say as to the number of clerks, but I can mention the number of departments. The basement will contain the Archives and the clerks connected therewith; the first flat or ground floor will be occupied by the Department of the Interior; the next floor will be occupied by the Department of Agriculture and Indian Affairs, and the third floor will also be occupied by the Department of Agriculture, leaving probably a few rooms for future occupation. The attic will be occupied by the models and the officers connected therewith.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What was the original contract for this building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for the stonework, without the iron work, the roof, &c., was \$295,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did the Government find the stone?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the contractor found the stone himself. A sample of stone was furnished to those who tendered and they were bound to find stone of equally good quality, to the satisfaction of the chief architect.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What are the extras up to the present time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that. Contracts have been given for iron joists and girders, the iron roofs, the iron staircase, and those are additional works.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Were they included in the original contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have you no extras from the contractor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course the contractor has a claim for some extras, but they are not settled until the final estimate is made by the chief architect.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At what do you estimate the amount of those extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. The contractor did not fulfil his contract within the specified time, and he gave as a reason that he was delayed sometime by the architects and by the other contractors, and we had to use the means named in the contract to put ourselves in a legal position towards him; that is to say we protested him. His claims will have to be viewed in the light of our protest, and at all events, if the question comes to a lawsuit there will be claims on both sides. I suppose the contractor will rely on the justice of the department without going to the courts.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was it understood in the contract at what rate the Government would bring the stone for him over the Intercolonial Railway from New Brunswick to Ottawa?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no such condition made. As I explained last year the contractor made his arrangements with the Department of Railways as to the rate for carrying the stone from the quarry at New Brunswick to Ottawa. He also arranged the rate with the Grand Trunk Railway, and I believe also with the Canada Atlantic Railway authorities.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did the Government expect to make any money by carrying that stone from New Brunswick at \$1.50 per ton?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I don't know; I cannot say.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is in the Minister's department, and he ought to be able to give us some information about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the Department of Railways, as in any other case where freight is offered, tried to make a profit out of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman knows that the department would not make much money by carrying it at \$1.50 per ton.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be an important point in favor of the contractor, would not the Government, in fact, lose a large sum of money by carrying this stone on the Intercolonial Railway at that rate, and would not the contractor get the benefit of it? If the stone was carried here at a considerable loss to the revenues of the country ought not that be added to the cost of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rate given to this contractor would be the same as is given to any other contractor. The contractor tried very hard to get stone up to the standard of the sample in the neighborhood of Ottawa, but the Chief Architect was not satisfied with the specimens produced, and he had to go elsewhere. The contractor thought that the Chief Architect was rather hard with him, and he asked that Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of Canals, who has experience in this matter, should also examine the stone, but Mr. Page agreed with the opinion of the Chief Architect. Finally they came to the understanding that the New Brunswick stone was the proper stone, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that apparently, at all events, it is a very fine stone.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not find any fault with the stone; on the contrary, I think it is a very handsome building material. But what I do find fault with is the Government giving out the contract, and then bringing up this stone at a heavy loss, because any contractor, if he had known at the commencement that stone was going to be brought up by the Government at \$1.50 a ton, would doubtless have made a difference in his offer. I think the Minister must see that by such an operation the country is at a considerable loss and the contractors at a considerable gain. Whether that is what the hon. Minister intended or not, of course I cannot say, but it looks very like it on the face of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Was not the original tender for stone from a particular quarry in Albert County?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. They knew from what district the stone came, but it was not stated that they should take it from one place or another. It was stated that the stone should be of as good a quality as the sample; and the contractor went all over the country trying to find as good a stone, so as to avoid the expense of haulage.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Was it to be as good a stone in quality as that obtained in Albert County?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was to be equal to the stone shown. I do not know whether it was taken from one

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

section or another. The tender was the lowest, and it was very low; and when the bargain with the contractor was made, the question was purely and simply whether that stone was equal to the sample, and when the chief architect agreed that it was so, the contractor went to make his arrangements with the railway company. He has always claimed that his contract was too low.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sample stone, I believe, was from Albert County, but the stone itself came from Miramichi, did it not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so. It came from New Brunswick.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I want to know is, did the Intercolonial Railway undertake to bring that stone from Miramichi and deliver it at Ottawa at \$1.50 per ton, or was the \$1.50 paid simply for the distance it travelled on the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for carrying the stone was not made with my department; it was made with the authorities of the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have a right to know, because it materially affects the question of the true cost of this building. If this stone was conveyed some 800 miles, 200 miles or thereabouts being over the Grand Trunk Railway, which I presume, charged a higher rate than the Intercolonial, and if it was brought here for a \$1.50 per ton, that would amount to one-sixth of one cent per ton per mile. I do not suppose it was possible to convey it at that rate without loss to the country, and the amount of that loss should be added to the cost of the building. The hon. gentleman's department may not be responsible for it, but a sister department is. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the quantity that was brought up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it was a large quantity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That information we should have when the Intercolonial Railway items come to be discussed. Will the Minister of Finance take a note of that?

Mr. FOSTER. I will take a note of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is curious to find how little the Minister of Public Works knows on some occasions. Last year he told us that this stone was brought up at 12 cents a cubic foot, with something under 12 cubic feet to the ton, which would make the cost about \$1.44 per ton. The Government must have lost heavily on every ton of stone they brought over the Intercolonial Railway, and the contractor must have gained correspondingly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know whether, when the tender was asked for, the question of stone was settled, as well as the question of the rate to be charged for conveying it from the quarry to Ottawa. That would be a very important item. A man in tendering would probably estimate what it would cost to bring a certain stone like the sample to Ottawa from the quarries, and he would probably get a rate from the railways before putting in his tender; and if, after he made his contract, he got the stone carried over the Intercolonial Railway at a considerable loss to the railway, that would be so much to his credit. Was the question settled before or after the contract was made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was stated in the specifications that the successful tenderer would have to provide stone equal to the sample exhibited at the office—nothing else. It was not stated whether that stone should be from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario or any other Province or place. There could be nothing done about the rates for carrying the stone, because it was not known

where the contractor would find a stone of the required quality. Therefore, no preference was given to any one, but everyone who tendered was on the same footing. The successful tenderer has complained repeatedly that the stone he had to furnish cost him delivered here much more than he ever thought it would cost. But he had to furnish a stone equal in quality to the stone given as sample.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I cannot understand how any contractor could give an intelligent tender under those circumstances. He has a sample of the stone provided and is called on to tender, without having the slightest information as to where he is to get the stone. Certain information should be given to tenderers as to where they are to find the stone, so that they might enquire as to the cost of quarrying and freight. If he went into the question of freights on the Intercolonial he would find that he could not get a quotation of one-sixth of a cent per ton per mile, because the road cannot possibly carry freight at that price. I suppose this was a part of the great international trade which the hon. the Minister of Finance referred to in his Budget speech.

Amount required for construction of Port  
Arthur Harbor and for Kaministiquia River \$133,000

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** What is the condition of the works now?

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** This is a revote of \$43,000 and a new vote of \$90,000, and it is for the completion of the works in Port Arthur Harbor and of the improvements in Kaministiquia River. The amount due the 22nd November, 1888, on the breakwater was \$30,000. The probable expense on the three sections was \$30,000; during 1888-89 it was \$15,000. Amount due 22nd of November for dredging the Kaministiquia River, \$7,000. The total amount expended up to July, 1889, from November, 1888, was \$54,580.

Kingston Graving Dock ..... \$124,000

**Mr. JONES (Halifax).** What will be the total cost?

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** \$350,000. Length, 280 feet; width at bottom, 70 feet; width at top, 72 feet; at the entrances, 48 feet. That will be sufficient for the largest vessels that ply on the lakes.

**Mr. JONES (Halifax).** I have no objection to the Government building a dry dock at Kingston, as they have the Military College there, and as it is represented by the leader of the Government, and as the majority is not very large, and as there are other considerations of the same kind, but I do object to the Government making this class of public works Government undertakings in all Provinces except Nova Scotia. There are none in New Brunswick yet, it is true, but the tide falls so much there that they do not require a graving dock. In British Columbia, the graving dock is a Government work. In Quebec, the Government have relieved the city from their liability, and now they propose to build a graving dock at Kingston, and all these are under control of the Government and are managed by them. It may be quite proper that these works should be of that character. I am not objecting to that so much, but what I do object to most strongly is that, while the Government are taking charge of these public works and assuming all responsibility in connection with their construction and maintenance, in Halifax we have to pay \$10,000 a year in order to get a similar work. It is quite true that the Government are paying \$10,000 a year for a certain time towards the construction of that dock in Halifax, but that is nothing at all compared to the amount they have assumed and are incurring in the city of Quebec, in the Province which the Minister of Public Works so ably represents in this House. I venture to think that, if the Minister of Public Works had come from Nova Scotia instead of from Quebec—and

that might have been a very good thing for us for the time being—the work in Halifax would have been placed on the same footing as the works in other parts of the Dominion. When the late Finance Minister was in Halifax, during a discussion in relation to this dock, he gave his opinion that, if these works were assumed by the Government, if the Quebec dock was assumed by the Government, the Government would also assume the Halifax dock, and I believe a representation of that character was made by the late Finance Minister to the Government of the day. The Government however did not apparently favor the view which the then Minister of Finance entertained, and we then applied to the Government to loan us the money on the same terms on which they were loaning it to the city of Quebec. We expected at that time to pay the interest, which I believe the city of Quebec never did, so it would have been a safer investment; but, when the Government changed their policy and took the dock off the hands of the corporation of Quebec, I think they were bound in good faith to take the Halifax dock on the same terms and to relieve Halifax from the charge which I admit we voluntarily assumed in order to obtain the construction of the dock there. That being the case, I do not feel very kindly disposed to the expenditure of these sums for docks in other parts of the Dominion, unless the Minister can give us some indication that the Government will carry out their general policy and relieve us to that extent. It would only make the amount \$20,000 a year, instead of \$10,000 for the twenty years, and the Government would not have to assume the whole cost of the dock because that is being built by a company with English capital, but it would relieve the taxpayers of Halifax of the \$10,000 they now contribute, and which I think the Government are bound to assume in order to place us in the same position in which they have placed the other parts of the Dominion. Last year I brought this matter to the notice of the Government, and I shall never rest content until the Government do justice to the city of Halifax in this respect. I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works, with that sense of right and justice and fair play which has characterized his public career—as some people say, and I have nothing to say to the contrary—will admit that the case I have made entitles us to be placed in the same position as Quebec, Kingston and British Columbia.

**Mr. MULOCK.** No doubt the case is very much as it has been placed before the House by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), but I feel that the case is not yet complete, and in order to lay the views of the people of Halifax properly before the Government, I think the statement should be supplemented by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny).

**Mr. WELSH.** I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Jones) in reference to the Halifax graving dock. The people there have put their hands in their own pockets, and that is a thing which is not often done in the North-West, or in British Columbia, or on the St. Lawrence. The Government have had to assume the debt of the Harbor of Quebec, and the debt of Montreal, and the debt for the rivers. I hope the suggestion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) will be heard by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). I know he loves Halifax and loves fair play, and I have no doubt he will go in for letting Halifax take her share of the public plunder. Coming to Prince Edward Island we are coming nearer home. I assure the House that we are starved out in Prince Edward Island in the way of piers and harbors. We want a graving dock badly. Will you believe me? There was a dredge boat repaired in Charlottetown. She was on the north side of the Island and got damaged and she was ordered round, and there was no graving dock there, and, instead of taking her to Picton

where there is a slip, they took her into Charlottetown and they built a slip for the purpose of repairing her there. Will you believe me when I say that the cost of repairing her hull was \$12,600, while the contract for building that dredge new was only \$7,000? There is a nut for my hon. friend to crack. You laugh, but the taxpayers will remember it. Let my hon. friend take a note of that if he pleases, and let him answer that, if he pleases also, when he has the opportunity. When we reach the harbors and rivers of Prince Edward Island, I shall have more to say. The Government of this Dominion are bound to take the harbors and piers of Prince Edward Island off the people, and they have not done so. What is the result? I see that the organ of the Government, or some other organ, has published a speech made by the Conservative Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island in which he says that the six members for the Island are blocks of wood and the Senators are no better, because we do not get the piers taken off by this Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever a Senator dies, you will make a very good peer.

Mr. WELSH. I think you will have to come down to the Island again. You found it a very good place when you did come down, and if you will come down again, I will undertake that we will cure you again and will make it a very pleasant place for you, and when you come back, you will be gnashing your teeth and will say it is a shame that the Minister of Public Works does not do this. Now, you come down with me and I will be bound we will get some benefit out of you. I will be happy to do all I can to make your visit pleasant. I will take you around and show you your piers, and you will come back gnashing your teeth, and your piers, too; and you will be ashamed the moment you stand up in the House and utter a word. I am bound to say that you will come back a wiser man, if you do not come back a better man, but I will guarantee that you will enjoy yourself. Now, the Minister of Public Works is laughing, I hope he is taking note of that dredge, because if he don't, we will dredge him as sure as he is a living man. Will you believe me, Sir, last summer the people came to me with long faces, and I said: "What do you want?" "Well," they said: "We cannot ship our potatoes, there is no wharf, and we don't know what to do;" and I had to pull \$5 out of my pocket to help put the Government piers in proper order. Why, Sir, my pay here would not permit me to do that. There are a great many more things that I could tell you, but I do not feel inclined to now. When the time comes, I will dredge the Minister of Public Works a little more.

Mr. KENNY. It seems that the hon. gentlemen opposite take more interest in the junior member for Halifax than I ever gave them credit for doing. I regret that I did not hear all the remarks that fell from my hon. colleague. I have no doubt that he said something against the Government, I am quite sure he did, and I am quite sure that was the prime object of his speech. It seems that the subject under discussion is the expenditure on the Kingston Graving Dock, and that my hon. friend and colleague took that opportunity of reminding the Minister of Public Works that we are building a graving dock in Halifax, and that the city of Halifax has contributed from its own funds a portion of the money necessary to build that very much needed work in order to complete the winter port of the Dominion. We all know that the Dominion Government contributes so much by statute towards the construction of these graving docks, and that any community, or any company, or any association, requiring additional aid must supplement it themselves. In this instance the dock is completed from a fund derived from subsidies to which the Imperial Government, and the Dominion Government, and the city of Halifax contribute; and I suppose that if we called on the Dominion Government for a portion of the

Mr. WELSH.

contribution, we shall also have to call upon the Imperial Government. So far as the action of this Government is concerned, all that Halifax asks is that she shall be treated in the same way, and on the same terms as other places are treated. We ask no favor, but we ask fair play.

Mr. BARRON. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the circumstance that while he is repairing the dam at Bobcaygeon at a cost of some \$15,000, we want a dock there for the repair of steamboats, and while this work is going on it would be a good opportunity for building this dock. It can be done by lengthening the piers, there being a natural bottom. It can be done at an expense of one or two thousand. If it is not done by the Government it must be done by a company to which I belong, and, of course, that company would have to ask the other boat owners to pay whenever they want to have their steamboats repaired. Now is a good opportunity to do this work at a very little expense, and as it is very necessary, I think it should be done at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter mentioned by the hon. gentleman is not under my control. I think that when the item for railways and canals comes up, he will find that the Government has not lost sight of that matter.

Cape Tormentine Harbor, N.B. .... \$68,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a revote. The total cost, when the work is completed, will be \$197,000. This vote is for carrying on the harbor works during the fiscal year, and to afford wharf accommodation at Cape Tormentine in connection with the terminus of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway. It will permit this route being utilised as a means of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see that the Minister in his report mentions the fact that the first contractors have failed to prosecute the work, that fresh tenders were called for, and a contract had been entered into for the completion of the work. Perhaps he would tell us what the first contract was, and what the second contract is?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractors were Strong & Perkins, and the amount of their contract was \$131,869. The new contractor is Edward Murphy, and the amount of the contract is \$169,907 for the same work.

Mr. WELSH. I have got a little to say about this harbor. The Almighty never intended that a harbor should be built there, or he would have made one. Now, I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works who asked for the pier. No one in Prince Edward Island. I want to tell him that the Almighty has made some very fine harbors in both Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. There is the harbor of Pugwash, represented by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). There is also the harbor of Shediac, New Brunswick, right opposite Summerside, a capital harbor. There is a narrow neck of land which, for winter crossing, is very good when they utilise it. This harbor would be for about three months in solid ice, and therefore it would be of no use in the winter. This vote has been here for two or three years, and every contractor has failed in carrying out his contract, and the harbor has not been built. If it goes on in this way, it won't be built for some time, and the public money will be expended. Well, it will accommodate the railway of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). It may do some good, I am not going to cry down the work of my hon. friend from Westmoreland. He has changed the title of that railway, and he has got Prince Edward Island into the name of his railway. It was called the Cape Tormentine Railway, but he has applied for a new charter, and now he calls it the Prince Edward Island Railway. I have brought this harbor up ever since I came to this

House; money has been voted for it, but the work has not been completed, and it has been a failure. I ask this Committee, what is the good of having this harbor completed, unless there is a proper connection made? The next vote should be to form a harbor at Cape Traverse. They have a wharf there now, but nothing can go to it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is for a wharf.

Mr. WELSH. You know nothing about it. There is not a man who knows more about where it should be built than I do, and I say they are building it in the right place. If the Minister of Public Works is in earnest about this matter and wants to complete the scheme, why does he not construct a harbor opposite to where the connection has to be made? Why does he not have a vote passed for a harbor opposite Cape Tormentine, where there could be a summer route and a ferry carrying mails and passengers a distance of eight or nine miles from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse? It is proposed to expend money for a harbor on the New Brunswick side, but nothing is given for a harbor on the Island. And yet it is made to appear as if it was done for the benefit of the Island. The Government know well that if they intend to carry out this scheme they should insert \$100,000 or \$150,000 in the Estimates to build a harbor opposite the railway at the connection with the Island. If any hon. gentleman will look at the map they will see that at Tormentine there will be a very safe and good harbor, with from twelve to thirteen feet of water when completed; but what good will it be unless there is one built opposite? Prince Edward Island never asked for this harbor to be built. If I ask for \$500 or \$1,000 to improve the harbors of Prince Edward Island it is refused or a decision is postponed. I can prove it and I will prove it by-and-by. And yet I have presented prayers and petitions from the people. I say to the Minister that if his prayers when he goes to bed at night are not attended to better than are the prayers of the people addressed to him he will get drilled by-and-by, and will have to suffer. I present petitions from the people, and I come back next Session and find they have not been attended to. I am, however, going right along with this matter until the Government come down with a firm platform, and see that the public works in Prince Edwards Island are put in as good order as are the works at Three Rivers and the works along the St. Lawrence. I will keep on until I get every pier in Prince Edward Island in a good state of repair, and every harbor and breakwater attended to by those valuable engineers that the Minister talks about. He told us that he had valuable engineers in his office and that one of them had had an offer from England, and so he was obliged to pay more money and asked an increased vote. I wish some one would offer the hon. gentleman something and let him take his engineers away, and let us have young men who will look after the works and put our harbors and wharves in proper order. There never were public works in such a state on God's earth as are the public works in Prince Edward Island, and I hold the Minister of Public Works responsible; and if he or any member of the Government will come down and they do not go away satisfied that such is the case, I will eat every one of them. I guarantee that any hon. gentleman belonging to the Government who sees our public works will be ashamed to hold up his head and face to the people in any part of the Dominion. I will stake anything on the truth of what I am saying. Hon. gentlemen wonder as to the position taken by Prince Edward Island members. What should they do? Should they kiss the hand that smites them? The Government are killing their own interests in the Island, for it has been a Conservative Province and it has always sent a fair share of supporters to the Government, and I wish I was supporting the Government to-day; but I can tell them, they will never get supporters from the

Island so long as our public works are attended to in the present fashion. I will give some proof. When I first sat in this House, I did not like to rise and address it. But I went and quietly asked the Minister Public of Works whether he would prefer my pointing out to him the wants of the people quietly or stating them on the floor of the House. He said he would much prefer that I should make my wants known to him. I spoke to the Minister of Public Works and said that such and such wharfs wanted repairing. He took a note of them and said he would attend to them. I said Pinette River required to be attended to, and that China Point wharf was falling down. He said: I will attend to them. I went home. I found that the first work was put in a fair state of repair, but the wharf at China Point, which was much worse was not attended to. The Conservatives wanted to complain. I said: No; the Minister no doubt overlooked the matter. The Conservatives did not write against him because I would not let them. When I came up last year there was an amount placed in the Estimates for China Point Wharf quite insufficient to do the work. \$3,000 were placed in the Supplementary Estimates, and will the House believe it that wharf has fallen into the river, and the people have had to travel 7 or 8 miles round in order to ship their freight. I had a long interview with the Minister about other matters, including the New London Breakwater, and I spent several hours with him and one of his valuable engineers, and it was very satisfactory as far as the discussion went. The Minister then agreed that the matter should be attended to. I thought next day I would write him a note and get a reply so as to have something I received the following reply:—

“OTTAWA, 20th April, 1888.

“DEAR MR. WELSH.—In answer to your letter of yesterday, I want to tell you that the matter of the New London Breakwater has been referred to Mr. Perley for consideration and report, and that I will have the harbors of Pinette and Wood Island examined at the proper season this year.

“Yours truly,

“H. LANGEVIN.”

This letter was dated the 20th April, 1888. Will you be kind enough to answer me, Mr. Chairman, what year that was? That was the 20th April, 1888, and would you believe me, that during the year 1888 there never was anything of the kind done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Impossible!

Mr. WELSH. It is a fact, and as true as you are sitting there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. It is no laughing matter at all for the members, and we will have a little talk about it. I felt aggrieved about this and I went to the Minister, and what do you think was the answer I got from him? He said “Poo-oo-oo-oo, that is for next year, I meant the financial year of 1889.” I wrote those words of his down in the presence of Mr. Perley, and they are as follows: “Sir Hector Langevin said that that promise meant the 1st of July, 1889.” Would any hon. gentleman believe that? Is there an hon. gentleman on the floor of this House who would justify such an answer as that? Let me hear of him if there is. There is not one. I dare any hon. gentleman to get up, and if he does, I will send him the letter across the floor and let him answer it. Is this the proper way to treat the representatives of the people when they come here attempting to do their duty? I want to know from the hon. the Minister of Public Works or from the leader of the Government, what are we to do if a gentleman does not keep his word and his bond. Here is the bond of the hon. gentleman, and what has been the result to the New London Breakwater? I asked the Minister the other day, and he could not answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. WELSH. It is not carried yet. I had a friend last year and he was the Minister of Marine then, and I could get a shot at him but now he is the Minister of Finance and he is out of my reach, but he holds the purse and he will have to open it, for I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will come down in the Supplementary Estimates with a sum sufficient to put all those Prince Edward Island works in proper order. I want my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to get up on the floor of the House and give me an assurance as one of the representatives of the people of Queen's County that the harbors and the breakwaters of Prince Edward Island shall be thoroughly examined and the duty of the Government performed to the fullest extent in putting those works in proper repair. I ask this as a representative of the people, for if I had to go on a personal matter I would turn to my friend the Minister of Finance. I thought he gave us a hint last year that there was something going to be done in the way of matrimony. He told us in the Budget speech too that he did not drink rum, or gin, or use tobacco, but he said the population was going to increase, and if the population does increase it will not be in a legitimate way if he keeps on in the way he is now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WELSH. Order, it is quite right to have order. Before I leave this subject I may say that I looked in the *Hansard*, and I found that when we were discussing that old boat the *Northern Light* that the First Minister got tired of the *Northern Light* and he said: "If the hon gentleman will keep quiet we will make him a present of the *Northern Light*." Those were the words of my hon. friend as they appear in *Hansard*, and I suppose when he said "we" he meant the Government. Now, that offer mollified my feelings a good deal, and as you offered me the boat I think I will take it. I will accept it in the same spirit that you offered it, but I hope it won't be an Indian gift—that you will want to take it back again. You have got this white elephant of a *Northern Light* on your hands, and wouldn't you be glad to get rid of her. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will rise on the floor of this House and state that those public works in Prince Edward Island belonging to this great Dominion of Canada—which will only cost a trifling sum of money—will be put in a proper state of repair. Prince Edward Island is an Island—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. It is surrounded by water, and it has got some very fine harbors and more harbors in proportion to its population and extent than almost any other Province of the Dominion. As I said before, in some of my former speeches, we are shut out from the rest of the world for five months of the year, and it is only during the fall and spring that our farmers can ship their produce, so that we require the Government to give us every facility that our farmers may get their produce shipped to market. I hope and trust that the Minister of Public Works and the Government will see that this thing is attended to. On the 29th of July, when I found that these promises of the Minister of Public Works were not being carried out, I wrote him a letter and here is the answer:

"SIR,—I am directed by the Minister to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, dated the 29th ult., calling attention to surveys required at Pinette and Wool Islands Harbors and to repairs at China Point and Halliday's Wharves and asking that the above repairs be attended to.

"A. GOBEL."

I submit now that I have satisfied every hon. member of this House that I have not only made a statement, but that I have proved that statement, and I challenge any hon. gentleman on the floor of this House, or on the floor of any other house—

Mr. WELSH.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. It is all right; you may laugh. If your constituents were treated the way our constituents are treated you would not laugh, and if you did laugh they would not send you back here to laugh any more. I am going to wait till my friend the Minister of Public Works gives me an answer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I may say that I think the House will pretty well understand that this appropriation of \$190,000 for this pier will go a long way to account for the roseate views entertained by the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) respecting the condition of affairs in the Maritime Provinces just now, and also to account for the fact that that hon. gentleman's views differed so much from the views of gentlemen who spoke on the same subject.

Mr. WELSH. Just let me say that I find a paper here which refers to this matter. There is a letter in the *Examiner* as follows:—

"CHINA POINT WHARF.

"SIR,—There appeared in the *Examiner* of the 1st instant, a paragraph referring to a report of a sum money being granted for the pier at China Point, which was not expended. It is so—but on Mr. Welsh's statement that Sir Hector Langevin promised him to have \$3,000 added to the appropriation for China Point pier. Mr. Welsh also stated in 1887, that there was \$300 for the repairs to China Point pier, and it was expended at Pinette. If these reports are untrue, they do not lie on the people of

"CHINA POINT.

"China Point, March 6, 1889."

It is a most extraordinary thing that something is not done here, and I wonder at it because if there is one spot in Queen's County which has a majority of supporters of the Government it is China Point. Whoever wrote that letter is an honest man, because he wrote that letter, no doubt, from the statement I made to him, and whatever statement I made to him is a true statement, as far as I am concerned.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia. .... \$13,950

Mr. EISENHAUER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works on what principle the Government proceed to erect custom houses and post offices in different localities in the Dominion, and whether they will proceed on an estimate of population or revenue, or on what other principle? I find in the county which I represent there were \$15,000 collected in the shape of revenue last year at a cost of collection of about \$3,000. At Annapolis only \$13,822 was collected at a cost of \$2,157, leaving the net revenue \$11,635. At Baddeck, which has a public building, only \$1,460 was collected at a cost of \$1,896, leaving a loss to the Dominion of \$436. In Antigonish \$13,751 was collected, and the cost of collecting it was \$1,528, leaving the net revenue about the same as that of Lunenburg. Then, when we come to the amount received from postal revenue, the receipts at Antigonish were \$1,120, at Annapolis \$2,026; and I find by returns that \$1,675 was collected at Lunenburg, from the 1st of January, 1888, to the 30th June, 1888. I do not know what the total would be for the full year, probably more than was collected at Annapolis. As the hon. gentleman well knows, the Government purchased a site for a post office in the town of Lunenburg in 1826, and they did nothing more, while in 1887 they proceeded to erect a post office in the town of Annapolis, for which \$10,000 was voted, and for which there is now \$10,000 more. I would like to know on what principle the Government proceed in erecting public buildings—whether it is altogether on political favoritism, or is the population or the amount of revenue taken into account?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Post offices and other public buildings are erected in accordance with representations made to the Government. If they are informed that in a certain town or city the public service requires a custom house

or post office, the matter is investigated. It is done not merely on account of the population of the place or on account of the revenue derived, but the general importance of the place and all these things combined are taken into consideration. There may be some public buildings erected in places where the population is smaller than other places which do not get them; but we have tried to erect these buildings as they appeared to us to be necessary, and when the condition of the revenues of the country enabled us to do so. Sometimes the post office, the custom house, the inland revenue office, and other offices are scattered in a town, and it is represented to us that the public service is suffering on that account, and that if there was one public building the work would be better attended to and the cost would be less than the rents paid for the different buildings, and there would be less danger from fire and from burglars. Altogether, we think we have done what is required from us, and Parliament seems to have agreed with us in that respect. The hon. gentleman asks just now whether these works are done by favoritism. Of course not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Oh, no.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very glad to see that my hon. friend agrees with me. For example, last Session there was a vote for a public building at St. Hyacinthe for a post office, custom house, &c.; and that city is represented by an hon. member sitting on the other side of the House. We have asked for another vote this year for that work, and will have to do that until it is completed. The same thing I think was done at Laprairie, which is represented by an hon. member who, unfortunately, does not support us. With regard to the items included in this vote, there is a post office and custom house at Annapolis. The total cost of the building will probably be about \$24,500, and another vote of \$6,500 will be required next year to complete it. The sum for Halifax Dominion buildings is for repairs; it is the ordinary vote required for the large cities. For the Sydney post office and custom house we have a revote of \$3,000 and a new vote of \$7,000. That will not finish the building, which will cost about \$26,000 altogether. We have already taken, including this vote, about \$17,000, so that we shall require about \$9,000 to finish it.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The hon. Minister has stated that the Government act on the best information they can get with regard to the erection of public buildings. I would like him to tell me whether Annapolis is a more important town than Lunenburg? In erecting a building at Annapolis, is he acting on the information of the member for the county, or has he sought information for himself? Now, I think the Government must have been convinced of the necessity of a public building for the town of Lunenburg when they went so far as to purchase a site; and I do not think it can be for want of information that they have failed to do anything further. I cannot help thinking it is for no other than a political reason, because when the county ceased to send a supporter of the Government here, they stopped proceedings. I think that is very wrong. I suppose it is useless for me to bring this matter up. I have brought it up in two Sessions; but I have been sent here to do my duty, and I do not want the blame to be put on my shoulders. I do hope the hon. Minister will make some provision in the Supplementary Estimates for this work. The trade of the town of Lunenburg is increasing very rapidly and it is more necessary to have a Custom house there than it is to have one in the town of Annapolis. As far as the business connected with Customs is concerned Lunenburg does five times as much as Annapolis.

Mr. FLYNN. I would call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the fact that some years ago the necessity of erecting a public building in the town of Arichat was brought to his notice, and a correspondence

took place between parties there and the Government, the result being the purchase of property as a site for the erection of a public building. Tenders were called for, but the building has never been erected. There are many towns less in size and less entitled to buildings than the town of Arichat, which have been given public buildings. I am not claiming that the town is entitled to a custom house, but I ask the hon. gentleman why, after he had recognised the fact that it was, and had bought the ground for \$1,000—which to-day he could not get \$200 for—the building was never erected. There was a lengthy correspondence on the subject; a survey was made by an officer of the Public Works Department, and a great deal of expense incurred independently of the cost of the site, and no building erected. The town of Baddeck which is not so important a town as Arichat has been more favored in this respect. I do not regret that Baddeck has a post office, but I maintain that we are entitled to one, especially after the preliminary steps the Government have taken with a view of going on with the work.

Mr. KIRK. As this appears to be the time to represent our wants with regard to public buildings, it is my duty to draw attention of the Government to the claims of Guysborough. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has said that he does not act partially, and he has given one instance in which he erected a post office in a town represented by an opponent. That occurred in Quebec, but so far as Nova Scotia is concerned not a county represented by a Liberal has a public building at all. In the County of Cape Breton no less than two custom houses have been erected. I suppose that is because the county is represented by two members supporting the Government. In every county in Nova Scotia represented by members supporting the Government, there are public buildings. The hon. gentleman says he erects public buildings in those towns where it costs less to erect them than to pay rent, but in Baddeck I would ask him if it does not cost more for interest than the amount of rent which the Government had to pay for the buildings they rented. The hon. gentleman has said that before buildings can be erected in any place it is necessary that application should be made for their erection. Well, Guysborough has made application, but nothing has yet been done, and the Minister has not thought proper even to make any enquiry. I take it for granted, therefore, that nothing will be done. I take it for granted that not one dollar will be spent in the County of Guysborough for public buildings. Well, I have only to say that if the Government think they will force by such means as this the people of Guysborough to support them they will find the people are not made of stuff of that kind. There is no reason why any county, no matter whether represented by a supporter of the Government or the Opposition, should be treated as Guysborough has been.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had a motion for a return of the various sums which had been expended on the different public works in the Dominion. The hon. gentleman has not brought it down yet. I am aware that it would take some time in preparation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a long return, but I will try to bring it down early next week. My hon. friend will remember that there were three returns asked for on the same subject. However, I will press it on my department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it would shorten the return I would be content to have it for the last ten years instead of the last twenty years.

Public Works, New Brunswick .....\$ 15,050

Mr. FLYNN. I think the question which I put in regard to the public buildings at Arichat should be answered. It



is not treating the House or myself with that courtesy one would expect when no answer is made. I stated that \$1,000 had been spent for a site, that tenders were invited for the construction of a public work, but that no contract was awarded and no building was erected. There is a heap of ruins there which is known as the Government property. I think the hon. gentleman should state the reason why the site was purchased, why the tenders were invited, and why the buildings were not erected. If we come here as the representatives of the people, we may not receive the public money, we may not get our share of what we are entitled to, but I think, at all events, we are entitled to common courtesy, and, when a fair case is put before the House, such as I think I have put, the Minister of Public Works, who has the reputation of being, and I believe is generally, a very courteous gentleman in administering his department, has not come up to that character in omitting to make any answer. I demand it as my right that he should answer my questions, so that I may be in a position, when I am questioned in regard to it by my constituents, to state the reason which he or the Government give.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that he is entitled to an answer, and that answer I intended to give him, but I cannot give it now, because the word "Ariehat" is not in these Estimates or in those of the previous year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is what he is complaining of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I could not give the hon. gentleman an answer unless I had known beforehand that he was going to mention the subject, but I have made a note of it and will enquire into the matter.

Mr. FLYNN. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. KIRK. As far as it goes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What will be the total cost of the Dalhousie post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may probably cost \$23,500, or it may be only \$22,000. I cannot say exactly.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is it both post office and custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. It seems to me to be absurd for the Government to put up stone buildings in these scattered places where there is not another stone or brick building. A post office and custom house could be hired at Dalhousie for \$100 or \$150 a year, and yet the Department of Public Works put up in these little villages large stone buildings which completely dwarf the whole town, because they are the only buildings which look like anything. It may be a good example to the people to improve their style of building. I suppose the hon. gentleman has been at Dalhousie, where many people go now in the summer, and certainly, if he owned the town, he would not certainly propose to put up such a building as that. The building at Newcastle also is quite out of keeping with the place. A solid brick building would answer all the purposes and would be half as expensive.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The fact that other buildings in a town are erected of wood would be a sufficient reason for my department or the Government to erect a substantial building, though without any architectural pretensions, in stone or brick, because there would otherwise be greater danger of the destruction of the building by fire when the other buildings were of wood. Besides, as the hon. gentleman says, perhaps it is not a bad thing to give new ideas to the residents of a place of that kind, which is growing, to induce them to build something more substantial. I believe

Mr. FLYNN.

that, if we erect Government buildings, they should be substantial, though without any great architectural pretensions.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). If, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) states, a building could be rented for \$100 a year, it seems a very unbusinesslike undertaking to spend \$26,000 to put up a stone building there. The interest of the insurance on such a building would be quite a sum, and, if a building can be rented, what is the use of spending so much money as this?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What has the Woodstock post office cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$46,000. In 1888 and this year we have voted \$3,000. The remainder was voted in previous years.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has the Bathurst post office been finished?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it has been completed.

Public Buildings, Quebec..... \$69,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman keep the Hull post office insured?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it is not insured; but I took care to make it as fireproof as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the Joliette post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The probable cost will be \$21,000 or \$22,000.

Mr. LAURIER. The population is 5,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a growing place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, \$20,000. This has been in our Public Accounts for a long time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The works intended for the completion of the penitentiary are not finished. A new wing is necessary, and although a large portion of the material is upon the ground, it was thought better this year not to proceed with it, but to construct what is more urgently required—a boundary wall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was supposed to have been built, I thought, last year; at any rate, it has been figuring in our Estimates for a long time.

Public Buildings, Ontario..... \$184,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Cayuga post office, \$4,500—what is the total cost here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total probable cost is \$15,500. That includes furniture and heating.

Mr. BARRON. I do not see anything here in regard to the Peterborough post office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The word Peterborough is not here, but it is in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Government Printing Bureau \$33,000—What is the sum total for this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total probable cost of the building is \$222,640. This is built on our own ground.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the necessity of building a post office in the town of Blenheim, in the County of Kent. I had the honor to present to the Government a largely signed petition from the municipal council of the town, and a large number of business men. I think when post offices are being built in little villages like Dalhousie, that a flourishing town like Blenheim ought not to be without a suitable post office,

especially as the present post office is altogether inadequate for the business that is done in that town. The petition I presented set forth that the town proposed to build a large public building, and they offered to the Government to furnish a suitable building, to heat it, and to take care of it, for a nominal rent of \$300 a year. That would be an excellent bargain for the Government to make. The Government will be obliged to put up a building in that town some time, and I know they cannot build it and heat it for anything like that sum. I would like to know from the Minister what he thinks of that proposition. The petition was presented to himself, and also to the Postmaster General and the First Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give an answer now, but I will take a note of the statement and will discuss it with the Postmaster General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is this vote of \$20,000 at the Kingston Penitentiary required?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount required will be \$30,000, but we now ask for \$20,000 to carry out certain works, including a high service water tower with a special supply pipe from Lake Ontario, \$4,000; alterations and repairs, covering the roof of the dining hall, reflooring dormitories, &c., \$19,000, and then there are contingencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Taking into account the appropriation for the current year and this \$30,000, the hon. gentleman is going to expend nearly \$50,000 for works of which the high service water tower is the only new structure. It seems a very large sum to spend on what are practically repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am speaking of the work to be done next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what was the money expended? because I am not aware that there have been any new works of importance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I gave the statement last year as to the objects on which the money would be expended, and I have not the statement now.

Mr. BARRON. What is expected to be the total cost of the post office at Lindsay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$28,000.

Mr. BARRON. What was the amount of the accepted tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract was for \$16,497, then there were additional works, furniture, painting, fittings, heating, fences, foot-paths, &c.

Mr. BARRON. Is the contractor for the building the same as the contractor for the additional part of the building that has to be done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If fittings are required in a new building, and the contractor has been a good contractor, the work is done by him on a tender examined by the Chief Engineer, and if the tender is too high the Chief Engineer reduces it to the proper sum. The amount is generally \$2,000 or \$3,000, and the contractor has the benefit of having the workmen at hand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the hon. Minister thinks that by next week he will be able to give the information moved for. I asked that because otherwise there might be a good deal more discussion in regard to many of the votes we are now passing; but if the hon. gentleman will agree to have it brought down next week, we will let them pass without further discussion at the moment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of it. I will see my officers to-morrow specially so as to have it ready next week.

Public Buildings, N.W.T. .... \$47,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought a residence had been provided at Regina long ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The residence at Regina is a very old building, it being a portable building. It costs a great deal to maintain, the building being very cold. A new one is required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much will it cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$50,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not state what the total cost of those four buildings were in Moose Jaw, Wolseley, Maple Creek and Medicine Hat. Does the hon. gentleman intend to put substantial buildings there, or are they wooden buildings which I suppose will share the fate of the Governor's residence at Regina, and be found to be insufficient or too cold, as I dare say they would be in that country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those will be frame buildings. We think it not advisable to build more substantial buildings there at present, because, in a few years, it may be that the centre would be changed to some other point and the buildings would become useless.

Arisaig Pier ..... \$6,000

Mr. KIRK. How much did the new pier at Arisaig cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been \$14,460 expended. We ask \$6,000 now, and we will require \$2,000 more next year, making \$22,000 altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that for a new pier or is it to rebuild an old one?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is for the renewal and extension of the pier, and for some dredging that is required. The pier is to be used for fishing boats, and the little harbor that will be constituted by the dredging will accommodate small vessels as well as the steamer that runs along that coast.

East River of Pictou ..... \$3,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). From the best information I have been able to obtain I learn that this money seems to be expended for some purpose not certainly in the public interest. Near where this river terminates the Government have for some purpose, not very clear, undertaken to clear out the centre of the river, which is dry at certain times of the year. I have my information from Mr. Carmichael, who was here the other day. I mention his name; and he told me that the money expended on this was utterly thrown away. I know nothing about it personally, except that I derived that information from a man of the high standing of Mr. Carmichael.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman's information is entirely astray. I know the locality very well, and I believe that the money was well expended in clearing those rocks in order to allow the descent of timber down the stream.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No logs come down there now.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Pictou). There have been logs coming down there for a great many years, and some came last summer.

Mr. KIRK. I have not the slightest doubt that the rocks are being taken away, not in the public interest, but to get votes for the Government. I know the locality, and I am quite positive that that money, if expended, will not be in the public interest. Logs and timber have been driven down that river since Pictou was settled, and it is only since the system was adopted of spend-

ing money to obtain votes that any one ever thought of the necessity of clearing the rocks to let the timber come down. I want to know why this Government should spend money on clearing the rocks out of a river, even though it should be necessary. I do not see that that is the business of this Government to have anything to do with streams that are not navigable, but I have been trying for years to get a few dollars expended to clean out a river in order to let fish come up, and I could not. There has been money expended in my county for a similar purpose, and it was just about as much needed as it is in Pictou County. I did not hesitate to condemn the expenditure of \$2,000 in my county at the time of an election when it was being expended, when I was looking for votes, and among the people who were working the money, and I condemn it now. It is not for the purpose for which the people's money should be expended at all. This Government have the fisheries under their control, and they have assumed the right, I believe very properly, to clean out streams where it was necessary to clean them out, so as to enable the fish to get to their spawning grounds. I have been applying to this Government for a few hundred dollars to clean out a very important stream, but not a dollar is granted; and the people were told distinctly, by an officer of the Government, that they could not get any money until they sent a supporter of the Government to Parliament, as that was the principle on which the money was granted. These Estimates are bristling with votes of that kind, for corrupt purposes, placed there for no other purpose than to influence votes; and I do not hesitate to say that the \$500 voted here to clean out the East River of Pictou, is for that purpose and no other. Although much larger drives of logs have gone down that stream in the past than will ever go down again, there was no necessity of cleaning it out until last year, when it was necessary to secure votes for the Government. I say it is a scandalous waste of money, and is granted for corrupt purposes.

Mr. TUPPER. I must say one word on this small vote for a very necessary purpose. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that the hon. gentlemen, who are dissatisfied because the Government have not come down and asked Parliament to appropriate all the money that they think their own particular counties in Nova Scotia require, should carp and criticise the Government for voting money in other districts where it is needed. The hon. gentleman, I am quite satisfied, after hearing him in the last few minutes, has not the slightest knowledge of the subject on which he is speaking.

Mr. KIRK: I know more about it than you do, although you represent the county.

Mr. TUPPER. I venture to say that this vote is taken largely at the request of people who differ from myself in politics, and who live on East River. As the hon. gentleman has said, logs are driven down here; I believe four large rafts went down this year, but the driving is obstructed by the rocks, and on this Parliament devolves the duty of removing those obstructions. Why did not the hon. gentleman find fault with the Government in the past for removing obstructions in large rivers in other parts of the country? How is it that he has to fall foul of this small river in his own Province, and make statements which I beg to assure the House most sincerely are not founded on facts. I have been in that county a good deal, and I know its needs, and the representations of the people. The hon. member points out that Mr. Carmichael, a former representative of this county, had given his opinion that this expenditure was not necessary. Mr. Carmichael has been told in the past that he did not understand the wants of the people sufficiently to induce them to send him to this House; he was not able to present their claims

Mr. KIRK.

properly to Parliament, and he was elected long ago to remain at home; and out of a feeling, perhaps, of jealousy, he has been induced to make those statements, although this expenditure is a direct advantage to the town of New Glasgow, where he lives; and I am amazed that any man's political feelings could carry him so far as to lead him to challenge an expenditure of this kind made at the request of the people of the locality. I would like to know where the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) got his knowledge that these rocks do not impede the rafts coming down that river, because it would be a curious piece of intelligence to give to the people who live on both side of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The vote should be understood as being, not for the accommodation of the logs, but a little grant for log-rolling. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows very well that before he was in the County of Pictou, ages ago, when ship-building was going on there, timber and logs came down that river without let or hindrance, and it is only of late years, when there is no ship-building going on, and when no logs to any extent are coming down, that we are asked to vote, last year \$700, and this year \$500, \$1,200 in all, that is, \$250 apiece for each of the four rafts which came down the river last year. Perhaps we may have another appropriation next year. I believe that this House and the people of Pictou would take the opinion of the gentleman I have named far before the opinion of the Minister of Marine, who, although he represents Pictou, can know very little of a practical subject such as this; and I have the assurance of a man who does represent the business of Pictou that this is an unnecessary appropriation. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Carmichael was elected to stay at home—why? Because he would not log-roll in this way; he would not come to Parliament and ask for money for such an improper purpose. If he had descended to make use of the means which the hon. gentleman and those who preceded him made use of to obtain grants of money for that county from one end to the other, or on such representations as those exposed by the hon. member for Queen's, the other night, Mr. Carmichael might have represented Pictou to-day; but he was not the man to do it, and I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks he can hold Pictou by these paltry little grants. But it is the principle involved in this matter which we complain of; and if we allow this sum to go to-night, we shall have another vote next year for some other purpose—for a political purpose, without any advantage to the County of Pictou, and wasting public money.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not wish to be tried by the principle the hon. gentleman seems to entertain in connection with the expenditure of public money. I did not go to the people on the East River of Pictou and tell them that if they would send me to Parliament I would obtain a grant for the removal of these rocks, but the hon. gentleman thinks I must have; and, no doubt, because in the days when his party was in power he went to the people of Halifax and told them that if they would send him to Ottawa he would ask for a sufficient sum to extend the Intercolonial Railway to West's Wharf, at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars, therefore the hon. gentleman thinks I must have pursued the same tactics. This was not a question before the people at the elections in that county. The people of Pictou are not so low and so corrupt that they are to be controlled and influenced by these votes. We were told to-night several times that the people of Guysborough and of Lunenburg, and a portion of the people of Halifax are not in the slightest degree influenced by the amounts that the Government spends or refuses to spend in those particular districts. If the hon. gentleman is logical, he asperses by his method of attack the people of Pictou, and insults that county in a manner not at all reflecting upon his own in-

telligence. The people of that county and of the East River make a demand in connection with this vote which is perfectly proper. The hon. gentleman suspects there is some wrong mixed up with this, and makes a serious charge against the people in imputing that it was necessary to pay them for their support by this kind of an appropriation, and that, in fact, they were bought by this and the railway to which he was so fond of alluding and the justification of which has been successfully made in this Parliament. I am amazed at the effrontery and audacity of the hon. gentleman in making these charges broadcast upon mere suspicion and upon the information of a beaten politician, a man who has been repudiated by the county in which he lived, and I do not think the friend of the hon. gentleman will be obliged to him for dragging his name into this House in connection with a matter of this kind, when the hon. gentleman was capable of giving no further facts than the mere *ipse dixit* of that disappointed politician for an attack upon this appropriation. If we were to follow the hon. gentleman through the expenditures made in his time, we could make out a much better case, for he seems to know no other reason to induce the majority of Parliament, of which he may be one, to make a grant of public money unless for some purpose in connection with the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to West's Wharf in Halifax. I know the hon. gentleman has an unpleasant recollection of Pictou, and in consequence of that is ready to malign the majority of the people of that county and to state here that they are bought by railway subsidies and appropriations of \$500 and \$700 to remove obstructions in the navigation of the river. The day was when the hon. gentleman would not have dared to make such an insinuation. That day was when he was a thousand miles away from here in that county addressing the people and seeking to obtain the return to this Parliament of the gentleman he quoted as his authority.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). While the hon. gentleman was speaking, I could not help thinking of the appropriate remark made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) to-day in reply to another gentleman, who had the effrontery to address him in the manner in which the hon. gentleman has assumed to speak to me, and other hon. gentlemen on this side, on a previous occasion. The hon. member for Northumberland told him that he had not yet got his pin-feathers of a politician.

Mr. TUPPER. You have lost yours, I am sorry to say.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will learn, after he has been a little longer in this House, that when he speaks of a subject of that kind, and uses the language of effrontery towards any member on this side, a little more modesty would become his age and position better. With regard to this matter, if I were disposed to go into it, I could, perhaps, reveal a condition of affairs to which the hon. gentleman is entitled for his seat that would not be creditable or agreeable to him. The hon. gentleman has referred to my efforts for the extension of the Intercolonial to West's Wharf in Halifax. I do not know to what he refers. He may be indebted to his imagination for his facts. It is a very fertile imagination and he comes honestly by it. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the question of the extension of the railway to West's Wharf had been a public question for a long time. If I did say so, and I do not know that I did—

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear. You are drawing on your imagination.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I repeat I may have said I was in favor of it. I always was in favor of it, but I did not go surreptitiously, as the hon. member did, and have a little vote put in for an improper purpose.

Mr. TUPPER. You were in the Government at the time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was not; it was the election before that. But the hon. gentleman, using his position in the Government, gets a sum put in the Estimates for an improper object, merely for the purpose of assisting him in a certain locality, wasting the public funds of the country, and then he comes here and says we have the effrontery to oppose it. The hon. gentleman must be aware that we understand his game too well to be intimidated by any such assertion as this. He must remember the exposure made of him the other night in this House, when he was proved to have misrepresented the whole position of that road which was built to elect him and without which he would not be in this House to-day, and which has cost this country \$1,500,000,—he must know that, valuable as may be his services to his party, they may arrive at the conclusion that, perhaps, like Mr. Weller's muffins, they are rather filling at the price. If he expects to retain the County of Pictou by such improper appropriations of public money from year to year, before he lives to a great time in his public career the amount will be no small one. We know that road was built on the representation to this House that it was going to shorten the distance 45 miles, and we know by the actual result that it does not shorten the distance two miles.

Mr. TUPPER. You do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When an hon. member comes to this House with such a statement and such misrepresentation, and claims a grant of public money on such a misrepresentation of the assumed facts, when it is proven by the actual result that the road does not shorten the distance two miles, it is evident that any statement coming from an hon. gentleman of that character is not worthy the attention of the House, and will always be received with discredit. That is the position the hon. gentleman occupies in that county, and he should understand that before he attempts to lecture me as to my position in Halifax.

Mr. TUPPER. When the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) rises to make ridiculous statements; connected with my county, I will expose those statements, and the ridiculous position in which the hon. gentleman must find himself is evident when he cannot even be original in his retort but has to borrow something funny from the leader of the third party to use across the House. I just want to tell the hon. gentleman that, for an hon. gentleman who has not only obtained his pin-feathers but has lost them all, he is an extraordinary statesman to draw a distinction between the right of a member of Parliament to obtain a grant of money for his county when he is outside of the Government, when he says that under those circumstances it is open for him to approach the Government and lay the wants of his county before them, while, according to the creed of this veteran statesman, the moment you go into the Government you must become dumb as to the requirements of your county. The statements which I made to the people of the County of Pictou in regard to the expenditure of public money have been verified, while the statements which the hon. gentleman made to the people of Halifax have not been verified. You will find that his promises are confined chiefly to election speeches, while mine are to be found in the Public Accounts, and I am here now or at any other time ready to justify the expense, as Parliament has justified it. The hon. gentleman speaks of my not having come here if that expense had not been made. It may be truly said, to a large extent, that the majority of the members of this House would not be here if it were not for the judicious expenditure of public money for useful public works in this country; but I have to inform that veteran statesman, who I suppose had his pin-feathers at one time, that I came to this Parliament without any promise that any public expenditure would be made which he thinks has assumed such alarming proportions, and as to

which he cites the statements made by the member for Queen's (P.E.I.) in a previous debate, reference to which on his part was highly improper at this time. The expenditure to which he refers was not only acceptable to the people in the three counties which are traversed by that line of railway, but to the Province at large. It was an expenditure which the hon. gentleman never, to my recollection, on any public occasion attacked in his native Province; but smarting under some feeling which has driven him to object to this expenditure of \$500, he has again found fault with an expenditure voted by Parliament for his own Province. I had no opportunity to justify that expenditure in the past debate. The attack was made upon it when I could not answer, and to-night I would not abuse the condescension of the Committee by undertaking a justification of that expenditure. The hon. gentleman, however, has not attacked, and I do not believe he will attack, the expenditure of that money in his own Province where the facts are known. It is an expenditure which was highly necessary, highly useful, and which develops a most important portion of the Intercolonial Railway, which has not only met its expenses, but has produced a very good profit. I think the hon. gentleman had better keep his fiery indignation in regard to the expenditure of public money in his Province for sums over \$500.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman has gone into a long explanation to justify the expenditure of money in his county. He says that money has been judiciously expended. Was it a judicious expenditure to pay \$3,700 a mile to build a branch road from Stellarton to Pictou? Will anyone tell me that it requires that amount to build a road when the right of way is furnished, when not a dollar is required for rolling stock, when five or six miles of the road was an old road and must have been bought at a lower price than it would require to build a new one? When he says that the expenditure of such an enormous amount of money as that which was spent on the Pictou Branch Railway is a judicious expenditure, he must think that the people of this country are pretty easily deceived. I do not believe that the road cost anything like that, but the figures which were given in this House this year, in answer to the question of an hon. member, show that it did cost that. The hon. gentleman has also tried to justify the building of the Short Line Railway for the reasons which were given at the time this Parliament was asked to vote the money. He questions the truthfulness of the statement made by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies).

Mr. O'BRIEN. I rise to a question of order, and ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. My attention having been called to it, I think this is out of order.

Mr. KIRK. I would not have touched upon this question at all if you had not allowed one of your Ministers to talk upon it for half an hour. However, there will be another opportunity. The justification for building that road was that it was to benefit the whole of eastern Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, and was to save 45 miles of distance. I find here that \$22,100 is asked for harbors and rivers in Nova Scotia, and where is this money to be expended? Is one dollar of it to be expended in a county represented by an Oppositionist from Nova Scotia? Not one. All the money is to be expended in counties represented by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government. Is this a mere accident?

Mr. BOWELL. Purely.

Mr. KIRK. Surely it must be an accident. Surely the Government would not be so unjust as not to give a portion of this money to other counties.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. BOWELL. Wait till you get the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. KIRK. The Government may do justice in the Supplementary Estimates, but there is no justice in this item or in any other items. The hon. gentleman has tried to leave the impression by his speech that I oppose this measure because it is a vote for Nova Scotia.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not allude to you at all.

Mr. KIRK. You alluded to the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and myself as well. You said that we objected to this vote and would not support it while we would support votes for other Provinces. I object to this because of the principle upon which it is voted. This Government has no right to vote money in order to clean rocks out of the river for the purpose of driving logs or timber. I have always approved the granting of money for cleaning out rivers or streams for purposes of navigation; but I say it is not the proper thing for this Government to vote money for the purpose mentioned by the Minister, and I shall oppose it. I do not believe there is any necessity at all for this grant, because timber and logs have been rafted down the river, perhaps, ten times more than was driven down it last year, every year for the last 50 or 60 years, perhaps more than that. There is very little timber on that stream now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a small sum, it is true, but the principle involved is not a trifle. If the Government are going to undertake the improving of streams for the benefit of lumbermen, we have a right to know it because there are several hundred streams in Ontario, Quebec and the other Provinces, on which it would be very convenient for the lumbermen, who have large interests there to have, public money expended for their benefit. If no better answer can be given than that which has been given for the propriety of this vote, I shall certainly challenge it on concurrence. I think that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works are introducing an extremely dangerous precedent in allowing it to be understood that votes of public money are to be taken for the purpose of improving rivers to enable lumbermen to raft their property down to the sea, or the lake, as the case may be, more easily than they have done. I am not aware that that has been done heretofore.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, on this river, East River, Pictou. This is not the first time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you done it in other places?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This did not begin in our time, it began on the first of July, 1876.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What river? Give the place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It continued from time to time until the 30th June, 1887. At that time there had been expended \$4,681.82 in this East River, Pictou.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not for the purpose of improving it for logs?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year \$700 were voted, this year \$500 more. Of course, I give the information that has been furnished me. The hon. gentleman must understand that it was not made up for the moment, but I find it in the book of information that I have here. As the hon. gentleman says that he will challenge this vote on concurrence, I will be ready to give the details then.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The work that was done in the East River at the time he refers to, was dredging lower down, not at all at this point of the river; and the hon. gentleman knows it very well, and it is not fair in him to put

it to the House in that way, because if he is aware of the fact at all, he knows that the dredging took place down at a lower point of the river for the accommodation of shipping.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that. He affirms that I knew this. How does he know that?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You must know it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has no right to treat a colleague and a Minister in that way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You ought to know it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He has no right to affirm a thing of that kind. I say that I did not know it; the hon. gentleman should not affirm that I did.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman should have known it before he affirmed it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is my affair, to a certain extent, because I was responsible for the item. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is unfortunately not able to be in his place, but I have a very distinct recollection, not of what occurred there, but of what was stated to me, and I do know that my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, did not suggest votes to me in my capacity of Finance Minister, for the purpose of improving these rivers for lumbering purposes; the votes that he suggested to me were for the purpose of improving them for navigating purposes. He may have been deceived. I may have been deceived, but I know that neither in 1876 nor in 1878, did we bring down votes for the purpose of improving rivers for lumbering purposes. If a vote was obtained for the purpose of improving rivers for lumbering purposes, then I was deceived and the House was deceived. But I do not

think, on enquiry, that the hon. gentleman will find that to be the case. Even if it were so, I think he would have been wrong, or that we would have been deceived in doing it. But that would not in the slightest degree affect the course that I propose to take, because I think this practice of using public money for purposes such as the hon. gentleman has now stated, is a very mischievous one, and likely to lead to a very injudicious expense over the Dominion. You cannot confine it to Nova Scotia; there are hundreds of other places where, on the strength of such a precedent as this demands, would be made for the expenditure of public money, and the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we have more than enough to do to make both ends meet as it is.

Mr. LOVITT. Yarmouth, removal of rocks, \$1,000—a similar sum was voted last year for the removal of rocks, but the engineer found that the rock, instead of being loose, was a ledge, and I understand he has given up the project. I would ask the hon. gentleman to have it put into the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman says, it was found to be not loose rock, but a ledge. In that case a sum of this kind would not be at all sufficient, therefore, I will enquire into what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. LOVITT. The sum would be sufficient to erect a beacon so as to keep ships from going on to it.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:30 a. m. (Saturday).

# I N D E X.

## THIRD SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1889.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remarks or debate; Acts, Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; Hse. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I. C. R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N. S., Nova Scotia; O. C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P. E. I., Prince Edward Island; P. O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the movers.

### Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse*.

- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com. and in Com., 778 (i).
- Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (objection) 366 (i).
- Controverted Elections Act Amt. (Ques.) 224 (i).
- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 127 (i).
- Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 503 (i).
- Debates, Official, delay in Printing French Edition (remarks) 654 (i), 945 (ii).
- Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 70, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 298 (i).
- Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 6 m. h., 1121 (ii).
- Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1437 (ii).
- Pilots, average Amounts received (Ques.) 1146 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1134 (ii).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Steamship Subsidies, 1534 (ii).
- Rebellion in N. W. T., 9th Battalion (documents read) 234 (i).
- Official Cor. (M. for copies) 304–317; wthdn., 322 (i).

### Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S. on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
- Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (remarks) 1533.
- SUPPLY:
- Immigration (Agents)* 948, 954 (ii).
- Justice* (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).
- Ocean and River Service (Masters and Mates Certificates)* 974 (ii).
- Railways—Capital: Cape Breton* (construction) 1070 (ii).
- Victoria Bridge, Cost of maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1081 (ii).

### Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex*.

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237 (i).
- C.P.R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063 (ii).
- Farmers, Frauds upon, on M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 16 (i).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 40 (i).
- Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 954 (ii).
- Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 274(i).
- Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1347 (ii).
- Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) 1160 (ii).
- Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 504.

**Armstrong, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt to M. to conc. in Res., 1682 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (Agents) 954 (ii).

*Indian Affairs* (Man. and N. W. T.) 1596 (ii).

*Legislation* : House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 274 (i).

**Bain, Mr. T., North Wentworth.**

Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1721 (ii).

Dundas and Waterloo Macadamised Road (M. for Cor., &c.) 34 (i).

—— Survey (Ques.) 1628 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 44 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1024 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1348 (ii).

New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry, rents and arrearages (Ques.) 348 (i).

Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Income* (Welland) 1516 (ii).

*Civil Government* (Postmaster General) 69 (i).

*Immigration* (Agents) 947, 949, 952, 956 (ii).

*Public Works—Income* : Experimental Farms (Buildings, &c.) 974 (ii).

**Baird, Mr. G. F., Queen's, N. B.**

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1033 (ii).

**Barnard, Mr. F. S., Cariboo.**

Mining Machinery in B. C., and Free List (Ques.) 1265.

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

**Barron, Mr. J. A., North Victoria, Ont.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ques.) 1533 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 362 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1006; in Com., 1012, 1021 (ii).

Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ques.) 1627 (ii).

Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ques.) 590 (i).

Indian Reserves, Sale of Pine Timber (Ques.) 20, 30.

Jesuits' Estates Act (Ques.) 79 (i).

—— on M. to adjn., 436 (i).

—— papers respecting (remarks) 524, 526 (i).

—— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 828 (ii).

—— Test of Legality (Ques.) 1327 (ii).

La Cloche Island, Provincial Claims (Ques.) 1081 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1244 (ii).

**Barron, Mr. J. A.—Continued.**

Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 364 (i).

Saw Logs, Export Duty (Amt.) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1484; neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494; (Amt.) 1584; neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 1594 (ii).

Scugog River (Ques.) 1533 (ii).

Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).

Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ques.) 426 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1207 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues* : Canals (Trent) 1495 (ii).

*Legislation* : House of Commons (Voters' Lists, printing) 272 (i).

*Militia* (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 793; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 495; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 797 (i).

*Mounted Police*, 1213 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).

*Pensions* (Mrs. Gowanlock) 792 (i).

*Public Works—Capital* : Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 802. *Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 806 (i), 1521 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).

**Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.**

Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1721 (ii).

Fishing Regulations in Berthier (M. for copies) 743 (i).

Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Mr. *Thompson*) M. for Com. on Res., 1688 (ii).

Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1682 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).

St. Barthelemy Post Office (Ques.) 591 (i).

St. Lawrence River Overflow, prevention (Ques.) 591.

**Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 117 (i).

Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition (remarks) 944 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

**Bell, Mr. J. W., Addington.**

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co. and Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 90, 1°\*) 369 (i).

**Bergéron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.**

Beauharnois Canal, opening of Navigation (telegram read) 1285 (ii).

—— Rep. of Engineer Crawford, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).

Budget Speech, French Edition (Ques.) 171 (i).

St. Louis River Improvements (Ques.) 34 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., on M. to conc. in Res., 1535 (ii).



**Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.**

- Cornwall Canal, prop. Location in 1834, Reps., &c., of Engineers (M. for copies) 595, 677 (i).  
Recent Break (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 303 (i).  
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on M. that Com. rise, 361 (i).  
Prescott County Ry. Co's. incorp. Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. Edwards) 2° objected to, 239 (i).  
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 264 (i).  
Winnipeg and North Pacific Ry. Co's incorp. Act Amt. (B. 82, 1°\*) 346 (i).

**Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.**

- Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ques.) 171 (i)  
Hereford Ry. Co's Subsidy, Laborers' Wages and conveyance of Volunteers, (Ques.) 1017 (ii).  
Lake St. Louis, construction of Piers (Ques.) 80 (i).  
Longueuil Wharves, completion (Ques.) 80 (i).

**Blake, Hon. E., West Durham.**

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income : Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 917. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925 (ii).

**Boisvert, Mr. F., Nicolet.**

- Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., Reps., &c., 21 (i).

**Borden, Mr. F. W., King's, N. S.**

- Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co's (M. for Cor., &c.) 529, 539 (i).

**Bourassa, Mr. F., St. John's, Que.**

- Belle Vallée Post Office, change of Location (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 943 (ii).

**Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.**

- Aird, W. B., jun., Names of Sureties (Ans) 1017 (ii).  
American Fishing Vessels, authority to Enter and Clear (Ans.) 348 (i).  
Bannerman, Wm., Customs sub-collector at Calgary, defalcations (Ans.) 677 (i).  
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T.R., on M. for Cor., 87 (i).  
—— Drill Shed, construction, on M. for Cor., 700 (i).  
—— Harbor B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1042.  
Bridgewater, Seizure, Claims for compensation (Ans.) 1423 (ii).  
C. P. R., Interest due on \$15,000,000 Bonds (Ans.) 348.  
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt (Mr. Flynn) to prop. Res., 134 (i).  
Customs Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 469; in Com. on Res., 763 (i); (B. 117) 2° m., 1138; in Com., 1140; M. to recom., 1330 (ii).  
—— Appraisers (Ques.) appointment (Ans.) 370 (i).  
—— Seizures, on Res. (Mr. Holton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1290 (ii).  
Debates, Official (M. for Sp. Com.) 3 (i).

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

- Electoral Lists, Expenditure on preparation, &c. (Ans.) 30, 33 (i).  
Exports to Great Britain *vid* U. S. (Ans.) 428 (i).  
—— to Australia, Manufactures (Ans.) 1423 (ii).  
Fish, Foreign, change in Bonding System (Ans.) 224 (i)  
Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1089 (ii).  
Flour and Pork Duties, on adjmt. (remarks) 1723 (ii).  
Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 686, 692 (i).  
Fruits and Seeds Imported from U.S. (Ans.) 224 (i).  
Gowan and Boswell, Judges, in Com of Sup., 1362 (ii).  
Grosse, John A., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 171 (i).  
Imports and Exports (Ans.) 1363 (ii).  
I. C. R., French Language on (Ans.) 29 (i).  
Jukes, Dr., in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).  
Labor Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 1283 (ii).  
Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M. for copies, 556 (i).  
Lumber Shipments from N. B. to U. S. (Ans.) 935 (ii).  
Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. Burdett) on M. for 2°, 260 (i).  
—— (M.) to trnstr. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii).  
Oils, Imports into Man. (Ans.) 1533 (ii).  
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com., 1137 (ii).  
Preventive Officers in P. E. I. (Ans.) 15 (i).  
Printing and Stationery, deptl. Rep. (presented) 346.  
—— Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).  
—— Committee (M. to add names) 346 (i).  
Public Accounts Com., meeting (Ans.) 222 (i).  
—— (remarks) 500 (i).  
—— Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).  
Ross, Josiah, Seizure of Property by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 428 (i).  
Saw Logs, Importation, on M. for Ret., 33 (i).  
SUPPLY :  
Administration of Justice (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).  
Civil Government (Oustoms) 152, 155 (i).  
Collection of Revenues : Canals (Trent) 1495. Culling Timber, 1362 (ii).  
Customs (Detective Service) 1221; (Salaries, &c.) 1217; (Miscellaneous) 1461 (ii).  
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1078 (ii).  
Legislation : House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i); (Returning Officers) 1362 (ii); (Voters' Lists, printing) 271 (i).  
Miscellaneous (Jukes, Dr.) 1571; (Printing Bureau) 1571 (ii).  
Mounted Police, 1453 (ii).  
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1519 (ii).  
West Bay, N.S., Custom House Officer (Ans.) 427 (i).  
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on presentation of Rep. of Sel. Com., 384; in Com., 608, 614; on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for 3°, 761 (i).  
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. Patterson, Essex) on M. to adjn. deb., 259 (i).  
Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 3 (i).  
Vincent, Joseph E., and Customs Dept., on M. for Cor., 935 (ii).  
Voters' Lists, printing, distribution, &c. (Ans.) 15 (i).

**Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.**

- Berlin and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 58, 1°\*) 269 (i).  
 Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. Carling) in Com. on Res., 1268 (ii).  
 Ont. Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°\*) 194 (i).  
 Return re Fire Insurance Co's (Enquiry) 323 (i).

**Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.**

- Business of the House, on adjmt. (remarks) 762 (i).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1144 (ii).  
 Fruits and Seeds imported from U. S. (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Canals—Income* (Welland) 1515 (ii).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud (B. 6, 1°\*) 13 (i); on 2°, 1100 (ii).

**Brien, Mr. J., South Essex.**

- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 125 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1014, 1129 (ii).  
 Immigrants, Arrivals from 1867 to 1889, number, &c., (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 964 (ii).  
 Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 223 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 963 (ii).

**Brown, Mr. A., Hamilton.**

- Bagwell, Geo. McDonald, Relief (B. 123, 1°\*) 871 (ii).  
 Ballot Box, Waddell's Patent (M. for Sel. Com.) 24 (i).  
 Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. of Can. Act Amt. (B. 25, 1°\*) 47 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1115 (ii).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 119 (i).  
 Cruelty to Animals prevention (B. 3, 1°) 13; 2° m., 240; on M. that Com. rise, 360; (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 367; agreed to (Y. 96; N. 92) 368; M. for Com., 607 (i).  
 Fraudulent Practices Com. (M. for Sp. Com.) 16; (M.) reducing quorum, 222 (i).  
 Fire Arms, Improper use (B. 148, 1°\*) 1221 (ii).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2°, 1102 (ii).

**Bryson, Mr. J., Pontiac.**

- Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).  
 Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 51, 7°\*) 222 (i).

**Bryson, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).  
 Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 854 (ii).

**Burdett, Mr. S. B., East Hastings.**

- Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T. R. (M. for Cor.) 85 (i).  
 Belleville Harbor B. 116 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1042 (ii).  
 Deaf and Dumb Institute, Belleville, in Com of Sup., 70 (i).  
 Drill Shed at Belleville, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 ——— construction (M. for Ret.) 699 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1026, 1126 (ii).  
 Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud (B. 16, 1°\*) 30; 2° m., 259 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1137 (ii).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenue, &c. (M. for Ret.) 225 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (Postmaster General) 69 (i).

**Burns, Mr. K. F., Gloucester.**

- Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1121 (ii).  
 Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1086.

**Cameron, Mr. H., Inverness.**

- Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).  
 Dredge *Cape Breton*, compensation to Captain and Laborers for Losses (Ques.) 427 (i).  
 Dredge lost in Northumberland Straits (Ques.) 469 (i).  
 L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 698 (i).  
 McDonald and Dowling's Gulches, Pile-driving (Ques.) 677 (i).  
 Simms & Slater, Sureties' Deposits (Ques.) 677 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Indians* (P.E.I.) 1173 (ii).  
 West Bay, N.S., Custom House Officer (Ques.) 427 (i).

**Campbell, Mr. A., Kent, Ont.**

- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1444 (ii).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 116 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1007; in Com., 1013, 1020, 1128 (ii).  
 Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1407 (ii).

**Campbell, Mr. A.—Continued.**

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 585.  
Stephenson, Rufus, in Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*: (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1513 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1253 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1078 (ii).  
*Indians* (Industrial Schools) 1178; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1176 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1361 (ii).  
*Militia* (Armories, &c.) 794; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1456 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Man.) 220 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 806 (i). Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 928, 1531 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 1068 (ii).  
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Eseeck*) on M. for 2°, 256 (i).

**Cargill, Mr. H., Bruce.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 132 (i).

**Carling, Hon. John, London.**

Agriculture, deptl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).  
Artisans, Importation, attention called to Advertisement (remarks) 1668 (ii).  
Concurrence, 1598 (ii).  
Experimental Farm, expenditure (Ans.) 428, 525 (i).  
Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947, 1320 (ii).  
—— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 275 (i).  
Manuscripts respecting Canada, copying (Ans.) 1363.  
Mennonite Immigrants Loan (prop. Res.) 1146; in Com., 1267; (B. 138) in Com., 1399 (ii).  
Population of Dom. by Provinces (Ans.) 170 (i).  
Seed Wheat, payment by Settlers (Ans.) 590 (i).  
Stein, Leonce, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 1534 (ii).  
SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census and Statistics) 298 (i), conc., 1598 (ii); (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1512; (Dairy Interests) 1513 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 289 (i); (Fruit-growing Interest) 1513 (ii); (Health Statistics) 287 (i); (*Patent Record*) conc., 1598 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 71 (i).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 947, 1320, 1498 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 274 (i).  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 932; (St. John and Halifax) 931 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1518; Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 971; Roads and Bridges (Ottawa River and City) 1450 (ii).  
Webster, W. A., Sums paid for Services (Ans.) 303 (i).  
—— employment by Govt. (Ans.) 979 (ii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., Quebec County.**

Bedson, S. L., appointment in Militia Force (Ans.) 1328 (ii).  
—— in Com. of Sup., 1509 (ii).  
Bonsecours Market Hall and Volunteers (Ans.) 19 (i).  
Cartridge Manufacture, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).  
Cavalry School, Toronto (Ans.) 302 (i).  
Concurrence, 1599 (ii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—Continued.**

Hereford Ry. Co.'s Claim for conveyance of Volunteers (Ans.) 1017 (ii).  
Lake, James P., payment for Wire Rope (Ans.) 1623 (ii).  
Militia Act Amt. (B. 29, 1°) 105 (i); wthdn., 1629 (ii).  
Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553 (ii).  
Military College, Commandant's House (Ans.) 34 (i), 1534 (ii).  
Militia and Defence, deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).  
Militia Regulations, &c., French Edition (Ans.) 171 (i).  
National Defence Com. (Ans.) 1423 (ii).  
Permanent Forces, expenditure for Repairs on Works (Ans.) 171 (i).  
Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).  
Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).  
Rebellion in N. W. T., Cor. respecting 9th Battalion, on M. for copies, 317 (i).  
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1637 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Government* (Contingencies) 157; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).  
*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), 1353 (ii); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 793 (i); (Drill Pay) conc., 1599 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i); (Military College) 1357 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 798; (Rifled Ordnance) 794 (i).  
*Penitentiaries* (Man.) 1509 (ii).  
*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 788; (Fenian Raid) 788; (Veterans of 1812) 788 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (B. C.) 1528; (Ont.) 1520, 1694 (ii).  
*Territorial Accounts* (Rebellion in N.W.T.) 1461 (ii).  
Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ans.) 427 (i).  
Toronto School of Infantry, Bread supply, Tenders (Ans.) 1082 (ii).  
Valiquette, Sergt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).  
Volunteers' (9th Battalion) discipline (Ans.) 1327 (ii).

**Carpenter, Mr. F. W., South Wentworth**

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 2° m., 299 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., South Oxford.**

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1580.  
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 194 (i).  
Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329 (ii).  
Brown, Capt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 791.  
Budget Speech (Ques.) 79 (i).  
BUDGET, THE (reply) 456; (prop. Res.) Unrestricted Reciprocity with U. S., 468 (i).  
Buildings, Public, erected 1867–1889 (M. for Ret.\*) 303.  
Business of the House (remarks) 269 (i).  
Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 138, 142, 145, 196, 199 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670; in Com. on Res., 673; (Amt.) to recom., neg. (Y. 68; N. 113) 763 (i).
- Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 367 (i).
- Commercial Treaties, on M. to adja. (remarks) 105, 168 (i).
- Commercial Treaties with Foreign States (prop. Res.) 172; neg. (Y. 66; N. 94) 193 (i).
- Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.\*) 24 (i)
- Concurrence, 1597, 1601, 1607, 1614 (ii).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1140.
- Contingencies, depl., in Com. of Sup., 159, 166 (i).
- Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1240, 1251 (ii).
- (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1310 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, The (remarks) 30 (i).
- Experimental Farm, expenditure (Ques.) 423, 525 (i).
- Exports of Manufactures to Australia (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
- Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.\*) 24 (i).
- (Ques.) 1363 (ii).
- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 419 (i).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 987 (ii).
- Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
- Freight Transit through Canada, on Order Res for Sal. Com. being called (remarks) 591 (i).
- Govt. Business on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Wednesdays, 654 (i).
- on M. to adja. (remarks) 979 (ii).
- Indian Treaties, Surrender of Lands (Ques.) 841 (ii).
- I. C. R., Capital Account, expenditure (Ques.) 676 (i).
- Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 950, 1319 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 908 (ii).
- on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).
- Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1687 (ii).
- Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).
- Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, amounts received on account (M. for Ret.) 30 (i).
- (Ques.) 944 (ii).
- (remarks) 945, 1044 (ii).
- (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1147; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169 (ii).
- paragraph in Prospectus *re* Sinking Fund (Ques.) 1328 (i).
- Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders, on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).
- Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).
- Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).
- Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.**

- Ministerial Changes, on M. to adja. (remarks) 27 (i).
- Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1709 (ii).
- Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 769 (i).
- N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1263 (ii).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1373, 1376, 1384 (ii).
- (B.C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to Res., 1387; in Com., 1388 (ii).
- (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res., 1329; in Com., 1389, 1394 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1603; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).
- Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74.
- Population of Dom. by Provinces (Ques.) 170 (i).
- Printing Bureau, expend. for Plant, &c. (Ques.) 428 (i).
- Public Accounts Com., meeting (Ques.) 222 (remarks) 500 (i).
- Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).
- Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1366 (ii).
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1706 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1284.
- Rys. and Canals (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1601; neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1603 (ii).
- Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).
- Saw Logs, Export Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1483.
- on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1492, 1593 (ii).
- Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1660 (ii).
- on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1678; on conc. in B., 1683 (ii).
- Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., and B., 1720 (ii).
- (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616, 1630; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census and Statistics) 298 (i), conc., 1598 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 289, 295 (i); (Health Statistics) conc., 1598 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Cornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1205; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1202; (Tay) 1211; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1210; (Welland) 1207; (Williamsburg) 1205. *Income* (Lachine) 1514; (Rideau) 1211; (Welland) 1516 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Brokerage and Commission) 204; (Country Savings Banks) 203; (Dom. Loan reduced) 204 (i).
- Civil Government* (Agriculture) 71; (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 159, 166, 168; (Customs) 152, 155 (i); (Departments generally) 1503 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) 151, 196 (i); (Contingencies) 1503, 1597; (Indian Affairs) 1502 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 66; (Interior) 65; (Marine) 138, 142; (Mounted Police) 62, 153; (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 151 (i), 1506 (ii).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food*, 1227. Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1211; (Trent Canal) 1495. Culling Timber, 1362. Dom. Lands, 1240, 1251, 1607. Excise, 1223, 1225. Post Office, 1236, 1596. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1229 (ii).
- Fisheries (Salaries, &c.)* 1077 (ii).
- Geological Survey*, 1079 (ii).
- Immigration (Agents)* 950, 961, 1319 (ii).
- Indians (B. C.)* 1178; (Schools) 1170, 1177; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1173, 1595 (ii).
- Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary)* 270, (i); (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii); (Library of Parlt.) 272; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i); (Returning Officers) 1362 (ii); (Voters' Lists, printing) 271 (i). Senate (salaries &c.) conc., 1597 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms)* 975, 1361 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.)* 1703 (ii); (Magdalen Islands) 1261, 1450; (Payment to Mr. King) 1451.
- Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.)* 794; (Ammunition, &c.) 793 (i); (Drill Pay) conc., 1599 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i); (Military College) 1357 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796; (Rifled Ordnance) 794 (i).
- Miscellaneous (American Association)* 1699; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179, 1362; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 1179; (Labor Commission) 1497, conc., 1614; (Lands, O. P. R. Belt) 1570; (Litigation) 1460; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1456; (St. Lawrence River Survey) 1461 (ii).
- Mounted Police*, 1212, 1451, 1497 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers)* 974 (ii).
- Pensions (Compensation in lieu of Land)* 788; (Fenian Raid) 788; (Veterans of 1812) 788 (i).
- Penitentiaries (Kingston)* 1509, conc., 1615 (ii); (Man.) 216 (i), 1507, conc., 1597 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Additional, Ottawa)* 799 (i). Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 1599; (Que.) 1517 (ii). Buildings (N. S.) 805; (N. W. T.) 807 (i), 1527 (ii); (Ont.) 806 (i), 1521, 1694 (ii); (Que.) 808 (i), 1362. Repairs, Furniture, &c., 913. Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 931; (N. B.) 925, 1447 (ii); (N.S.) 807 (i), 912; (Ont.) 1448. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449; conc., 1615. Telegraph Lines (N.W.T.) 1233 (ii).
- Railways—Capital: O. P. R. (construction)* 1047. I. C. R. (Rolling Stock) conc., 1614. Cape Breton (construction) 1069. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).
- Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service)* 976 (ii).
- Superannuation: Railways (W. Wallace)* 1597 (ii).
- Superintendence of Insurance (Expenses)* 1361 (ii).
- Unprovided Items*, 1494 (ii).
- Tariff, proposed Changes (Ques.) 1221 (ii).
- Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
- Western Counties Ry. B. 127 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1043 (ii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.**

- Customs Buildings, cities and towns of less than 20,000 (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).
- Cab-hire, &c., in Com. of Sup., 162, 166 (ii).
- Canal Works, Tenders for (M. for Ret.) 593 (i).
- Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
- Concurrence, 1598 (ii).
- Convict Labor, in Com. of Sup., 212 (ii).
- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Flynn) to prop. Res., 112 (i).
- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 245 (i).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

- Fabre, Mr., in Com. of Sup., 1323 (ii).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. Mulock) 39 (i).
- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 402 (i).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1127 (ii).
- Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 691 (i).
- Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. Ives) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).
- on Order, Res. (Mr. Ives) for Sel. Com. being called, 591 (i).
- Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 53 (i).
- Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) for Joint Com., 783 (i).
- Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders, on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).
- Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1133 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 261 (i).
- Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 300, 607 (i).
- St. Catharines Milling Co's. Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 53 (i).
- Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1683 (ii).
- Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1647; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Patent Record) conc.*, 1598 (ii).
- Civil Government (Contingencies)* 162, 164, 166, 168; (High Commissioner's Office) 196; (Interior) 58; (Justice) 53; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).
- Immigration (Agents)* 1323 (ii).
- Legislation: House of Commons (Contingencies) conc.*, 1598 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 273 (i).
- Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.)* 1353; (Drill Pay) conc., 1598 (ii).
- Penitentiaries (Kingston)* 212 (i).
- Public Works—Capital: Buildings (N.B) conc.*, 1599. *Income Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) conc.*, 1599. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 928 (ii).
- Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. Boyle) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1104 (ii).
- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) to M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; on M. for 3°, 760 (i).
- Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. Patterson, Essex) on M. for 2°, 256 (i).
- Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.**
- Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).
- River Matane (Ques.) 171 (i).
- Rights in Matane River (M. for Cor.) 938 (ii).
- Lebourdais Bros., Cor. re Trial (Ques.) 16 (i).
- Ont. Loan and Debenture Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. Moncreiff) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. P. B.—Continued.**

Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 301 (i).  
St. Roch des Aulnets Wharf (M. for Cor.) 529 (i).

**Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.**

Bannerman, Wm., late postmaster at Calgary, defalcations (Ques.) 677 (i).  
Bass Fishing Permits, Lake Erie (Ques.) 1081 (ii).  
Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ques.) 426 (i).  
Commercial Union with U. S., telegram *re* Hitt's Res. (read) 384 (i).  
Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 122 (i).  
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2°, 245 (i).  
Cullers' Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1363 (ii).  
Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 67 (i).  
Debates, Official, delay in Printing (remarks) 944 (ii).  
Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to trn-fr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).  
Franchise Act, amount expended for all services (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).  
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 981; in Com., 1127; on M. for 3°, 1278; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1279 (ii).  
Free List Extension (Seeds and Grains) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 685 (i).  
Fruit Baskets and Boxes, amount of Duty collected (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
Interest and Sinking Fund, amounts charged against (Ques.) 1363 (ii).  
Jesuits' Estates Act on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 883 (ii).  
—— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).  
Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 371 (i).  
Map of Canada in Chamber (request) 469 (i).  
Maritime Court Law (Ont.) Act Amt. (B. 3°, 1°\*) 169 (i).  
Orange Order incorp., Legislation (Ques.) 1082 (ii).  
Pagans in Joliette County (Ques.) 1710 (ii).  
Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res. and B., 1133 (ii).  
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 479 (i).  
Saw Logs, Exportation and Duty collected (M. for Ret.\*) 33 (i).  
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1480, 1584 (ii).  
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).  
Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1034 (ii).  
Sittings of the House (prop. Res.) not to sit after 12 o'clock, Order read, 432; Res., 526 (i).  
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1630, 1635 (ii).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* (Customs) 67; (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 68 (i).  
*Indians* (Oka Indians, removal) 1172 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1699 (ii).  
Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 665 (i).  
Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1103 (ii).  
Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).  
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on presentation of Rep. of Sel. Com., 384; in Com., 608, 619; on M. for 3°, 755; (Amt.) 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).  
Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

**Chisholm, Mr. D., New Westminster.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 127 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration*, 951 (ii).  
*Militia* (Permanent Forces, &c.) 799 (i).

**Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.**

Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., (Amt.) 933 (ii).  
Electoral Lists, Expenditure on preparation, &c. (Ques.) 30, 33 (i).  
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1026 (ii).  
I.C.R., French Language on (Ques.) 29 (i).  
—— Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ques.) 248 (i).  
—— Receipts and Expenditures from opening to date (Ques.) 427 (i).  
Post Office Inspector, Three Rivers division (Ques.) 1181 (ii).  
Quebec and Lévis Ferry provision (B. 12, 1°\*) 29 (i).  
Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii).  
U.S., Invitation to Members to visit (Ques.) 34 (i).

**Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Toronto Centre.**

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).  
London and Can. Loan and Interest Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 77, 1°\*) 322 (i).  
Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 701 (i).  
SUPPLY :  
*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1697 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1696 (ii).  
Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 253 (i).

**Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.**

Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. *Davis*) on Sen. Amts., 1056 (ii).  
Jesuits' Estates Act, Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 836 (ii).  
Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°\*) 138; 2° m., 239 (i).

**Colter, Mr. C. W., Haldimand.**

- Cayuga Post Office, Cost to date (Ques.) 303 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 1445; in Com., 1446 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 98; on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1000; in Com., 1008, 1020, 1025, 1127 (ii).  
 Grand River Bridge at York Village, construction (Ques.) 171 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Indian Lands (Sales, &c.) Grand River, Cayuga (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1168 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. 563 (i).  
 Ross, Josiah, Seizure of Property by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 428 (i).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Barron) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1489 (ii).  
 Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1675 (ii).  
 Six Nation Indians, Sale of Lands (Ques.) 428 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Collection of Revenues: Customs (Salaries, &c.)* 1220 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges*, 970 (ii).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c, prevention of Fraud B. 6. (Mr. Boyle) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6. m. h., neg. on a div., 1102 (ii).  
 Webster, W. A., Sums paid for services (Ques.) 303.  
 ——— (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).

**Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.**

- Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G. T. R., on M. for Cor., 87 (i).  
 Business of the House (remarks) 270 (i).  
 Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 670 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 557 (i).  
 Cruiser, Govt. Steamer, Engineer's Certificate (Ques.) 739 (i).  
 Dom. notes, Printing, in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).  
 Engineers (Stationary) Examination and Licensing (B. 8, 1°\*) 17 (i); 2° m., 1107 (ii).  
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Monday (remarks) re Home Rule for Ireland, 1182 (ii).  
 Gowan, Hon. J. R., Senator, Pension (Ques.) 676 (i).  
 Home Rule for Ireland (prop. Res.) 304 (i).  
 Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206, 209 (i).  
 Personal Explanation, paragraph in Toronto *World* re Elevator's Bill, 842 (ii).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 226 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 17; 2° m., 362 (i); M. for Com., 1099 (ii).  
 Sawdust in Ottawa River (Ques.) 223 (i).

**Cook, Mr. H. H.—Continued.**

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice (Vice-Admiralty Court)* 206 (i).  
*Charges of Management (Printing Dom Notes)* 204 (i).  
*Civil Government (Contingencies)* 159; (High Commissioner's Office) 200; (Marine) 146; (Militia and Defence) 57; (Public Works) 150 (i).  
 Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 663 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 613 (i).

**Corby, Mr. H., West Hastings.**

- Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s. (B. 75, 1°\*) 322 (i).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Fisher) to prop. Res., 112 (i).

**Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N. B.**

- Cigars, reduction of License Fees (Ans.) 171 (i).  
 Cullers Act Amt. M. for Com. on Res., 1363; in Com., 1365; (B. 142) 1°\*, 1366 (ii).  
 Hide and Leather Inspector, Montreal, on M. for Papers, &c., 23 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (prop. Res.) in Com., 1221; (B. 139, 1°) 1269; in Com., 1397 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue, depl. Rep. (presented) 3 (i).  
 ——— (correction) 17 (i).  
 Inspection Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°) 1263; in Com., 1398.  
 New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry, rents and arrearages (Ans.) 348 (i).  
 O'Connor, D., Fees and Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Flynn) informer Le Caron and Secret Service Fund, 323 (i).  
 Quesnel, Jules, complaints against (Ans.) 1145 (ii).  
**SUPPLY:**  
*Civil Government (Inland Revenue)* 66 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food*, 1227. Excise, 1223. Minor Revenues, 1229. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1229. Weights and Measures, 1226 (ii).  
 Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. (B. 113) prop. Res., 469; in Com., 661, (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°) 79; 2° m., 195 (i).

**Couture, Mr. P., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.**

- Chicoutimi and Saguenay Counties, expenditure of Subsidy (Ques.) 427 (i).  
 Lake St. John, Buoys and Lights (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— Hydrographic Survey (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— Mail Service (Ques.) 1628 (ii).  
 ——— Wharves, Construction (Ques.) 1181 (ii).  
 Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 979 (ii).  
 Ry. Subsidies, Lake St. John (Ques.) 427 (i).  
 ——— Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Ques.) 1181 (ii).  
 Saguenay River, Buoys and Lights (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— Tenders (Ques.) 1422 (ii).  
 St. Alphonse Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1181, 1363 (ii).  
 Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf, construction (Ques.) 525 (i).  
 St. Lawrence Telegraph Service (Ques.) 1363 (ii).

**Curran, Mr. J. J., Montreal Centre.**

- Bonsecours Market Hall and Volunteers (Ques.) 19 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116; on M. (Sir John Thompson) for 3° (Amt.) 1468; on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).  
 Customs Act Amt B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 1139.  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1475 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 991; in Com., 1008, 1022 (ii).  
 Hide and Leather Inspector, Montreal, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 23 (i).  
 Lachine Canal, new Bridge (Ques.) 20 (i).  
 Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (M.) 1687.  
 ——— Harbor Police (Ques.) 1423; (remarks) 1573.  
 Personal Explanation *re* Judges' Salaries, 1498 (ii).  
 St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s (B. 45, 1°\*) 194 (i).  
 St. Helen's Island Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 36, 1°\*) 138 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 612 (i).

**Daly, Mr. T. M., Selkirk.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) in Com., 238 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 780 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2°, 1001; in Com., 1012 (ii).  
 Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°\*) 369 (i).  
 Lao Seul Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°\*) 222 (i).  
 Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 376 (i).  
 Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77, 1°\*) 322 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com., 1135 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 580.

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 292 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands*, 1258 (ii).  
*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 1177 (ii).

**Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P. E. I.**

- Bagwell, Geo. McDonald, Relief B. 123 (Mr. White, Renfrew) in Com., 1234 (ii).  
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).  
 Bounties to Fishermen, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).  
 Cab-hire, &c., in Com. of Sup., 165 (i).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1063, 1097 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. Ellis) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 1439; on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

- Commercial Treaties with Foreign States, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 187 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1598, 1604, 1607 (ii).  
 Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1400; in Com., 1401; on M. to recom., 1465 (ii).  
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on M. that Com. rise, 362 (i).  
 Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 1366 (ii).  
 Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1249 (ii).  
 Dredge *Prince Edward*, Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).  
 Estreated Recognisances Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°) 384 (i).  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir John Thompson) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1474 (ii).  
 Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1267 (ii).  
 Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 404 (i).  
 Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (Ques.) 30 (i).  
 Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1091 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1043, 1127; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280 (ii).  
 Freight Rates, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).  
 Good Friday, adjmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1397 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).  
 Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. Fisher) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1345 (ii).  
 Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com. on Res., 1638 (i).  
 Judges' Salaries, Legislation (Ques.) 1629 (ii).  
 Loan (3 per cent.) of 1883, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).  
 Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2°, 995; on M. for Com., 1265 (ii).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 656 (i).  
 Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 133 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1399 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1274 (ii).  
 Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c. (M. for Ret.) 429 (i).  
 Mount Stewart Pier, in Com. of Sup., 921 (ii).  
 New London Breakwater, Survey (Ques.) 468 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1387; on conc., 1426; (Amt.) 1428.  
 ——— (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1377, 1384; on Amt. (Gen. Laurie) to conc. in Res., 1425 (ii).  
 Piers and Wharves in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 148 (i), 919 (ii).  
 Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).



**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

- Public Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).  
 Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 606 (i).  
 Rys., on M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 1604 (ii).  
 Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 705 (i).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1032 (ii).  
 Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1673, 1681; in Com., on B. 1685 (ii).  
 Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1618; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1652; neg. (Y. 33; N. 65) 1653 (ii).  
 Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) conc., 1598; (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1512 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 165; (High Commissioner's Office) 202; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) 54; (Marine) 138, 143 (i); (Printing and Stationery) 1503; (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Public Works) 148; (Railways and Canals) 151 (i); 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Adulteration of Food 1227. Dom. Lands, 1249, 1254. Excise (Preventive Service) 1224. Minor Revenues, 1229. Post Offices (Salaries, &c.) 1239. Public Works (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232. Slides and Booms, 1230. Railways (I. O. R.) 1496 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1075; conc., 1607 (ii).  
*Indians* (P.E.I.) 1173 (ii).  
*Justice* (Supreme and Vice-Admiralty Courts) 205 (i).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Magdalen Islands) 1450 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 1179; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1456 (ii).  
*Mounted Police*, 1452 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (B.C.) 1528; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 913. Dredging, 1600. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 926; (P. E.I.) 919, 1529; (Que.) 928 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* : Cape Breton (construction) 1069. I. O. R. (City front of St. John) 1068; (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1064. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1074 (ii).  
*Unprovided Items*, 1496 (ii).  
 Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).  
 Winding-up Act Amt. B. 93 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 660 (i).

**Davin, Mr. N. F., Assiniboia.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 284 (i).  
 Beer (4 per cent.) Imported into N. W. T. (Ques.) 525 (i).  
 Bills relating to N. W. T. (Ques.) 1147 (ii).  
 Canteen at Regina Barracks (Ques.) 1082 (ii).  
 Concurrence, 1609 (ii).  
 Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 1465 (ii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.**

- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 130 (i).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. (Ques.) 34, 762 (i).  
 ——— B. 145 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1537 (ii).  
 Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).  
 Fish Propagation in N. W. T. (Ques.) 740 (i).  
 Hudson's Bay Ry. and Man. repudiation (Ques.) 1628.  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1398 (ii).  
 Inspection Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1399 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).  
 Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1343 (ii).  
 Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).  
 Jukes, Dr., in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).  
 Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 60 (i).  
 Legislative Assembly of N. W. T., Memorials (M. for copies) 348 (i).  
 Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 785 (i).  
 Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 553 (i).  
 Mounted Police Desertions (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).  
 ——— Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1270; on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1272 (ii).  
 N. W. T. Act Amt. (Ques.) 105 (i).  
 ——— B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).  
 Personal Explanation, 1574 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1130; in Com. on B., 1135 (ii).  
 Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1709 (ii).  
 Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1716 (ii).  
 Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 292 (i).  
*Civil Government* (Interior) 60 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Dom. Lands, 1253; conc., 1609 (ii).  
*Geological Survey*, 1080 (ii).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 953, 1323 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 280.  
*Miscellaneous* (Govt. of N. W. T.) 1179; (Jukes, Dr.) 1571 (ii).  
*Mounted Police*, 1452 (ii).  
 Town Sites in N. W. T., Receipts from Sales (M. for Ret.\*) 29 (i).  
 Tracey, A. R., Seizure of Goods at Medicine Hat (Ques.) 1016 (ii).

**Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.**

- Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1\*) 222 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1056; 3° m., 754 (i).  
 Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 380 (i).

**Davis, Mr. D. W.**—*Continued.*

Calgary, Alberta and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 41, 1°\*) 194 (i).

North-Western Junction Ry. and Lake of the Woods Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°\*) 322 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 31, 1°\*) 138 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, Binding) 280.

**Dawson, Mr. S. J.**, *Algoma.*

Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 19, 1°\*) 47 (i).

Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1654 (ii).

Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters (M. for Ret.) 82 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1008, 1020, 1128 (ii).

Indian Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 937 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1588 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1039 (ii).

Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 472 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1641 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Canals*—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1203 (ii).

*Indians* (Schools) 1170; (Treaty Annuities) 1171 (ii).

*Public Works*—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

**Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G.**, *West Toronto.*

Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que. (B. 30, 1°\*) 138.

Cartridge Manufacture, in Com. of Sup., 1355 (ii).

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1477 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1005 (ii).

Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 40, 1°\*) 194 (i).

Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 86) M. for Com., 754 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Administration of Justice* (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 1596 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 981, 1322 (ii).

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1355 (ii); (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796 (i).

Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.) 80 (i).

**Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L.**, *St. Maurice.*

Carbonneau, Joseph, payment for Services (Ques.) 1328 (ii).

**Desjardins, Mr. A.**, *Hochelaga.*

Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).

Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 654 (i), 944, 1462 (ii).

—— 1st Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 247 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 871, 933 (ii).

**Dessaint, Mr. A.**, *Kamouraska.*

Militia Regulations, &c., French Edition (Ques.) 171.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1265.

Témiscouata Ry. Co., Pet. for incorp., &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).

—— Shareholders, shares held, amount paid, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 24 (i).

—— Subsidy, amount paid (Ques.) 676 (i).

**De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A.**, *Portneuf.*

Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 979 (ii).

**Dewdney, Hon. E.**, *East Assiniboia.*

Ballot in N.W.T., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 525.

Beer (4 per cent.) Imported into N.W. T. (Ans.) 525.

Bills relating to N.W.T. (Ans.) 1147 (ii).

Breslayor Half-breeds, compensation for Losses (Ans.) 347 (i), 1082 (ii).

Boundary between Alaska and Can. (Ans.) 426 (i).

Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Councillors (Ans.) 427 (i).

—— Survey of Reserve (Ans.) 468 (i).

Concurrence, 1607 (ii).

Deschenes, Ludger Miville, amounts paid for Surveys in N.W. T. (Ans.) 1327 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (Ans.) 34, 762 (i).

—— (B. 145, 1°\*) 1462; 2° m. and in Com., 1537 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).

Gas (natural) in Western Ont., Mr. Coste's Rep. (Ans.) 463 (i).

Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ans.) 935 (ii).

Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) 22, 29 (i).

Indian Affairs, depl. Rep. (presented) 29 (i).

Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, Salary (Ans.) 1265 (ii).

—— Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 937 (ii).

—— Reserves, Sale of Pine Timber (Ans.) 20, 30 (i).

—— Treaties, Surrender of Lands (Ans.) 841 (ii).

Interior Dept., Clerks employed (Ans.) 1328 (ii).

—— depl. Rep (presented) 346 (i).

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1347 (ii).

La Cloche Island, Lake Huron, Sale (Ans.) 428 (i).

—— Provincial Claims (Ans.) 1081 (ii).

Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 63 (i).

Lands, Conveyance to Govt. of B. C. (B. 128, 1°) 911; in Com., 1042 (ii).

Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 382 (i).

Liquor Licenses Rocky Mountains Park (Ans.) 249 (i).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., 553 (i).

**Dewdney, Hon. E.**—*Continued.*

Mining Laws, B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).  
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 136, 1°) 1262; withdn., 1498 (ii).  
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s  
B. 151 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for Com. on  
Res., 1707 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°\*) 1363.  
Rosseau River Indian Reserve, Location (Ans.) 347 (i).  
St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Costs, &c.  
(Ans.) 1146 (ii).

St. Lawrence River, Sale of Islands (Ans.) 34 (i).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Barron) to M.  
for Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).

Scrip (Land) Outstanding (Ans.) 347, 525 (i).

Settlers' (Old) Claims in Man. (Ans.) 1533 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Sale of Lands (Ans.) 428 (i).

Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 223 (i).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. (B. 152) in Com. on Res.,  
1712; in Com. on B., 172J (ii).

Sultana Islands, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ans.) 426.

Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Civil Government* (Indian Affairs) 1502 (ii); (Interior) 58, 63 (i),  
1502 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1240, 1253; conc., 1607 (ii).  
*Geological Survey*, 1079 (ii).

*Indians* (B.C.) 1179; (Dingman, A., services) 1174, 1451; (Man.  
and N. W. T.) 1173, 1595; (Oka Indians, removal) 1171;  
(P. E. I.) 1173; (Que., relief of Distress) 1169; (Schools)  
1170, 1177 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1180, 1215; (Govt. of  
N. W. T.) 1179; (Half-breeds, relief) 1461; (Inspector, Regis-  
trars, &c., N. W. T.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Lands,  
C. P. R. Belt) 1570 (ii).

*Mounted Police*, 1452 (ii).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co. (prop. Res.)  
1628 (ii).

**Dickey, Mr. A. R., Cumberland.**

Concurrence, 1605 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°) 524 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir  
*Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 730 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdon-  
ald) in Com. on Res., 1618 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 296 (i).

*Railways—Capital* (I.O.R.) conc., 1605 (ii).

**Dickinson, Mr. G. L., Carleton, Ont.**

Benevolent Societies (B. 94, 1°\*) 370 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Free Press re Land Grants*,  
1600 (ii).

**Doyon, Mr. C., Laprairie.**

Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Councillors (Ques.)  
427 (i).

—— Survey of Reserve (Ques.) 468 (i).

—— (Ques. of Priv.) 501 (i).

Employés, Federal and Provincial Govts., dual Offices  
(Ques.) 525 (i).

Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, Salary (Ques.) 1265 (ii).

Laprairie Village, protection against Ice (Ques.) 427 (i).

Mormon Settlement in N.W.T. (Ques.) 980 (ii).

**Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.**

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt B. 4 (Sir John Thompson)  
on Amt. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1280 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Mac-  
donald) in Com. on Res., 1651 (ii).

**Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.**

Alberta Ry and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) in Com.,  
235 (i).

Assets and Debenture Co. of Canada (B. 22, 1°\*) 47 (i).

Ballot in N. W. T., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 525.

Beef Supplies, Indian Agencies, N. W. T., Tenders (M.  
for copies \*) 942 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thomp-  
son) on M. for Com., 775 (i).

*Bridgewater*, Seizure (M. for Ret.) 752 (i).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 63 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1056  
1094 (ii).

—— Interest due on \$15,000,000 Bonds (Ques.) 348.

—— Rys. crossing in Man., Validity of Act (Ques.)  
20 (i).

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir John Thompson) on  
M. for Com., 1438; in Com., 1446; on Amt. (Mr.  
*Curran*) to M. for 3°, 1468 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) on M.  
for 3°, 1463; on M. to recom., 1467 (ii).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir John  
Thompson) on M. for 2°, 502 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res.  
(Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret.,  
83 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson)  
on M. for 2°, 980; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1128 (ii).

Free List Extension, Combinations (B. 56, 1°) 248 (i).  
Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ques.) 935 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir John Thomp-  
son) in Com., 726 (i).

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. Mara)  
in Com., 238 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) for  
Joint Com., 782 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard  
*Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).

Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village,  
Sureties (Ques.) 677 (i).

Lowry, G. W., Relief B. 119 (Mr. Small) remarks,  
1160 (ii).

Public Matters (enquiries) further provision B. 72  
(Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Quebec Conference, 1887, Res. (M. for copies) 29 (i).

Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 427 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1235 (ii).

Voters' Lists, distribution, &c. (Ques.) 15 (i).

Winding-up Act Amt. B. 98 (Sir John Thompson) in  
Com., 660 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2  
(Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 255; in Com.,  
613 (i).

**Edwards, Mr. W. C., Russell.**

- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m. h., to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 247 (i).  
 Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 668 (i).  
 Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C. (M. for O. C.\*) 942 (ii).  
 Prescott Co. Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 138; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 239 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 266 (i).  
 Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Reps. of Engineer (Ques.) 370 (i).  
 Wright, E. P., claim for refund on Mining Machinery (M. for Cor.\*) 94 2(ii).

**Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., Lunenburg.**

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) in Com., 674 (i).  
 Fisheries in Lunenburg County (M. for Cor.) 940 (ii).  
 Fish, Foreign, change in Bonding System (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1086 (ii).  
 ——— (personal explanation) 1099 (ii).  
 Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for Cor., 749 (i).  
 Lunenburg Harbor, Survey, &c. (M. for Cor.) 749 (i).  
 Post Office, Repairs, &c (Ques.) 591 (i).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 656 (i).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 231 (i).  
 Sawdust in Canadian Rivers, Fines for violation of Law (Ques.) 591 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
 Fisheries (Salaries, &c) 1075 (ii).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.) 975.  
 Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 804 (i), 1518.  
 Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 968 (ii).

**Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John, N. B.**

- Channel Subway Co.'s Act, disallowance (Ques) 1628.  
 Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation (B. 18, 1<sup>o</sup>) 33; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 366 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1615 (ii).  
 Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1401 (ii).  
 Drawbacks on Goods for Export, Claims (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1046 (ii).  
 Freight Rates, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1067 (ii).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 656 (i).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1408 (ii).  
 St. John River Bridge at Fredericton, Cost (Ques.) 526 (i).

**Ellis, Mr. G. V.—Continued.**

- Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1040 (ii).  
 Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret., 546 (i).  
 ——— (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1666; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1672.  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1620 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
 Civil Government (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (P. O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1504; (Rys. and Canals) conc., 1615 (ii).  
 Collection of Revenues: Minor Revenues, 1495. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1231. Weights and Measures, 1226 (ii).  
 Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).  
 Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c. and West Indies, &c.) 1703; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1262 (ii).  
 Marine Hospitals (Que., N.S., N.B., P.E.I. and B.C.) 977 (ii).  
 Miscellaneous (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).  
 Ocean and River Service (River and Water Police) 975 (ii).  
 Penitentiaries (Kingston) 214 (i).  
 Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 805 (i). Dredging (N.S., P.E.I., and N.B.) 963. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925, 1530; (Que.) 927. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).  
 Quarantine (St. John) 931 (ii).  
 Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1067; (St. John, accommodation) 1088 (ii).

**Ferguson, Mr. C. F., Leeds and Grenville.**

- Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 965 (ii).

**Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.**

- Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. Mulock) 43 (i).  
 Gas (natural) in Western Ont., Mr. Coste's Rep. (Ques.) 468 (i).  
 Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 35, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 138 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 557.  
 SUPPLY:  
 Civil Government (Customs) 68 (i).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. Boyle) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).  
 Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 757 (i).

**Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.**

- Esquimaux Point Telegraph Line (Ques.) 935 (ii).  
 Fishing Licenses on the Natashquan (Ques.) 1533, 1627 (ii).  
 Fishing Rights in Matane River, on M. for Cor., 939 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Noel Fortin, Accident to (M. for Rep.) 303; (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Matane River Fishing Privileges (Ques.) 469 (i).  
 Rimouski Wharf Repairs, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 302 (i).

**Fisher, Mr. S. R., Brome.**

- Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (i).
- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 111; (Amt.) 112; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).
- Farley, Gunner, Claim for Loss of Horse (M. for Ret.) 433 (i).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 42 (i).
- Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1431; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).
- La Cloche Island, Lake Huron, Sale (Ques.) 428 (i).
- Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 551 (i)
- Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1271 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to prop. Res., 89; on Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 268 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dairy Interests) 1513 (ii).
- Immigration* (Agents) 958, 1326 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c) 973 (ii).

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud, B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).

**Flynn, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.**

- Cape Breton Ry., Contracts for Stations, &c. (Ques.) 1327, 1574 (ii).
- (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1182; Concurrence, 1607 (ii).
- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) to prop. Res., 112; (Amt. to Amt.) 112; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 136 (i).
- Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1087 (ii).
- Good Friday, adjmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).
- Grand Narrows Bridge, Cape Breton, Papers respecting (remarks) 1286 (ii).
- L'Ardoise Breakwater, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 698 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Informer Le Caron, 93, 97 (i).
- Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Marine) 145 (i)
- Fisheries* (Salaries) conc., 1607 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.B. and N.S.) 805 (i).
- Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448. Roads and Bridges, conc., 1615 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: Cape Breton (construction) 1071 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E., King's, N. B.**

- Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 225 (i).
- Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
- BUDGET, THE (Annual Statement) 436 (i).
- French Edition (Ans.) 172 (i).
- Budget Speeches, Cost, on M. for Ret., 20 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.**

- C.P.R. Co.'s Sale of \$15,000,000 Mortgage Bonds (Ans.) 1363 (ii).
- Extension to Que., Amount paid and to whom (Ans.) 248 (i).
- Chignecto Ship Ry. Prospectus (Ans.) 1423 (ii).
- Chipman, C. C., in Com of Sup, 196, 200 (i).
- Cobourg Town Relief B. 153 (prop. Res.) 1572; in Com., 1721 (ii).
- Commercial Treaties with Foreign States, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 179 (i).
- Concurrence, 1607, 1615 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE (presented) 30 (i).
- Suppl. for year 1889 (presented) 1018.
- (Ans.) 1397 (ii).
- for year 1890 (presented) 1467 (ii).
- additional for 1890 (presented) 1627 (ii).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 45 (i).
- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 337 (i).
- Flour Duties, Increase (Ans.) 1145 (ii).
- Inland Rev. Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 1221 (ii).
- Insurance Returns (presented) 1573 (ii)
- Interest and Sinking Fund, Amounts charged against (Ans.) 1363 (ii).
- Lard Alteration, Imports from U.S. (Ans.) 763 (i).
- Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, Amount received on account, on M. for Ret., 30 (i).
- (Ans.) 944 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 946 (ii).
- (Stmnt.) 1044 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
- paragraph in Prospectus *re* Sinking Fund (Ans.) 1328 (ii).
- Mail Service with England (remarks) 1574 (ii).
- Mesa. from His Ex. (presented) 30 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627.
- Mortgage on Properties, Kingston (prop. Res.) 1573 (ii).
- Mining Machinery in B.C. and Free List (Ans.) 1265.
- Ocean Steamship Subsidies (remarks) 1283 (ii).
- (B. C. and Australia) M. for Com. on Res., 1368 (ii).
- (B. C. and China, &c.) M. for Com. on Res., 1386; in Com., 1387; M. to conc., 1426 (ii).
- (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com., 1389, 1421 (ii).
- Pacific Mail Subsidy (Ans.) 34 (i).
- Pork Duties, Increase (Ans.) 1146 (ii).
- Public Accounts (presented) 2 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. (B. 115) on 2<sup>o</sup>, 1283 (ii).
- Rys. and Canals, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).
- St. John River Bridge at Fredericton, Cost (Ans.) 526.
- Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1483 (ii).
- Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).
- Subsidy to P. E. I. (Ans.) 15 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.**

Subway, Straits of Northumberland (Ans.) 16 (i).

SUPPLY (prop. Res. for Com.) 13 (i); in Com.:

*Canals—Capital* (Cornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1205; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1202; (Tay) 1211; (Welland) 1207; (Williamsburg) 1206. *Income* (Rideau) 1211 (ii).

*Charges of Management* (Brokerage and Commission) 204; (Country Savings Banks) 203; (Dom. Loan reduced) 204; (Printing Dom. Notes) 205 (i).

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 71; (Auditor Genl.'s Office) 66; (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Customs) 67; (Contingencies) 160, 163, 167 (i); (Departments generally) 1503 (ii); (Finance and Treasury Board) 66; (Fisheries) 148; (Gov. Genl.'s Sec.'s Office) 49; (High Commissioner's Office) 196 (i), contingencies, 1503, 1597 (ii); (Indian Affairs) 65; (Inland Revenue) 66; (Interior) 58; (Justice) 49; (Marine) 138 (i), 1502 (i); (Militia and Defence) 54; (Mounted Police) 62; (Printing and Stationery) 57 (i), 1503 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 49; (Postmaster General) 68 (i); (P. O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1503 (ii); (Public Works) 148; (Railways and Canals) 151 (i), 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).

*Collection of Revenues: Canals* (Repairs, &c.) 1212; (Trent) 1495. *Post Office* (Salaries, &c.) 1238. *Public Works* (Slides and Booms) 1230. *Railways* (I. C. R.) 1496. *Weights and Measures*, 1496 (ii).

*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 1323, 1493 (ii).

*Indian Affairs* (Man. and N. W. T.) 1595 (ii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (Franchise Act) 1512; conc., 1615 (ii); (Library of Parlt.) 272 (i); (Returning Officers) 1511 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 272; (Voters' Lists, printing) 271. *Senate* (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).

*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Halifax, &c. and West Indies, &c.) 1701; (Magdalen Islands) 1261, 1450; (New Westminster and Victoria) 1533; (Payment to Mr. King) 1451; (P. E. I. and Mainland) 1261; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1262 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1697; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Labor Commission) 1497; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 1453; ("Parliamentary Companion") 1453; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Lawrence River Survey) 1461 (ii).

*Mounted Police*, 1451, 1497 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers* (N. B.) 1530; conc., 1615 (ii).

*Railways—Capital: C. P. R.* (construction) 1047; I. C. R., 1498, 1597; (Moncton, accommodation) 1049; (St. John, accommodation) 1068; (Repair Sheds at Richmond) 1067 (ii).

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).

*Unprovided Items*, 1494 (ii).

Supply B. 147 (1°\*, 2°\* and 3°\*) 1712 (ii).

Tariff, proposed Changes (Ans.) 1221, 1266 (ii).

Trade Commissioner to South America (Ans.) 30 (i).

Ways and Means (prop. Res. for Com.) 13 (i).

**Freeman, Mr. J. N., Queen's, N.S.**

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 537 (i).

Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1092 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors, in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. Fisher) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 262 (i).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1037 (ii).

**Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.**

Great Northern Ry., Engineers' Rep. (Ques.) 370 (i).

**Gigault, Mr. G. A., Rouville.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Flynn) to prop. Res., 114 (i).

Richelieu River, Survey and Soundings (Ques.) 22, 29.

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 631 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1634 (ii).

**Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte.**

Cullers Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 662 (i), 1366 (ii).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 692 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1382 (ii).

— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1403 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1034 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1677 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1650 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues: Excise* (Officers in Distilleries, &c.) 1225 (ii).

*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1701 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 215 (i).

*Public Works—Income: Experimental Farm* (Buildings, &c.) 972. *Harbors and Rivers* (N. B.) 924, 1447 (ii).

**Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier.**

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 778 (i).

Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s incorp (B 23 1°) 47; Order for 2° read., 424 (i).

**Gordon, Mr. D. W., Vancouver Island.**

SUPPLY:

*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (New Westminster and Victoria) 1532 (ii).

**Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.**

Aird, W. B., Jr., Names of Sureties (Ques.) 1017 (ii).

Grover, J. M., Postmaster of Morden, Man., dismissal (M. for Pets, &c.\*) 942 (ii).

I. C. R., Dining Rooms at Stations, Tenders (Ques.) 428 (i).

Lévis Post Office, Pets, &c., for building (M. for copies) 433 (i).

**Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland.**

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°\*) 269 (i).

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) on M. for 2°, 1114; on M. (Sir John Thompson) for Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1691 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Brigade Majors, &c., Salaries) 793 (i).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.**

- Baltic, P.E.I., Post Office, establishment (Ans.) 1423.  
 Bannerman, Wm., late Postmaster at Calgary, defalcations (Ans.) 677 (i).  
 Brussels Mail Service (Ans.) 249 (i).  
 Carbonneau Joseph, payment for services (Ans.) 1328.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 100, 1°) 523; (prop. Res.) 621; 2° m., 669; in Com. on Res., 672; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 763 (i).  
 Chester, Que., complaint against Postmaster (Ans.) 468 (i).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 34 (i).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 685 (i).  
 Joliette Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 763 (i).  
 Lake St. John Mail Service (Ans.) 1628 (ii).  
 Little Dover Post Office and Canso Mail Service (Ans.) 590 (i).  
 Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village, Sureties (Ans.) 677 (i).  
 Longueuil Postal Service (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 Lourdes and Somerset Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 752 (i).  
 Money Order Offices, Que. (Ans.) 468 (i).  
 Murray Harbor South and Montague Mail Service (Ans.) 463 (i).  
 Oyster Ponds' Postmaster, Appointment (Ans.) 591.  
 Postage Rates, Reduction (Ans.) 34, 80 (i).  
 Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 17 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt (B. 93, 1°) 369; (prop. Res.) 469 (i); in Com., 1130; in Com. on B., 1133; on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1282 (ii).  
 Post Office Inspector, Three River division (Ans.) 1181.  
 Post Offices in Montcalm County (Ans.) 1082 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).  
 Registered Letters, compensation for Loss (Ans.) 525.  
 St. Barthelemy Post Office (Ans.) 591 (i).  
 Ste. Beatrix Post Office, Location (Ans.) 590 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1643 (ii).  
 Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (Contingencies) 156, 159; (Postmaster General) 68 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1235, 1461, 1596 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454 (ii).  
*Mounted Police*, 1452 (ii).  
 Three Rivers Postmaster and Newspaper Postage (Ans.) 740 (i).

**Hall, Mr. R. N., Sherbrooke.**

- Atlantic and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°\*) 269; in Com., 754 (i).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 38 (i).  
 Independent Order of Forresters incorp. B. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 755 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).  
 Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 1018 (ii).

**Hall, Mr. R. N.—Continued.**

- St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s (B 64, 1°\*) 269 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1638 (ii).

**Hesson, Mr. S. R., North Perth.**

- Ballot Box Com. (M. to add names) 105 (i).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 123 (i).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 691.  
 Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1566 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B.C. and Australia) (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1382 (ii).  
 Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 965 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1132; in Com. on B., 1136 (ii).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, &c., on M. for Ret., 229 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 294 (i).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 965 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 1447 (ii).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 620 (i).

**Hickey, Mr. C. E., Dundas.**

- Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1567 (ii).  
 Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 43, 1°\*) 194 (i); (M. to refund Fees) 1145 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1528 (ii).

**Holton, Mr. E., Chateauguay.**

- Bridgewater*, Seizure, Claims for compensation (Ques.) 1423 (ii).  
 Can. Congregational Foreign Missionary Society's incorp. (B. 44, 1°\*) 194 (i).  
 Customs Seizures (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1285; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314 (ii).  
 Liquor Licenses, Rocky Mountains Park (Ques.) 249.  
 National Defence Com. (Ques.) 1423 (ii).

**Hudspeth, Mr. A., South Victoria, Ont.**

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1012 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 717 (i).

**Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.**

- Chaplains in Public Institutions, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 24 (i).

**Innes, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ques.) 427 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1521 (ii).  
Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ques.) 427 (i).

**Ives, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe.**

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 670 (i).

Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 665 (i).

Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. Cook) on M. for 2°, 1109 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1129 (ii).

Freight Transit through Can. (prop. M. for Sel. Com.) 87 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 132 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1130 (ii).

**Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.**

Can. Temp. Act, working of (M. for Ret.) 541 (i).

Independent Order of Foresters incorp. (B. 74, 1°\*) 322; in Com., 754 (i); on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. Fisher) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1350 (ii).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T. (M. for Cor., &c.) 550 (i).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2°, 993; on M. for Com., 1264 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 88; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 260; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 266 (i).

**Joncas, Mr., L. Z., Gaspé.**

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 28, 1°) 79 (i).

**Jones, Mr. H. L., Digby**

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 536 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1528 (ii).

**Jones, Hon. A. G., Halifax.**

Ammunition manufactured at Quebec (remarks) 1222.

Annapolis and Liverpool Ry. Survey (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 532 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 775 (i).

C. P. R. Co. and B. 68 (remarks) 701 (i).

— Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1058 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 672 (i).

Clarke, Judge, Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1218.

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1467 (ii).

Concurrence, 1599, 1606 (ii).

**Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.**

Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 662, 665 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com. on Res., 764 (i); in Com. on B., 1141; on M. to recom., 1330 (ii).

Debates, Official, on Amt. (Mr. Choquette) to M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 934 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1046 (ii).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390 (i).

Fishermen, Safety (B. 133, 1°\*) 1180 (ii).

Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 435 (i).

Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1084.

Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 748 (i).

Good Friday, adjnmt., on M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1330 (ii).

Halifax Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, division (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 695 (i).

Mail Service with England (remarks) 1574 (ii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 656 (i).

Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).

Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. Mulock) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).

*Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 811 (i).

Montreal Harbor Commissioners' B. 103 (Mr. Tupper) on M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1574 (ii).

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 774 (i); on M. for 2° (Amt.) 1270; neg. (Y. 66, N. 108) 1277 (ii).

Ocean Mail Contract with Allan Line (Ques.) 1397 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) on Res., 1329; in Com. on Res., 1375 (ii).

— (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) and in Com. on Res., 1387 (ii).

— (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res., 1329; in Com., 1390, 1393, 1415, 1434 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 1°, 369 (i); in Com. on Res., 1130; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1281 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 263 (i).

Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).

Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).

Rolling Stock, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1049 (ii).

Schreiber, Mr., Salary, in Com. of Sup., 1504 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1032; in Com., 1037 (ii).

Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret., 547 (i).



**Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.**

- Short Line Ry. (personal explanation) 740 (i).  
 ——— Amount paid International Ry. Co. or C.P.R. (Ques.) 769 (ii).  
 ——— (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1664; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1674, 1682; in Com. on B., 1684.  
 ——— on defeat of B. in Sen. (remarks) 1724 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1501, 1616, 1617 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Judges Gowan and Boswell, refund) 1362 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 296 (i).  
*Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1203 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Adulteration of Food, 1228. Customs (Detective Service) 1221; (Salaries, &c.) 1217. Excise, 1224; (Preventive Service) 1225. Post Offices (Salaries, &c.) 1235, 1461. Public Works (Lévis and Esquimalt Graving Docks) 1232; (Slides and Booms) 1231. Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and Mainland) 1233. Railways (I.O.R.) 1074, 1496. Weights and Measures, 1496 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1074 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Committees, extra Sess. Clerks, &c.) 271 (i); (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.*, (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1702; (Magdalen Islands) 1261 (ii).  
*Marine Hospitals* (Marine and Immigrant, Que.) 976 (ii).  
*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), (1352); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794 (i); (Military College) 1358 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (Labor Commission) 1497 (ii).  
*Mounted Police*, 1453 (ii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (River and Water Police) 975; (Wrecks and Shipping Disasters) 974 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Halifax) 1319; (Man.) 1508 (ii).  
*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 788 (i).  
*Public Works—Capital* : Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 799. Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801; (Ont.) conc., 1599. *Income* : Buildings (N.S.) 1519; (Ont.) 1521; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 914. Dredging (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 988. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 807 (i); 912, 1528; (P.E.I.) 1530; (Que.) 1531. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1450, 1532. Telegraph Lines, 1532.  
*Quarantine* (Halifax) 931 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* : Cape Breton (construction) 1070. O. P. R. (construction) 1048. I. O. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 1048; (St. John, accommodation) 1069; (Rolling Stock) 1049; (I.O.R.) conc., 1606. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).

Valiquette, Sergt., Pension to Family, in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

Ventilation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

Western Counties Ry. B. 127 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 871; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1043 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 608, 614 (i).

**Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.**

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s B., on M. for copies of Cor., &c. 534 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

Fish Imported in Bond for Export, on M. for Cor., 1087 (ii).

Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1564 (ii).

**Kenny, Mr. T. E.—Continued.**

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1391, 1394, 1413 (ii).

Rolling Stock, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1052 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1036 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1667 (ii).

——— St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c. (M. for Ret.) 541 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1618 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* (Salaries, &c.) 1217 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1075 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1704; (Magdalen Islands) 1450 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* : I. O. R. (Rolling Stock) 1052; (St. John, accommodation) 1069 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital* : Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 802 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 608, 610 (i).

**Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysborough.**

Cape Breton Ry. Employés (Ques.) 762 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1194 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 136 (i).

Cullers Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 664 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1045; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*, St. John) 6 m. h., 1120 (ii).

Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 749 (i).

Freight Rates, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 697 (i).

Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M. for Cor., 553 (i).

Little Dover Post Office and Canso Mail Service (Ques.) 590 (i).

Lobster Factories in P.E.I., number, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 995 (ii).

Lunenburg Harbor Surveys, on M. for copies of Cor., 751 (i).

Oyster Ponds' Postmaster, Appointment (Ques.) 591 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, Bothwell) 263 (i).

Short Line Ry., Oxford to New Glasgow, total length, (Ques.) 529 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 297 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1237 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1075 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Digby and Annapolis) 1532 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (B.O.) 222; (Kingston) 215 (i).

**Kirk, Mr. J. A.**—*Continued.*SUPPLY—*Continued.*

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 805 (i), 1519. Dredging (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925; (N.S.) 807 (i), 912, 1528 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: Cape Breton (construction) 1070; Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).

**Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A.**, *Frontenac.*

Can. General Trusts Co.'s incorp. (B. 34, 1°\*) 138 (i).

C.P.R. and Steam Vessels (B. 60, 1°\*) 269 (i).

— Co.'s (B. 68, 1°\*) 269 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1058, 1094 (ii).

Can. Super-phosphate Co.'s incorp. (B. 81, 1°\*) 322 (i).

Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. (B. 80, 1°\*) 322 (i).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 690 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to take in Wednesday, 654 (i).

— on M. to take in Monday, 1182 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 786 (i).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°\*) 269.

Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°\*) 194 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) for Joint Com., 784 (i).

— Rep. of Joint Com. (Ques.) 1669 (ii).

Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1353 (ii).

Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).

Queen's College (Kington) Act Amt. (B. 46, 1°\*) 194; 2° m., 300, 602 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. 855 (ii).

Rock Lake Dam, damages caused through, Engineer's Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 936 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i), 1353 (ii); (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; (Brigade Majors, &c., Salaries) 792; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 796 (i).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters (B. 2, 1°\*) 13; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; 2° m., 250; Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 384; in Com., 607, 618; on 3°, 759 (i).

**Labelle, Mr. J. B.**, *Richelieu.*

Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 746 (i).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on B., 1685 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 253; in Com., 611; on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for 3°, 761 (i).

**Labrosse, Mr. S.**, *Prescott.*

Hawkesbury Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 20, 1°\*) 47 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1647 (ii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G.**, *South Grey.*

Budget Speeches, Cost (M. for Ret.) 20 (i).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1096 (ii).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 92, 105; reg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 998 (ii).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 691 (i).

Leduc, Charles, of Hull, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 171 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1420 (ii).

Ottawa, new deptl. Building, Tenders for Painting (Ques.) 1266 (ii).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 76.

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 1°, 370 (i); in Com., 1136 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Barron) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1211 (ii).

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 76 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1221. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1237 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 270 (i).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1522 (ii).

**Landry, Mr. P. A.**, *Kent, N.B.*

Edmundston and Florenceville Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°\*) 369 (i).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°) 19 (i).

P. E. I. and Continental Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 96, 1°) 384 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 265 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 566.

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 925 (ii).

**Langelier, Mr. C.**, *Montmorency.*

Bar of Quebec, Disallowance of Act (M. for O. C., &c.\*) 303 (i).

Beach Lots in Quebec, (M. for O. C., Cor. &c.\*) 303 (i).

Boundaries of Ont. and Que., Cor. between Local Govts. (M. for copies\*) 303 (i).

Cavalry School, Toronto (Ques.) 302 (i).

Customs Appraisers (Que.) appointments (Ques.) 370.

Disallowance of Quebec Acts, O. C., &c. (M. for copies\*) 303 (i).

Indians, Huron Tribe of Lorette (M. for Cor.\*) 33 (i).

Lévis Post Office, Pets., &c., for building, on M. for copies, 433 (i).

Magistrates, Disallowance of Act, (M. for O. C., Cor., &c.\*) 303 (i).

Pilotage Dues, change of Tariff (M. for Cor.\*) 942 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1531 (ii).

Vincent, Joseph E., and Customs Dept. (M. for Cor.) 935 (ii).

**Langelier, Mr. F., Quebec Centre.**

- Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 778 (i).  
 C. P. R. Extension to Que., Amount paid and to whom (Ques.) 248 (i).  
 Commercial Laws of Dom., Codification (Ques.) 194 (i).  
 Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for Com. on Res., 1364; in Com., 1365; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com. on Res., 767 (i).  
 ——— Collector, Three Rivers, Duty on Foreign Catalogues (Ques.) 740 (i).  
 Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition (remarks) 944, 1462 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 997; in Com., 1008 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 948 (ii).  
 Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).  
 Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).  
 North Shore Ry., Transfer (M. for O. C., Cor., &c.\*) 943 (ii).  
 Ordnance Lands, Que., Extension of Streets (M. for Pete., Cor., &c.\*) 943 (ii).  
 Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. Girouard) on Order for 2°, 425 (i).  
 Postmaster at Three Rivers, newspaper Postage (Ques.) 740 (i).  
 Salmon Rivers in Que., Leases, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 195 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government* (Inland Revenue) 66; (Militia and Defence) 57; (Postmaster General) 69 (i).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 948 (ii).  
*Justice* (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1517 (ii).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.**

- Adjmt. of House, Notices on Order Paper (remarks) 699 (i).  
 Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Watson) objected to, 283 (i).  
 Annunciation Day, adjmt. (M.) 782 (i).  
 Arichat, West, Breakwater, compensation for Expropriation (Ans.) 841 (ii).  
 Ash Wednesday, adjmt. (M.) 436 (i).  
 Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* (remarks) 287 (i).  
 Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).  
 C. P. R., Sale of \$15,000,000, Bonds (Ans.) 841 (ii).  
 Cape Breton Ry., Employés (Ans.) 762 (i).  
 Cascumpeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ans.) 848 (i).  
 Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Doyon) 502 (i).  
 Cayuga Post Office, Cost to date (Ans.) 303 (i).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.**

- Chicoutimi and Saguenay Counties, expenditure of Subsidy (Ans.) 427 (i).  
 China Point Piers, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 621 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1597 (ii).  
 Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ans.) 171 (i).  
 Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 944 (ii).  
 Dredge Cape Breton, compensation to Captain and Laborers for Losses (Ans.) 427 (i).  
 ——— lost in Northumberland Straits (Ans.) 469 (i).  
 ——— *Prince Edward*, payment to Captain (Ans.) 30.  
 ——— Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31; (Ans.) 302 (i).  
 Drill Shed at Belleville, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 Dundas and Waterloo Macadamised Road, on M. for Cor., 37 (i).  
 ——— Survey (Ans.) 1628 (ii).  
 Employés, Federal and Provincial Govts., dual Offices (Ans.) 525 (i).  
 Esquimaux Point Telegraph Line (Ans.) 935 (ii).  
 Experimental Farm (Ottawa) Cost (Ans.) 225 (i).  
 Fishing Licenses on the Natashquan (Ans.) 1533 (ii).  
 Fifteen Point, P. E. I., Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 1423.  
 Fortifications at Esquimaux, Col. O'Brien's Rep. (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 French Canadians, Repatriation (Ans.) 677 (i).  
 Govt. Business (M.) to take in Thursday, 423 (i).  
 ——— Wednesday, 653 (i).  
 ——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 762 (i), 979 (ii).  
 Grand Narrows Bridge, C. B., papers respecting (Ans.) 1266 (ii).  
 Grand River Bridge at York, construction (Ans.) 171.  
 Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., &c., 21 (i).  
 Great Northern Ry., Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 370 (i).  
 Hickey Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 621 (i).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers respecting (Ans.) 526 (i).  
 Labor Commission, Legislation (Ans.) 1422 (ii).  
 Lachine Canal, new Bridge (Ans.) 20 (i).  
 Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Macdowall) on Sen. Amts., 1160 (ii).  
 Lake St. John, Hydrographic Survey (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— Wharves, Construction (Ans.) 1181 (ii).  
 Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 979 (ii).  
 Laprairie Village, protection against Ice (Ans.) 427.  
 L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 694 (i).  
 Leduc, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 171 (i).  
 Legislative Economy, Joint Com. (M.) 782 (i).  
 ——— Rep. of Joint Com., 1669 (ii).  
 Lévis Post Office, Pets., &c., on M. for copies, 433 (i).  
 Library of Parliament (M. for Sel. Com.) 17 (i).  
 Longueuil Wharves, completion (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 Lunenburg Harbor, Surveys, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 750 (i).  
 ——— Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 591 (i).  
 Man. and South Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. La Rivière) on Sen. Amts., 1159 (ii).  
 Map of Canada in Chamber (remarks) 469 (i).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.**

- Miminegash Breakwater, Damages (Ans.) 1423 (ii).  
 ——— Repairs (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 Mormon Settlement in N. W. T. (Ans.) 930 (ii).  
 Mount Stewart Wharf, P. E. I., Construction (Ans.) 171 (i).  
 Naufrage Harbor, P. E. I., Engineer's Rep., on M. for copy, 33 (i).  
 New London Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 468 (i).  
 ——— Repairs (Ans.) 621 (i).  
 Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. Girouard) on M. for 2°, 169; on Order for 2°, 426 (i).  
 Ottawa new deptl. Building, Tenders for Painting (Ans.) 1266 (ii).  
 Piers and Breakwaters, P. E. I., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1232 (ii).  
 Pinette and Wood Island Harbor, Surveys (Ans.) 621 (i).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).  
 Printing Bureau, expenditure for Plant, &c. (Ans.) 428 (i).  
 ——— Cost of Building, Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1363 (ii).  
 Private Bills, Reps. from Com. (Ms.) to extend time, 556 (i), 841 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Flynn) re Informer Le Caron 97 (i).  
 Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367, 1668 (ii).  
 Public Works Rep. (presented) 2 (i).  
 Red River Postal Service (Ans.) 1533 (ii).  
 Richelieu River, Survey and Soundings (Ans.) 22, 29 (i).  
 Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).  
 St. Alphonse Wharf, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1181, 1363 (ii).  
 Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf, Construction (Ans.) 525 (ii).  
 Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 1265.  
 St. Clair Rapids, Dredging at Point Edward (Ans.) 591.  
 St. Lawrence River Overflow, prevention (Ans.) 591.  
 ——— Telegraph Service (Ans.) 1363 (ii).  
 St. Louis Lake, Construction of Piers (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 St. Louis River Improvements (Ans.) 34 (i).  
 St. Roch des Aulnets Wharf, on M. for Cor., 529 (i).  
 Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 427 (i).  
 Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 370 (i).  
 Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 33 (i).  
 Select Standing Committees (Rep. presented) 17 (i).  
 Short Line Ry., defeat of B. in Sen. (remarks) 1724 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 143 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1618 (ii).  
 Summerside, P. E. I., Harbor and Breakwater, Survey (Ans.) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government* (Public Works) 148 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Canals (Trent) 1495. Public Works (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232. Telegraph Lines (N.W.T.) 1233; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1232 (ii).  
*Legislation*: Senate (Salaries, &c.) conc., 1597 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1362; Jugements du Conseil Souverain 1453 (ii).

**Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 799 (i); (N.B.) conc., 1599 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i); (Ont.) conc., 1599 (ii); (Port Arthur Harbor, &c.) 801 (i); (Que.) 1516 (ii).  
*Income*: Buildings (B.C.) 1528 (ii); (N.B.) 806; (N.S.) 804; (N.W.T.) 807 (i), 1527 (ii); (Ont.) 806 (i), 1519 (ii); (Que.) 806 (i); (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 913. Dredging (Lake Man.) 970; (N.S., P.E.I. and N.B.) 968. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 966; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448; (N.B.) 924, 1447, 1530 (ii); (N.S.) 807 (i), 912, 1447, 1528; (Ont.) 928, 1448, 1531; (P.E.I.) 921; (Que.) 927, 1531. Roads and Bridges, 971, 1532; conc., 1615; (Ottawa City and River) 1449. Slides and Booms, 970. Telegraph Lines, 971, 1532 (ii).  
 Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. on M. (Mr. Denison) for Sel. Com., 81 (i).  
 Tignish Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).  
 Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 655 (i).  
 Union Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. White, Kenfrew) on Amt. (Mr. Bryson) to M. for 3°, 855; on Sen. Amts., 1233 (ii).  
 Ventillation of Chamber, in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).  
 West Point, P.E.I., Wharf, Repairs (Ans.) 1498 (i).  
 Yarmouth County, N.S., Public Works (Ans.) 34 (i).

**La Rivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.**

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 998 (ii).  
 Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).  
 Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Macdowall) on Sen. Amts., 1160 (ii).  
 Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 61, 1°\*) 269 (i).  
 Oils, Imports into Man. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Dickinson) re Land Grants, 1600 (ii).  
 Red River Postal Service (Ques.) 1333 (ii).  
 Rosseau River, Indian Reserve, Location (Ques.) 347 (i).  
 Seed Wheat, payment by Settlers (Ques.) 590 (i).  
 Settlers' (Old) Claims in Man. (Ques.) 1533 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Immigration* (Agents) 955, 1323 (ii).  
 Todd's Parliamentary Govt., distribution to Members, 1600 (ii).

**Laurie, Gen. J. W., Shelburne.**

- Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M for Cor., &c., 536 (i).  
 Arichat, West, Breakwater, compensation for Expropriation (Ques.) 811 (ii).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 107 (i).  
 ——— on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Flynn) 116 (i).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 638 (i).  
 Fish Imported in Bond for Export (M. for Cor.) 1032.  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 655, 657 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Australia and B.C.) on Amt. (Mr. Lawrie) to conc. in Res., 1426 (ii).

**Laurie, Gen. J. W.**—*Continued.*

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1412 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1700 (ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W.**, *East Quebec.*

Address, on the, 7 (i).

Annunciation Day, on M. for adjnmt., 782 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 777; in Com., 779, 788.

Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329 (ii).

— on M. for Com. on Res., 1657 (ii).

— Memorial from Mr. Mercier (remarks) 1363.

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).

Cape Breton Ry. (remarks) 1574 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 669 (i).

Commercial Treaties (remarks) on M. to adjn. House, 105 (i).

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Fynn*) to prop. Res., 136 (i).

Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1364; in Com., 1365; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).

Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 655 (i), 944 (ii).

— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 871 (ii).

— on Amt. (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. to conc., 934 (ii).

Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 1397 (ii).

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; on M. for 2°, 1463 (ii).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).

Fisheries in Lunenburg County, on M. for Cor., 941.

Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for Cor., 748 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 930; (Amt.) 985; neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1008; in Com., 1011 (ii).

Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. *Ives*) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Wednesday, 653 (i).

— (remarks) on adjnmt., 762 (i).

— on M. to take in Monday, 1181 (ii).

Homestead Inspectors, Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Reps., &c., 22 (i).

House of Commons Act Amt., B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 785 (i)

Inspection Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 1263 (ii).

I. C. B., Summer Freight Rates (remarks) 1330, 1535.

Intoxicating Liquors in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1340 (ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W.**—*Continued*

Jesuits' Estates Act, papers respecting (remarks) 526.

— Mr. O'Brien's Res. (Ques.) 675, 740 (i).

— on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).

King's Co., P.E.I., Representation, on prop Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).

Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 59 (i).

Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).

Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 782 (i).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for Cor., 553 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

Lunenburg Harbor, Surveys, &c., on M. for Cor., 751 (i).

Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).

Mining in Ry. Belt, B.C. (remarks) 980 (ii).

Ministerial Changes, on explanation (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 24 (i).

Mounted Police Pensions B., on Ques. of Order, 1270.

— B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1276 (ii)

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (remarks) 1283 (ii).

— (B. C. and Australia) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1328; on M. for Com. on Res., 1372; in Com., 1377, 1381; on conc. (Amt.) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426 (ii).

— (B. C. and China, &c) on M. for Com. on Res. (Amt.) 1386; neg. on a div., 1387; on M. to conc. in Res., 1430 (ii).

— (Can. and United Kingdom) B. 144, on M. for Com. on Res. (Amt.) 1389; in Com., 1422, 1437 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).

Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943, 1018 (ii).

Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 302 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1283.

Rebellion in N.W.T., Cor. respecting 9th Battalion, on M. for copies, 320 (i).

Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).

Ross, Hon. William, dismissal, O. C., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 24 (i).

Select Standing Committee (M. to add names) 169 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 120 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 911 (ii).

Short Line Ry., handing in documents to Reporters objected to, 546 (i).

— on personal explanation (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 741 (i).

Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).

Subsidies (money) to B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on 1st Res., 1499; on conc., 1535; in Com. on 2nd Res., 1621, 1629, 1638 (ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.**

- Summary Trials Act Amt. B. 121 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 912 (ii).
- SUPPLY, on M. for Com. (remarks) 48 :  
*Charges of Management*, 48 (i).  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 79; (Interior) 59; (Justice) 49; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1230.  
*Immigration* (Agents) 982 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454 (ii).  
*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 790 (i).  
*Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 1315 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1518; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1448; (N.B.) 926 (ii); (Que.) 727 (i). Slides and Booms, 970. Telegraph Lines, 971 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts, in Com. of Sup., 50 (i).  
 Tariff Changes (Ques.) 1266 (ii).  
 Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii).  
 Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 661, 668 (i).  
 Tolls and Dues (Collection) Act Amt. B. 122 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 912 (ii).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1105 (ii).

**Lavergne, Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.**

- Chester, Que., complaints against Postmaster (Ques.) 468 (i).  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1475 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1006 (ii).  
 Money Order Offices, Que. (Ques.) 468 (i).  
 Quesnel, Jules, complaints against (Ques.) 1145 (ii).  
 Senator for Shawinigan District (Ques.) 1628 (ii).

**Lépine, Mr. A. T., East Montreal.**

- Address, The (seconded) 6 (i).  
 Cigars, reduction of License Fees (Ques.) 171 (i).  
 Hospital Dues on Ships, collection (Ques.) 302 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).

**Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.**

- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).  
 Cab-hire and Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 164. (i).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 115 (i).  
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 245; on M. to restore to Order Paper, 368 (i).  
 Customs Seizures, on Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1313 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 63 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063.  
 Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1250 (ii).  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1475 (ii).  
 Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).

**Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.**

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1008, 1020, 1129 (ii).  
 Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ques.) 590 (i).  
 Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).  
 Manufacturers' Insurance Co.'s Stockholders (M. for Cor.) 591 (i).  
 ——— Return respecting (Ques.) 1017 (ii).  
 Middleton, W. H., Relief B. 125 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1093 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1565 (ii).  
 Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 227 (i).  
 Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).  
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Costs, &c., (Ques.) 1146.  
 St. Clair Rapids, Dredging at Point Edward (Ques.) 591 (i).  
 Savary, Charles, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 427 (i).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 1490 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (Contingencies) 164; (Militia and Defence) 56 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1250, 1254. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1240 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).  
*Indians* (Dingman, A., services) 1172; (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1169; (Schools) 1170 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses, &c.) 1450 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1525. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: Cape Breton (construction) 1072 (ii).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 255, 256 (i).

**Lovitt, Mr. J., Yarmouth.**

- Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 538 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656 (i).  
 Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).  
 Port Maitland Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1032; in Com., 1040 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (Marine) 147; (Public Works) 150 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 811 (i), 1528 (ii);  
 Yarmouth County Public Works (Ques.) 34 (i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., Kingston.**

- Address, on the, 11 (i).  
 Albert Ry. Co., Balance of Grant (Ans.) 348 (i).  
 Beauharnois Canal, opening of Navigation (remarks) 1285 (ii).  
 Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of American Govt. (remarks) 811 (ii).  
 — Proclamation of U.S. Govt. (Ans.) 971 (ii).  
 — Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).  
 Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G.T.R., on M. for Cor., 83 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 775 (i).  
 Boundaries of Ont. (prop. Res.) 1329, 1423; M. for Com., 1654, 1657 (ii).  
 — Telegram from Mr. Mowatt (remarks) 1363 (ii).  
 Business of the House (remarks) 269 (i), 1721 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).  
 — Co. and B. 68 (remarks) 701 (i).  
 — Maps, Land and Money Subsidies (Ans.) 935.  
 Canal Works, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 594 (i).  
 Canteen at Regina Barracks (Ans.) 1082 (ii).  
 Cape Breton Ry., Contracts for Stations, &c. (Ans.) 1327 (ii).  
 — payment of Laborers (Ans.) 871 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 1574 (ii).  
 Chambly-Longueuil Canal, Construction (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 Cheese Exports to Eng. (Ans.) 1181 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 670; in Com. on Res., 674 (i).  
 — Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. Ellis) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).  
 Commercial Treaties, on M. to adju., 105, 169 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1614 (ii).  
 Customs Collector, Three Rivers, Duty on Foreign Catalogues (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 Debates, Official, Com. (M.) to substitute Mr. Prior's name for Mr. Baker's, 269 (i).  
 — on Amt. (Mr. Choquette) to M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 934 (ii).  
 Deptl. Re-organisation Repeal B. 110 (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) on M. for 1°, 590 (i).  
 Derby Branch Ry., Extension (Ans.) 872 (ii).  
 — Subsidy (Ans.) 854 (ii).  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir John Thompson) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).  
 Fisheries and Trades Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 329 (i).  
 Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjmt., 1723 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 985; in Com., 1008, 1128 (ii).  
 Free List Extension (Combinations) B. 56 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 1°, 248 (i).  
 Freight Transit through Can., on prop. M. (Mr. Ives) for Sel. Com., 88 (i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Freight Transit through Can., on Order for Sel. Com. being called, 591 (i).  
 Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ans.) 1628 (ii).  
 Good Friday, adjmt. (remarks) 1285; (M.) 1330 (ii).  
 Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to take in Thursday, 424 (i).  
 — (M.) to take in Monday 1181 (ii).  
 — Saturday 1534 (ii).  
 G.T.R., Pets. from Shareholders *re* Subsidies to Rys. (Ans.) 1081 (ii).  
 Hereford Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, Laborers' Wages (Ans.) 1017 (ii).  
 Horse Island, Georgian Bay, Sale (Ans.) 590 (i).  
 House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 785 (i).  
 Hudson's Bay Ry. and Man. repudiation (Ans.) 1628.  
 Indian Annuities, Arrears, on M. for Cor., 938 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1397 (ii).  
 I.C.R., Capital Account, expenditure (Ans.) 676 (i).  
 — Dining Rooms at Stations, Tenders (Ans.) 428.  
 — Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ans.) 249 (i).  
 — Receipts and Expenditures from opening to date (Ans.) 427 (i).  
 — Summer Freight Rates (remarks) 1330, 1535 (ii).  
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 29 (i).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers (presented) 701 (i).  
 — day for discussion (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 — on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 903 (ii).  
 — Test of Legality (Ans.) 1328 (ii).  
 — on Res. (Mr. Ross) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).  
 Judges' Salaries, Legislation (Ans.) 1629 (ii).  
 King's Co., P. E. I. Representation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) challenging Seat, 169 (i).  
 Lake St. Louis Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1534 (ii).  
 Manufacturers' Life Insurance Co.'s Shareholders (explanation) 1098 (ii).  
 — on M. for copies of Cor., 592 (i).  
 — Return respecting (Ans.) 1017 (ii).  
 McDonald and Dowling's Gulches, Pile-driving (Ans.) 677 (i).  
 Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).  
 Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. Carling) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 29, 322 (i).  
 Military College, Commandant's Residence (remarks) 1534 (ii).  
 Milk Adulteration, prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. Burdett) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).  
 Ministerial Changes (explanation) 24 (i).  
 Modus Vivendi (remarks) 811 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 146, 1°\*) 1572; 2° m., 1709 (ii).  
 — Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 169 (i).  
 — Pensions (prop. Res.) 469; in Com., 769 (i);

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- (B. 118) 2° m., 1269; on Ques. of Order, 1271; in Com., 1277 (ii).
- Punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 430 (i).
- Northern and North-Western Ry. (Ans.) 248 (i).
- N. W. T. Act Amt. (Ans.) 105 (ii).
- Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°\*) 2 (i).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) on prop. Res., 1329; in Com., 1373, 1377 (ii).
- Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
- Orange Order incorp., Legislation (Ans.) 1082 (ii).
- Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., total Length (Ans.), 529.
- Pagans in Joliette County (Ans.) 1710 (ii).
- Piotou Branch Ry., total Cost (Ans.) 302; Length, 348 (i).
- Pontiac and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (prop. Res.) 1600 (ii).
- Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943, 1017 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1134 (ii).
- Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 19 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Flynn*) re Informer Le Caron, 97 (i).
- Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry. Co. (prop. Res.) 1572; M. for Com., 1706 (ii).
- Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1284 (ii).
- Ry. Subsidies Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Ans.) 1181. — Lake St. John (Ans.) 427 (i).
- Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).
- Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 916 (ii).
- Rimouski Wharf, Repairs, Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 302 (i).
- Rock Lake Dam, damages caused by, on M. for Reps. of Engineers, &c., 937 (ii).
- Rocky Mountains Park Amt. (B. 141, 1°\*) 1363; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- St. Charles Branch Ry., total Cost (Ans.) 302 (i).
- St. George's Bridge, Structural Defects (Ans.) 1081.
- Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1589 (ii).
- Select Standing Committees (M.) 2 (i).
- (M.) for Com. to prepare lists, 17 (i).
- (Lists presented) 18 (i).
- (Ms.) to add names 169, 269 (i).
- Senator for Shawinigan District (Ans.) 1628 (ii).
- Short Line Ry. (prop. Res.) 1424; in Com. on Res., 1658; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681; (B. 149, 1°\*) and in Com., 1683 (ii).
- (Harvey to Salisbury) Survey (Ans.) 1498 (ii).
- Amount paid International Ry. Co. or C.P.R. (Ans.) 769 (i).

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., objection (Mr. *Laurier*) to handing in documents to Reporters, 546 (i).
- on personal explanation (Mr. *Jones*) 741 (i).
- Simms & Slater, return of Deposits to Sureties (Ans.) 677 (i).
- Sittings of the House, Mr. Charlton's Res. (remarks) 432 (i).
- on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 527 (i).
- Smyth, Henry, of Chatham, employment of by Govt. (Ans.) 224 (i).
- Speech from the Throne (M. for consdn.) 2 (i).
- Subsidies (land) to Rys. (prop. Res.) 1572; B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1714, 1720 (ii).
- (money) to Rys. (B. 148) in Com. on 1st Res., 1499; M. to conc. in Res., 1535; 2nd Res., 1572; in Com. on Res., 1616, 1629; M. to conc. in Res., 1652; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).
- SUPPLY, on Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 48 (i):
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dairy Interest) 1513 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Jornwall) 1205; (Lachine) 1205; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1209; (Williamsburg) 1206. *Income* (Lachine) 1514; (W elland) 1516 (ii).
- Civil Government* (Contingencies) 160, 165; (Mounted Police) 152 (i); (Privy Council) 1501; (Railways and Canals) 1504.
- Collection of Revenues: Canals* (Repairs, &c.) 1212 (ii).
- Immigration* (Agents) 961 (ii).
- Indians* (Oka Indians, removal) 1171; (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1169; (Schools) 1170 (ii).
- Legislation: House of Commons* (Voters' Lists, Printing) 272.
- Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1693; (Banff: Roads and Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Labor Commission) conc., 1614 (ii).
- Mounted Police*, 1212 (ii).
- Pensions* (Rebellion, N.W.T.) 792 (i)
- Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Ont.) 1695; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 916 (ii).
- Railways—Capital: C.P.R.* (construction) 1047. Cape Breton (construction) 1069. I.C.R. (accommodation at Halifax) 1049; (City front of St. John) 1068; (Rolling Stock) 1614. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1073 (ii).
- Superannuation: Railways* (Mr. Wallace) 1597 (ii).
- Temiscouata Ry. Subsidy, Amount paid (Ans.) 675 (i).
- Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 669 (i).
- Todd's Parliamentary Govt., distribution to Members, 1601 (ii).
- Tolls and Dues, Collection (B. 122, 1°\*) 811 (i).
- Tracey, A. R., Seizure of Goods at Medicine Hat (Ans.) 1016 (ii).
- Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. for 2°, 1100; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1104 (ii).
- Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 20, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
- U. S., Invitation to Members to Visit (Ans.) 34 (i).
- Victoria Bridge, Cost of maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1081.
- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 253 (i).
- York-Simcoe Battalion Kit Allowance, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85; (remarks) 428 (i).



**Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.**

- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. to Sup., 385 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1002 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947 (ii).  
 Mail Carriage in Brussels, Ont. (Ques.) 249 (i).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 773 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1275 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) B. 144 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1379 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to prop. Res., 260 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (Agents) 947, 951 (ii).

**Macdowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.**

- C. P. R., Maps, Land and Money Subsidies (Ques.) 935.  
 Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1110 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 948 (ii).  
 ——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 277.  
 Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1338 (ii).  
 Lake, James P., payment for Wire Rope (Ques.) 1628.  
 Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 374 (i).  
 Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 369 (i).  
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1262 (ii).  
 Ont., Manitoba and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 346 (i).  
 Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).  
 Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1254. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1240 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 948 (ii).

*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 1173, 1596; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 277.

*Miscellaneous* (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1457 (ii).

*Mounted Police*, 1452 (ii).

Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 114, 1<sup>o</sup>) 676 (i).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 107, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 589 (i).

**Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.**

- Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. *Moncrieff*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 299 (i).  
 Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).  
 Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 203 (i).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 917 (ii).

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. to adjn. deb., 259 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.**

- Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 842 (ii).  
 Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. (B. 86, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 369 (i).  
 Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (M. to adjn. deb.) 258 (i).

**McCulla, Mr. W. A., Peel.**

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1444 (ii).

**McDonald, Mr. J. A., Victoria, N.S.**

Cape Breton Ry., payment of Laborers (Ques.) 871 (ii)  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 673 (i).

James, Mr. Justice, leave of absence (Ques.) 525 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Miscellaneous* (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1453 (ii).

**McDougald, Mr. J., Pictou.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 130 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 807 (i).

**McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.**

- Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 643 (i).

**McGreevy, Hon. T., West Quebec.**

Quebec Board of Trade incorp. Act Amt. (B. 87, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 369 (i).

**McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P. E. I.**

Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P.E.I. (M. for Ret.) 434 (i).

Mount Stewart Pier, in Com. of Sup., 922 (ii).

Naufrage Harbor, P.E.I., Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy) 33 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 922 (ii).

**McKay, Mr. A., Hamilton.**

Artisans, Importation, attention called to Advertisement, 1668 (ii).

Hamilton Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 39, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 194 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1132; in Com. on B. 1137 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1039 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. (money) B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, printing) 272 (i).

**McKeen, Mr. D., Cape Breton.**

- Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 120 (ii).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 121 (i).

**McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.**

- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 107 (i).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 768 (i).  
 Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Cost (Ques.) 225 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Ret.\*) 235 (i).  
 ——— expenditure (M. for Stmt.\*) 436 (i).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 40 (i).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 684 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1376 (ii).  
 ——— (Can. and United Kingdom) on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1418 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 646 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 288, 294.

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 285 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 778 (i).  
 Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 670 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 1441; on Sen. Amts., 1691 (ii).  
 Concurrence, 1598, 1609, 1614 (ii).  
 Convict Labor, in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).  
 Defence of Indian charged with Shooting (Ques.) 935.  
 Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 909; in Com., 1015 (ii).  
 Frauds upon Farmers, on M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 16 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Brown*) to reduce quorum 223 (i).  
 Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) 29 (i); Repts. (M. for copies) 22 (i).  
 House of Commons Act Amt. B. 108 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 786 (i).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 947, 1319 (ii).  
 Interest, computing, in Com. of Sup., 155 (i).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).  
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Ross*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).  
 Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 59, 64 (i).  
 Legislative Assembly in N.W.T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 378 (i).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Majors' Hill Park, in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1709 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 771 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1276 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1375 (ii).  
 ——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419, 1437 (ii).  
 O'Connor, D., Account for Law Cases, Fees, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).  
 Ottawa Public Roads, Improvements, amount paid (M. for Ret.\*) 303 (i).  
 Pictou Branch Ry., total Cost (Ques.) 302; Length, 348 (i).  
 Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 71.  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 370 (i).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 232 (i).  
 Printing Bureau, cost of building, plant, &c. (Ques.) 1363 (ii).  
 Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).  
 ——— Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 516, 523 (i).  
 Returns (enquiry) 621 (i).  
 Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).  
 Rolling Stock, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1066 (ii).  
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. vs. Queen, Law Costs, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 33 (i).  
 ——— (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 49, 52 (i), 1455 (ii).  
 ——— original Cheques (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).  
 St. Charles Branch Ry., entire Cost (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).  
 ——— total Cost (Ques.) 302 (i).  
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies\*) 304 (i).  
 Scott, Capt., Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 146 (i).  
 Short Line Ry., &c., on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1679 (ii).  
 Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1501, 1621, 1634 (ii).  
 Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dairy Interest) 1513 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 297 (i).  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 71; (Contingencies) 155; (High Commissioner's Office) 199; (Indian Affairs) 66; (Inland Revenue) 86; (Interior) 59, 64; (Justice) 49; (Marine) 146 (i), conc., 1614 (ii); (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 70 (i); (P.O. and Finance Depts., contingencies) 1503; (Privy Council) 1501; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii); (Sec. of State) 57 (i).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY—Continued.

*Collection of Revenues* (Adulteration of Food) 1227. Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1219. Dom. Lands, 1240, 1249, 1257; conc., 1609. Minor Revenues, 1229. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1596. Public Works (Slides and Booms) 1231. Railways (I.C.R.) 1496. Weights and Measures, 1226, 1496 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 947, 952, 1319 (ii).

*Indians* (Dingman, A., services) 1172, 1451; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1174, 1595; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii). Senate (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1180, 1215; (Lands, C.P.R. Belt) 1570 (ii).

*Militia* (Drill Sheds, &c.) 795; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 799 (i).

*Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1180; (Inspector, Registrars, &c., N.W.T.) 1180; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 1455 (ii).

*Mounted Police*, 1213, 1451, 1497 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 211 (i); 1510; (Man.) 217 (i), 1508; conc., 1598; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1319 (ii).

*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 789; (Mrs. Gowanlock) 792 (i).

*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 800 (i); Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) conc., 1599. *Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1521, 1693; (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 914, conc., 1599; Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 971. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 929. Roads and Bridges, 971; (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (Repair Shed at Richmond) 1066 (ii). *Superannuation*: Railways (W. Wallace) 1597 (ii).

Toronto School of Infantry, Bread Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

Trade Commissioner to South America (Ques.) 30 (i).

Webster, W. A., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 979 (ii).

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 690 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 951 (ii).

Jesuits' Estate Act, Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 869 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1354 (ii).

— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1418 (ii).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1039 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Immigration*, 951 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Weights and Measures, 1227 (ii).

**Madill, Mr. E., North Ontario.**

Deschenes, Ludger Miville, Amounts paid for Surveys in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1327 (ii).

Elevators and Hoists Safety (B. 13, 1°\*) 29 (i).

Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 84 (i).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 713 (i).

**Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.**

County Court Judges for B. C., appointment (Ques.) 80 (i).

Division List (correction) 1330 (ii).

**Mara, Mr. J. A.—Continued.**

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co's. (B. 15, 1°\*) 30; in Com., 238 (i).

Mining in Ry. Belt, B. C. (remarks) 980 (ii).

Mining Laws, B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1510 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) to conc. in Res., 1430 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1629 (ii).

SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues*: Public Works (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1232 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 957 (ii).

**Marshall, Mr. J. H., East Middlesex.**

London Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 50, 1°\*) 222 (i).

**Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.**

Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 109 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 1144.

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 254; in Com., 618 (i).

**Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.**

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 535 (i).

**Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) in Com., 235; on M. for 3°, 284 (i).

Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* newspaper (Ques.) 287 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 194 (i).

— on M. for Com., 775; in Com., 781 (i).

Boundaries of Ont., on prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1329; on M. for Com. on Res., 1654 (ii).

Breslayor Half-breeds, compensation for Losses (Ques.) 348 (i).

Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 161, 167 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1061, 1096 (ii).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 147, 201 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 671; in Com. on Res., 675 (i).

Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. Ellis) on objection to 2°, 367 (i).

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) on M. for 2°, 1115; on M. (Sir John Thompson) for Com., 1437, in Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).

Concurrence, 1608 (ii).

Controverted Elections, date of receipt by Speaker of certificates from Judges (M. for Ret. \*) 303 (i).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 502 (i).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 247; on M. that Com. rise, 359 (i).
- Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) on M. to recom., 1466 (ii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com., 1527 (ii).
- Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
- Dresden Turning Ground Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 151 (i).
- Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 109 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 787 (i).
- Exports to Great Britain *via* United States (Ques.) 428 (i).
- Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1266 (ii).
- Extradition, extension of provisions B. 84, on M. (Sir John Thompson) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395 (ii).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. Mulock) 46 (i).
- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 332 (i).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 983; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; on Amt. (Mr. Watson) 1281 (ii).
- Good Friday, adjmt. (remarks) 1285 (ii).
- House of Commons Act Amt. B. 103 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 785 (i).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1397 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 872 (ii).
- Judges' (Provincial) Salaries B. 150 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 1°, 1688 (ii).
- Land Commissioner's Office, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 64 (i).
- Lands in B.C., conveyance B. 128 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com., 1043 (ii).
- Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).
- Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) for Joint Com., 782 (i).
- Liquor Permits in N.W.T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c, 555 (i).
- Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).
- Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. Carling) on M. for 1°, 1268 (ii).
- Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 770 (i); on Ques. of Order, 1270; on Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1271 (ii).
- N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Dewdney) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B.C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1374 (ii).
- Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 72, 76, 78 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com., 1135 (ii).

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 230 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Trow) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 249 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt. to Amt.) to prop. Res., 261; neg. (Y. 35, N. 128) 267 (i).
- Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1366 (ii).
- Public Depts. reorganisation Repeal (B. 110, 1°) 589.
- Queen's College (Kingston) B. 46 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 300, 602 (i); on Sen. Amts., 855, (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2°, 1284.
- Rideau Hall Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).
- St. Catharines Milling Co., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).
- Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. Barron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1587 (ii).
- Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1684 (ii).
- Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 528 (i).
- Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 470 (i).
- Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1616, 1627, 1632, 1642; in Com. on B., 1686 (ii).
- SUPPLY (Ques. of Procedure) on M. for Com., 48 (i):  
*Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 206; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 205 (i).  
*Canals—Income* (Welland) 1515 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 72; (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 161; (High Commissioner's Office) 201; (Indian Affairs) 65 (i), 1503 (ii); (Interior) 58, 64; (Justice) 51; (Mounted Police) 62 (i); (Privy Council) 1502 (ii); (Public Works) 150 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Dom. Lands) 1246, 1255; conc., 1608 (ii).  
*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 1174, 1595 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii).  
 Senate (Salaries and Contingencies) 207 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1459 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Repairs, Furniture, &c.) 915. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 926; (Ont.) 927, 1448 (ii); Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1448 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 211; (Man.) 219 (i).  
*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 790 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: O. P. R. (construction) 1047. Cape Breton (construction) 1069 (ii).
- Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. Boyle) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1106 (ii).
- Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 667 (i).
- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 620 (i).
- Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. Patterson, Essex) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

**Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland.**

- Adams, A. & J., Claims for loss of *Carrier Dove* (M. for Cor.\*) 1182 (ii).
- Adams, Seizure of, Papers, &c. (remarks) on adjmt., 1462, 1463 (ii).

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- Adjmt. of House (remarks) *re* Notices on Order Paper, 699 (i).
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237 (i).
- American Law Reps., in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
- Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of American Govt. (remarks) 811 (ii).
- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 775 (i).
- Bills, Second Readings (protest) 357 (i).
- Business of the House (remarks) 270 (i).
- C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 1063, 1097 (ii).
- Canal Works, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 594 (i).
- Chignecto Ship Ry., Prospectus (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
- Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 139, 196 (i).
- Concurrence, 1598 (ii).
- Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 117 (i).
- on M. to adjn. House, 120 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 764 (i).
- Customs Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).
- Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1364 (ii).
- Derby Branch Ry. and Northern and Western Ry. (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 1182 (ii).
- Claims for Land Damages (remarks) 749 (i).
- Subsidy (Ques.) 854 (ii).
- Extension (Ques.) 871 (ii).
- Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 944 (ii).
- Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1477 (ii).
- Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 6 m. h., 1118; on M. to adjn. deb., 1122 (ii).
- Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
- Fishing Regulations in Berthier, on M. for copies of Cor., 747 (i).
- Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjnmt., 1723 (ii).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 987; in Com., 1014 (ii).
- Good Friday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1235 (ii).
- on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1330 (ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Thursday, 423 (i).
- Wednesday, 653 (i).
- Monday, 1182 (ii).
- Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 949 (ii).
- Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1342 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 839 (ii).
- Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
- on personal explanation (Mr. *Curran*) 1498 (ii).

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Mara*) in Com., 238 (i).
- Laborers Protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 1°, 223 (i).
- Lake St. Louis Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1574, 1652 (ii).
- (telegram read) 1534 (ii).
- Land Damages, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1065 (ii).
- Legislative Economy, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Joint Com., 784 (i).
- Map of Canada in Chamber (remarks) 470 (i).
- Ministerial Changes, on M. to adjn. House, 28 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 774 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1687 (ii).
- Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).
- Northern and North-Western Ry. (Ques.) 248 (i).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to conc. in Res., 1433 (ii).
- Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 169, on Order for 2°, 425 (i).
- Parker, Geo. R., Claims for damages *re* Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Cor.\*) 1182 (ii).
- Pope, late Hon. J. H. (remarks) 943 (ii).
- Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74.
- Postage Rates, Can. and U.S., in Com. of Sup. 70 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131 (ii).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Trow*) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 250 (i).
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).
- Railway Employés protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) 1462 (ii).
- St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).
- Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).
- Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1030; in Com., 1032 (ii).
- Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. 149 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1662; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681 (ii).
- Sittings of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 527 (i).
- Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi, in Com. of Sup., 140.
- Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1720 (ii).
- (money) to Rys., B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1639 (ii).
- Supplies, Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 205; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) conc., 1598 (ii).

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 74; (Customs) 68; (High Commissioner's Office) 198 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1502; (Interior) 1502 (ii); (Justice) 49; (Marine) 139; (Militia and Defence) 55; (Postmaster General) 69 (i); (Privy Council) 1502; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii); (Secretary of State) 57 (i).

*Immigration* (Agents) 950 (ii).

*Indians* (Relief of Distress, Que.) 1103; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 270 (i).

*Marine Hospitals* (Marine and Immigrant, Que.) 977; (Que., N.S., P.E.I., N.B. and B.C.) 979 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1697; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 1453; (St. Catherine's Milling Co.'s Costs) 1456 (ii).

*Mounted Police*, 1451 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 1313 (ii).

*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (N.B.) conc., 1599. *Income*: (Ont.) 1522, 1696. Dredging (new plant) 1448. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1447. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (accommodation at Halifax) 1048; (repair sheds at Richmond) 1065 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts, in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).

Toronto School of Infantry Bread Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1032 (ii).

Wright, Allan, Claim for Damages, Indiantown Branch, I. C. R. (M. for Cor.\*) 1094 (ii).

Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 603, 610, 616; on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 761 (i).

**Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.**

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s (B. 4<sup>o</sup>, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 194 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 267; (Amt. to Amt.) ruled out of Order, 268 (i).

St. Clair River, Stag Island Lighthouse (Ques.) 224 (i).

**Mulock, Mr. W., North York.**

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1097 (ii).

Canal Works, Tenders (on M. for Ret.) 595 (i).

Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 523 (i).

Cobourg, Town, Relief B. 153, in Com. on Res., 1721.

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 1440; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1401 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on M. that Com. rise, 360 (i).

Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 945 (ii).

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir John Thompson) in Com. 1473 (ii).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty (Res.) 37 (i).

Flour Duties, Increase (Ques.) 1145 (ii).

Flour and Pork Duties (remarks) on adjnmt., 1721 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1002; in Com., 1014, 1021, 1029 (ii).

Fraudulent Practices Com., on M. (Mr. Brown) to reduce quorum, 223 (i).

**Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.**

Free List, Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 686 (i).

Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 953 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1397 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act Disallowance, on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).

Judges' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).

Kyle, convict, in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 994 (ii).

Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).

Militia Clothing (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1542; Amt. neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).

Montreal Harbor Police (remarks) 1687 (ii).

Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 431 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1385 (ii).

—— (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1387.

—— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1419 (ii).

Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s Consolidation B. 48 (Mr. Moncrieff) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 299 (i).

Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 77.

Public Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).

—— Papers from Militia Dept. (remarks) 470 (i).

—— Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1368, 1394, 1668 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).

Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).

St. George's Bridge, Structural Defects (Ques.) 1081.

Scrip (Land) Outstanding (Ques.) 347, 525 (i).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1036 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1675 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com. on Res., 1719 (ii).

—— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1639 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 290 (i); (Indian and Colonial Exhibition) 1513 (ii).

*Canals—Income* (Welland) 1516 (ii).

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 77; (High Commissioner's Office) 198; (Interior) 58; (Militia and Defence) 56 (i); (Railways and Canals) 1505 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Canals (Trent) 1495. Railways (I. C. R.) 1496 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 954 (ii).

*Indians* (Oka Indians, removal) 1171; (Schools) 1170 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii); (Printing, Paper and Binding) 278 (i).

*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1703 (ii).

*Marine Hospitals* (Que., N.S., P.E.I., N.B. and P.E.I.) 978.

**Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Miscellaneous* (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (Printing Bureau) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1458 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 216 (i), 1510 (ii); (Man.) 219 (i), 1508 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Harbors and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i). *Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1519; (Ont.) 1519, 1697. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1448 (ii).  
*Territorial Accounts* (Rebellion in N. W. T.) 1461 (ii).  
 Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Macdowall) on M. for 2°, 676 (i).  
 Ways and Means (remarks) *re* Millers of Ont., 1711.  
 Webster, Mr., Immigration Agent in N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 278 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 611 (i).  
 York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance (prop. Res.) 85.  
 ——— (remarks) 428 (i).

**Neveu, Mr. H., Joliette.**

- Joliette Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 762 (i).  
 Ste. Beatrix Post Office, Location (Ques.) 590 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).

**O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.**

- Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83.  
 Indian Annuities, Arrears (M. for Cor.) 937 (ii).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act (notice of prop. Res.) 384 (i).  
 ——— on fixing day for deb. (remarks) 675 (i).  
 ——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1405 (ii).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. Barron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1586 (ii).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1038 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1500 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 290 (i).  
*Indians* (Oka Indians, removal) 1171 (ii).  
*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1352 (ii); (Rifled Ordnance) 795 (i).  
*Pensions* (Compensations in lieu of Land) 791 (i).

**Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.**

- Belleville Drill Shed, construction, &c., on M. for Cor., 700 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for Com., 776 (i).  
 Customs Seizures, on Res. (Mr. Holton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).  
 Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com. on Res., 763 (i); in Com. on B., 1138; on M. to recom., 1330 (ii).

**Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.**

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 996; in Com., 1010, 1126 (ii).  
 Imports and Exports, condensed Tables, in Com. of Sup., 152 (i).  
 Independent Order of Forresters incorp. B. 74 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 754 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1398 (ii).  
 Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1156 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1274; in Com., 1277 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1380 (ii).  
 ——— (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1387; on M. to conc. in Res., 1431 (ii).  
 ——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1414, 1416 (ii).  
 Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 73, 77 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 723 (i).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Barron) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1494 (ii).  
 Sittings of the House, Mr. Charlton's Res., 433 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government* (Agriculture) 73; (Customs) 152, 155; (Contingencies) 155, 160; (Indian Affairs) 65; (Mounted Police) 62, 151 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Canals (Trent) 1495. Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1219 (ii).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 961, 1326 (ii).  
*Indians* (Schools) 1170 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Bauff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Experimental Farm (Buildings, &c.) 972. Harbors and Rivers (B. O.) 967 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* (I. C. R.) 1498 (ii).

**Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.**

- Mounted Police, punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 432 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 252; (Amt.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; withdn., 256; in Com., 620 (i).  
 Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters (B. 7, 1°) 15; 2° m. 256; on M. to adjn. deb., 258 (i); withdn., 1107 (ii).

**Perley, Mr. W. G., Ottawa City.**

- Majors' Hill Park, in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. Barron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1590 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

- Public Works—Income*: Roads and Bridges (Ottawa City and River) 1449 (ii).  
 Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Co.'s Wires (B. 112, 1°\*) 620 (i).  
 Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 667 (i).

**Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P. E. I.**

- Baltic Post Office, establishment (Ques.) 1423 (ii).  
 Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 741 (i).  
 Cascampeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ques.) 348 (i).  
 Confederation and P. E. I., Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 525 (i).  
 Dredge *Prince Edward*, payment to Captain (Ques.) 30.  
 ——— Repairs, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).  
 ——— Repairs and Costs (Ques.) 302 (i).  
 Fifteen Point Breakwater, Survey (Ques.) 1423 (ii).  
 Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).  
 Fishery Commissioner (Assistant) P. E. I., Appointment (Ques.) 171 (i).  
 Lobster and Oyster Commission, in Com. of Sup., 159 (i).  
 Lobster Factories, in P. E. I., number, &c. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).  
 Miminegash Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1146, 1423 (ii).  
 Piers and Wharves in Com. of Sup., 149 (i) 923 (ii).  
 Preventive Officers in P. E. I. (Ques.) 15 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 577 (i).  
 Returns (enquiry) 524 (i).  
 Subway, Straits of Northumberland (Ques.) 16 (i).  
 Subsidy to P. E. I. (Ques.) 15 (i).  
 Summerside Harbor and Breakwater Survey (Ques.) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Civil Government* (Contingencies) 159; (Public Works) 149 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (P. E. I.) 923 (ii).  
 Tignish Breakwater, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).  
 ——— Repairs (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 West Point Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 1498 (ii).

**Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward.**

- Concurrence, 1615 (ii).  
 Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ques.) 427 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1006; in Com., 1020, 1127 (ii).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) prop. Res., 684, 689 (i).  
 Military College, Commandant's House (Ques.) 34 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1379 (ii).  
 ——— (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1406 (ii).  
 Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 74 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1632, 1637 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 74 (i).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1077 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) conc., 1615 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1531 (ii).  
 Tête du Pont Barracks, Sale (Ques.) 427 (i).

**Porter, Mr. R., West Huron.**

- Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 228 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 510.

**Préfontaine, Mr. R., Chambly.**

- Chambly—Longueuil Canal, Construction (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1013 (ii).  
 Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Pets., &c., 22 (i).  
 Longueuil Postal Service (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 ——— Wharves, Completion (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 St. Louis Lake, Construction of Piers (Ques.) 80 (i).

**Prior, Mr. E. G., Victoria, B. C.**

- Ammunition manufactured at Que. (remarks) 1222.  
 Behring's Sea Fisheries, Proclamation of U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 871 (ii).  
 ——— Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).  
 Fortifications at Esquimalt, Col. O'Brien's Rep. (Ques.) 1146 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) in Com. on Res., 1388; on conc., 1431 (ii).  
 Pacific Mail Subsidy (Ques.) 34 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1239 (ii).  
*Militia* (Armories, care of Arms, &c.) 794; (Permanent Forces, &c.) 797 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (B. C.) 966 (ii).  
*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Service) 976 (ii).  
 Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s (B. 32, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 138 (i).

**Purcell, Mr. P., Glengarry.**

- Cape Breton Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).  
 Laborers Protection (B. 53, 1<sup>o</sup>) 223 (i).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1205 (ii).

**Putnam, Mr. A., Hants.**

- Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 537 (i).

**Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.**

- Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 224 (i).  
 Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, Pets., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 20 (i).  
 Lake St. Peter, Floating Light (Ques.) 979 (ii).  
 Salmon Rivers in Quebec, Leases, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
- SUPPLY:**  
*Public—Works Capital*: Harbors and Rivers (Quebec) 1517.  
 Whiskey, Illicit Manufacture, Costs of Suits (Ques.) 935 (ii).



**Riopel, Mr. L. J., Bonaventure.**

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1041 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1644 (ii).

Three Rivers and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 99, 1°\*) 468 (i).

**Robertson, Mr. J. E., King's, P. E. I.**

Bounties to Fishermen, in Com. of Sup., 1076 (ii).

Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).

Mount Stewart Wharf, Construction (Ques.) 171 (i).

Murray Harbor South and Montague Mail Service (Ques.) 468 (i).

Piers and Harbors in P. E. I. (M. for Cor. \*) 942 (ii).  
— in Com. of Sup., 920 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1217 (ii).

*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1076 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.) 976 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Magdalen Islands) 1450; (P. E. I. and Mainland) 1261 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Dredging (N.S., P. E. I. and N.B.) 969.  
Harbors and Rivers (P. E. I.) 920, 1530 (ii).

**Robillard, Mr. H., Ottawa City.**

Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. Barron) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1491 (ii).

**Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.**

Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ques.) 80 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1129 (ii).

Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 228 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Taylor) to prop. Res., 92 (i).

**Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar.**

Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°\*) 269 (i).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com. on Res., 1718 (ii).

— prop. Res. in Amt. to Com of Sup., 1692 (ii).

**Rowand, Mr. J., West Bruce.**

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 688 (i).

**Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.**

Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. 18 (Mr. Ellis) on M. for 2° (objection) 366 (i).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 816 (ii).

Pub. Accts. (M. to ref. to Com.) 47 (i).

— (M.) summoning Senator Sanford, 620 (i).

Sunday Traffic on Canals (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 304 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Canals—Income* (Welland) 1515 (ii).

Welland Canal Water Power, Reps. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copies\*) 304 (i).

**Ste. Marie, Mr. L., Napierville.**

C. P. R., Sale of \$15,000,000 Bonds (Ques.) 841, 1363.

— Receipts from Sale (M. for Ret.\*) 436 (i).

**Scarth, Mr. W. B., Winnipeg.****SUPPLY:**

*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1253 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 954 (ii).

**Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.**

Conn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Flynn) to prop. Res., 135 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Bowell) in Com. on Res., 764 (i), 1330 (ii).

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 687 (i).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).

— on Res. (Mr. Ross) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 1133 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 264 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Indians* (Dingman, Inspector, payment) 1451 (ii).

**Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.**

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718.

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 295 (i).

**Shanly, Mr. W., South Grenville.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 14, 1°\*) 30; in Com., 235; on 3°, 283, 298 (i).

G. T. R., Pets. from Shareholders *re* Subsidies to Rys. (Ques.) 1081 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) B. 144 (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Res., 1417 (ii).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on B., 1683 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com. on Res., 1715 (ii).

— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Canals—Capital* (Lachine) 1205; (Williamsburg) 1206 (ii).

**Skinner, Mr. C. N., St. John, N. B., City and County.**

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1472.

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 657 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1404 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons (Sessional Indemnity) Amt. (B. 111, 1°) 590 (i).

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1665; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1681 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Mail Subsidies* (Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c.) 1703 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 1447 (ii).

**Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.**

- Lowry, W. G., Relief (B. 119, 1°\*) 871; 2° m., 992; neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; (M.) to restore B. to Order Paper, 1016; on M. for Com., 1264 (ii).  
 Middleton, Wm., Relief (B. 125, 1°\*) 871; 2° m., 1098.  
 Ont. and Que. Ry. Co. and Land Security Co. Ratification (B. 66, 1°\*) 269 (i).  
 Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Co.'s Wires (B. 78, 1°\*) 322 (i).  
 Toronto Board of Trade (B. 135) M. to suspend Rules and 1°\*, 1262 (ii).  
 Wand, Arthur, Relief (B. 124, 1°\*) 871 (ii).

**Smith, Sir Donald A., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.**

- Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. Fisher) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1344 (ii).  
 Marine Hospitals (Ques.) 934 (ii).  
 Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ques.) 1710 (ii).  
 Title and Mortgage Insurance Co. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 620 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 3°, 760 (i).

**Smith, Mr. W., South Ontario.**

- Deschenes, Ludger Miville, Amounts paid for Surveys in N. W. T. (Ques.) 1327 (ii).  
 Pauper Immigration (children) in Com. of Sup., 965.  
 Wheat and Flour Importations from U.S. (M. for Ret.\*) 33 (i).

**Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.**

- Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 160 (i).  
 Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 674 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1611 (ii).  
 Debates, Official, delay in printing French Edition, 655, 944 (i).  
 Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 686 (i).  
 Govt. Advertising, in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 900 (ii).  
 — Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).  
 — Salaries, &c. (Amt.) to M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).  
 Montreal Flood Commission, Printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).  
 Pub. Accts. Com., meeting (remarks) 501 (i).  
 — Printing of Evidence, 1366, 1600, 1638 (ii).  
 Returns in hands of Members (remarks) 1573 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Income* (Welland) 1514 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 203; (Contingencies) 157, 160, 163; (High Commissioner's Office) 200; (Marine) 1502; (Printing and Stationery) 1503 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Dom. Lands, 1248, 1253. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1236 (ii).  
*Immigration (Agents)* 959; (Salaries, &c.) conc., 1611; (Amt.) 1613 (ii).

**Somerville, Mr. J.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1512 (ii); (Voters' Lists, Printing) 271; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 272 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1698 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 215; (Man.) 217 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1524 (ii).  
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 157, 163 (i).

**Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET) Laval.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) objection (Sir Hector Langevin) to Amt. to M. for 3° sustained, 283 (i).  
 Assiniboia (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Bills, Royal Assent, communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 749 (i) 1262 (ii).  
 Bills, Second Readings, remarks on protest (Mr. Mitchell) 357 (i).  
 Cape Breton Ry. (remarks) 1574 (ii).  
 Cardwell, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Cariboo, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. Ellis) on objection to 2° (Ruling) 367 (i).  
 Colchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116 (ii).  
 Controverted Elections, 1, 2 (i).  
 Cruelty to Animals B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on M. to restore to Order Paper (Ruling) 368 (i).  
 Cumberland, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. Choquette) ruled out of Order, 934 (ii).  
 Expropriation of Lands B. 131 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 1°, 944 (ii).  
 Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S. Members checked, 388 (i).  
 Halton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on notice of prop. Res., 384 (i).  
 Joliette, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Lanark (South) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Legislative Economy, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Laurier) Ruling, 783 (i).  
 Library, Rep. of Joint Librarians (presented) 2 (i).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 29, 30, 323 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).  
 Mining in Ry. Belt, B. C., remarks declared out of Order, 980 (ii).  
 Ministerial Changes, irregularity of deb., remarks on, 27 (i).  
 Montreal (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir John A. Macdonald) remarks on Ques. of Order, 1270 (ii).  
 New Members, notification of Ret., 1 (i).  
 Nicolet, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Northumberland (East) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Pictou, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 229 (i).  
 Prorogation, communication from Gov. Genl.'s Sec. (read) 1711 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Trow*) Member leaving Seat during Vote, 249 (i).  
 Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *Mills*) Ruling, 43 (i).  
 Provencher, Ret. of Member Elect, 2 (i).  
 Pub. Accts. Com., meeting, deb. ruled irregular, 501.  
 ——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Somerville*) Evidence re Mr. *Smyth's* Account, 1600 (ii).  
 Shelburne, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).  
 Speech from the Throne (rep.) 2 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Committees, Extra Sess. Clerks, &c.) 271; (Salaries, Clerk's Estimate) 270 (i).

Tenders, Translation of Forms (remarks) 1535 (ii).  
 Vacancies, notification, 1 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on prop. M. to ref. B. to Sel. Com., 253 (i).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 237; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 283 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to Ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1116; on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1442 (ii).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 128 (i).  
 Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 945 (ii).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 41 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1013, 1022 (ii).  
 Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 687 (i).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 949 (ii).  
 ——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).  
 Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1351 (ii).  
 Lard Adulteration, Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 763 (i).  
 Lowry, W. G., Relief (B.) Rep. of Com. (presented) 1221 (ii).  
 Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 170 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1282 (ii).  
 Post Offices built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 232 (i).  
 Prescott County Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. *Edwards*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 239 (i).  
 Ry. Act. Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 363 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 637 (i).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (ii).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1031 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1637 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Civil Government* (Railways and Canals) 1506 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

*Immigration* (Agents) 949 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (Griffin, Mr., gratuity) 1454; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Man.) 220 (i).  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 933 (ii).  
 Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1106 (ii).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 619 (i).

**Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.**

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).  
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).  
 Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) Survey (Ques.) 1498 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).  
 South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 59, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 269 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1352 (ii).

**Stevenson, Mr. J., West Peterborough.****SUPPLY:**

*Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1208 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues: Canals* (Trent) 1495 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Ont.) 1523 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.**

Free List Extension (Grains and Seeds) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 687 (i).  
 Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1346 (ii).  
 Jones' Creek, Township of Young, Pets., &c. (M. for Ret.) 540 (i).  
 King's Co., P. E. I., Representation (prop. Res.) challenging Seat, 169 (i).  
 Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1711 (ii).  
 Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and Australia) in Com. on Res., 1383 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Amt. to Amt.) 89; on M. to adjn., 90; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 263 (i).  
 Pub. Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1367 (ii).  
 Registered Letters, compensation for Loss (Ques.) 525.  
 St. Lawrence River, Sale of Islands (Ques.) 34 (i).  
 Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ques.) 1710 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1641 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 294 (i).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 960 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Continued.**

Young and front of Essex Townships, Pets., &c., re disallowing Union Act of Ont. Legislature (M. for copies\*) 436 (i).

**Temple, Mr. T., York, N. B.**

Fishing Licenses, in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 85 (i).

Short Line Ry., St. Andrews, &c., *vid* Mattawamkeag, &c., on M. for Ret. 549 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).

**Thérien, Mr. O., Montcalm.**

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir John Thompson) on Amt. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1280 (ii).

Joliette District Judge, Appointment (Ques.) 170 (i).

Postage Rates, Reduction (Ques.) 34 (i).

Post Offices in Montcalm County (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

Sawdust in Rivers, prevention (Ques.) 1082 (ii).

**Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D., K. C. M. G., Antigonish.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. Shanly) in Com., 235 (i).

Annapolis and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 538 (ii).

Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s B. 65 (Mr. Hall) in Com., 754 (i).

Bagwell, G. McD., Relief B. 123 (Mr. White, Renfrew) in Com., 1234 (ii).

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1582.

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., (B. 5, 1°) 14; 2° m., 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778 (i); withdn., 1629 (ii).

Bills of Lading (B. 92, 1°\*) 369 (i); 2° m., 1691 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in Com., 1097 (ii).

—— Rys. Crossing in Man., Validity of Act (Ans.) 20 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, distribution of Fines (Ans.) 80 (i), 1533 (ii).

Channel Subway Co.'s Act, disallowance (Ans.) 1628.

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Mr. Wallace) M. to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1328; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; on M. for 3°, 1468; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).

Commercial Laws of Dom., Codification (Ans.) 194 (i) Concurrence, 1615 (ii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (Ans.) 224 (i).

Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs (B. 71, 1°\*) 303; 2° m., 502; in Com., 503 (i).

Corrupt Practices Trials, Counsel's Instructions (Ans.) 427 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°) 524; 2° m., 1399; in Com., 1401; on M. for 3°, 1463; M. to ref. back to Com., 1465, 1466; in Com., 1467 (ii).

County Court Judges for B. C., Appointment (Ans.) 80 (i).

**Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D.—Continued.**

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 246; on M. that Com. rise, 359 (i).

Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) 2° m. and in Com., 1536 (ii).

Defence of Indian charged with Shooting (Ans.) 935 (ii).

Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 3 (i).

Escapes and Rescues Act Amt. (B. 140, 1°\*) 1363 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 109, 1°) 589; in Com., 787 (i).

Expropriation of Lands (B. 131, 1°) 943; in Com., 1266, 1331 (ii).

Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84, M. to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2° m., 1468; in Com., 1480 (ii).

First Offenders Conditional Release (B. 91, 1°\*) 369; 2° m., 504 (i).

Fisheries and Trade Relations with U.S., on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 14 (i); on M. for 2°, 980; in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; on Amt. (Mr. Watson) 1281 (ii).

Gowan, Hon. J. R., Senator, Pension (Ans.) 676 (i).

House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 589, in Com., 785 (i).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 132, 1°\*) 979; 2° m., 1130; in Com., 1331 (ii).

Intoxicating Liquors in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. Fisher) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1336 (ii).

James, Mr. Justice, leave of Absence (Ans.) 526 (i).

Joliette District Judge, Appointment (Ans.) 170 (i).

Jesuits' Estates Act (Ans.) 79 (i).

—— on Res. (Mr. O'Brien) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 856 (ii).

Judges' (Provincial) Salaries (prop. Res.) 537 (i); M. for Com., 1687 (ii).

Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. Mara) in Com., 238 (i).

Laborers Protection B. 53 (Mr. Purcell) on 2° being called (remarks) 384 (i).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, on M. for copies of Surveys, &c., 696 (i).

Larue, Casgrain, Angers & Hamel, Law Fees paid (Ans.) 347 (i).

Lebourdais Bros., Cor. *re* Trial (Ans.) 16 (i).

Legal Fees and Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 49, 52 (i).

Legislation Expenses (prop. Res.) 701 (i).

Liquor Permits in N. W. T., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 556 (i).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1883, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).

Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2°, 992, 1160; on M. for Com., 1264; (Amt.) 6 m. h., (neg. Y. 55, N. 69) 1265 (ii).

Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 239 (i).

Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1399 (ii).

**Thompson, Hon. Sir John S. D.—Continued.**

- Milk (Adulteration) prevention of Fraud B. 16 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 259 (i).
- Mining in Ry. Belt., B. C. (remarks) 980 (ii).
- N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 1262 (ii).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (B. C. and China, &c.) on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) to conc. in Res., 1432 (ii)
- Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 169 (i).
- Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).
- Public Matters (enquiries) further provision (B. 72, 1°\*) 303; 2° m., 504 (i).
- Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 605 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 365 (i); on M. for Com. (Amt.) 6 m. h. agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).
- Ry. Employés protection B. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*) 1462 (ii).
- Rules of Court, Criminal Matters (B. 55, 1°\*) 247; in Com., 502 (i).
- St. Catharines Milling Co., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 52 (i).
- Scugog River (Ans.) 1533 (ii).
- Senate and House of Commons (Sessional Allowances) Act Amt. (B. 120) in Com. on Res. and 1°\* of B., 787 (i); in Com., 911 (ii).
- Speedy Trials Act (Indictable Offences) Amt. (B. 17, 1°) 33; 2° m., 195; in Com., 470 (i).
- Summary Convictions Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°\*) 1081; in Com., 1266 (ii).
- Trials Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°\*) 811; in Com., 912 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Administration of Justice* (Exchequer Court) 205; (Miscellaneous Expenditure in N. W. T.) 205; (Supreme Court) 205; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 206 (i).
- Charges of Management* (Brokerage and Commission) 204 (i).
- Civil Government* (Justice) 49; (Penitentiaries Branch) 54 (i).
- Dominion Police*, 211 (i).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 1511 (ii).
- Miscellaneous*: (Labor Commission) 1497; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1455 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 222 (i); (Dorchester) 1507 (ii); (Kingston) 211 (i), 1509, conc., 1615 (ii); (Man.) 217 (i), 1507 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1315, 1510 (ii).
- Public Works — Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1527 (i); (Que.) 806 (i).
- Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 105, 1°) 556; 2° m., 787 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 50 (i).
- Tolls and Dues Act Amt. (B. 122) 2° m., 912 (ii).
- Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).
- Western Counties Ry. (B. 127, 1°) 871; 2° m., 1043.
- Whiskey, Illicit Manufacture, Costs of Suit (Ans.) 935.
- Winding-up Act Amt. (B. 93, 1°) 424; in Com., 660.

**Tisdale, Mr. D., South Norfolk.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 236 (i).
- Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Subsidy and G. T. R., on M. for Cor., 87 (i).

**Tisdale, Mr. D.—Continued.**

- Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) 1368, in Com., 1446 (ii).
- Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; in Com., 357; (M. that Com. rise) 359; agreed to, 362; on M. to restore to Order Paper (Amt.) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; M. that Com. rise, 607 (i).
- Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1473 (ii).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1020, 1022 (ii).
- Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).
- Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s B. 23 (Mr. *Girouard*) on M. for 2°, 170 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 364 (i).
- Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).

**Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 283 (i).
- Annunciation Day, on M. for adjmt., 782 (i).
- Cascompeque Harbor, dismissal of Blasting Foreman (Ques.) 348 (i).
- Cornwall and Galops Canals, enlargement, Tenders (M. for copies\*) 943 (ii).
- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. to restore to Order Paper (Ques. of Procedure) 368 (i).
- Debates, Official, delay in printing (remarks) 946 (ii).
- Dom. Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 24, 1°\*) 47 (i).
- Exports of Manufactures to Australia (Ques.) 1423 (ii).
- Fishing Licenses in River Natashquan (Ques.) 1627.
- Gannon Narrows Floating Bridge (Ques.) 1627 (ii).
- Gowan, Hon. J. R., Senator, Pension (Ques.) 676 (i).
- Grazing Leases cancelled in Alberta (Ques.) 935 (ii).
- I. C. R., Macdonald, A. R., Superintendent, Pet. of Employés (Ques.) 248 (i).
- Lake St. John Mail Service (Ques.) 1628 (ii).
- Logan, Wm., Mail Contractor at Pickering Village, Sureties (Ques.) 677 (i).
- Members' Sessional Indemnity (remarks) 1710 (ii).
- Montreal Flood Commission, printing Rep. (remarks) 1687 (ii).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1391 (ii).
- Pagans in Joliette County (Ques.) 1710 (ii).
- Pairs (personal explanation) 1574 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 1°, 369 (i).
- Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) Rules of the House, 249 (i).
- Prorogation (closing remarks) 1724 (ii).
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1707 (ii).

**Trow, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Repatriation of French Canadians (Ques.) 677 (i).  
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders for construction (M. for copies\*) 943 (ii).  
 Sawdust, &c., in Ottawa River, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 370 (i).  
 Senator for Shawinigan District (Ques.) 1628 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Salaries, &c.)* 1236 (ii).  
*Immigration (Agents)* 938 (ii).  
*Militia (Armories, care of Arms, &c.)* 794 ; Drill Sheds, &c.) 795 (i).  
*Penitentiaries (B.O.)* 222 ; (Kingston) 214 (i).  
 Title and Mortgage Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 114 (Mr. Macdowall) on M. for 2°, 676 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. C. H., Pictou.**

- Adams, Seizure of, Papers, &c., respecting (remarks)* 1463 (ii).  
 Arthabaska Fishery Overseer, Appointment (Ans.) (302) (i).  
 Bass Fishing Permits, Lake Erie (Ans.) 1081 (ii).  
 Behring's Sea Seizures, paragraph in *Empire* 287 (i).  
 Belleville Harbor (B. 116, 1°) 762 (i); in Com., 1042.  
 Bounties to Fishermen, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).  
 Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, on M. for Cor., &c., 742.  
 Cape Enragé Lighthouse, change of Keeper (Ans.) 841 (ii).  
 Chipman, C. C., in Com. of Sup., 140, 143, 145, 196 (i).  
 Concurrence, 1607 (ii).  
 Cruiser, Govt. Steamer, Engineer's Certificate (Ans.) 739 (i).  
 Engineers (stationery) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. Cook) on M. for 2°, 1103; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1109 (ii).  
 Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 129, 1°) 911; in Com., 1045; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 6 m. h., 1119; on M. to adjn. deb., 1124 (ii).  
 Fisheries, deptl. Rep. (presented) 1150 (ii).  
 ——— in Lunenburg County, on M. for Cor., 941 (ii).  
 ——— and *Modus Vivendi* (Ans.) 30 (i).  
 Fishery Bounty, Claims made and rejected in P. E. I., on M. for Ret. 435 (i).  
 ——— Commissioner (Assistant) P.E.I., appointment (Ans.) 171 (i).  
 ——— Overseer, Arthabaska, Revenue, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 80 (i).  
 Fishing Licenses in River Natashquan (Ans.) 1627 (ii).  
 ——— River Matane (Ans.) 171, 469 (i).  
 ——— Inland Waters, Ont., on M. for Ret., 84 (i).  
 ——— Regulations in Berthier, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 746 (i).  
 Fish Propagation in N. W. T. (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 Hospital Dues on Ships, collection (Ans.) 302 (i).  
 Lake St. John, Buoys and Lights (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 Lake St. Louis, Buoys and Lights (remarks) 1574, 1652.  
 Lake St. Peter, Floating Light (Ans.) 979 (ii).  
 Lobster Factories in P. E. I., number, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. C. H.—Continued.**

- Marine, deptl. Rep. (presented) 2 (i).  
 ——— Hospitals (Ans.) 934 (ii).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 26, 1°) 79; 2° m., 195 (i); in Com., 655; on Sen. Amts., 1029.  
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°) 524; 2° m., 774 (i).  
 ——— Police (Ans.) 1423; (remarks) 1574, 1687 (ii).  
 Pilots, average Amounts received (Ans.) 1146 (ii).  
 Pope, Mr. (Dep. Com. of Patents) in Com. of Sup., 73, 75 (i).  
 Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 1575 (ii).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 472.  
 Saguenay River Buoys and Lights, (Ans.) 1422, 1446.  
 Salmon Rivers in Que., Leases, &c. (Ans.) 224.  
 Sawdust in Canadian Rivers, Fines for violation of Law (Ans.) 591 (i).  
 ——— in Ottawa River (Ans.) 223 (i).  
 ——— prevention (Ans.) 1082 (ii).  
 Scott, Capt., Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 146. (i).  
 Seamen Shipping in U. S. Vessels, Instructions to Shipping-masters (Ans.) 469 (i).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 223 (i); 2° m., 1029; in Com., 1032 (ii).  
 Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund (Ans.) 1710 (ii).  
 Smelt Fishing, in Com. of Sup., 141 (i).  
 St. Clair River, Stag Island Lighthouse (Ans.) 224 (i).  
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 130, 1°) 911; in Com., 1044 (ii).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government (Agriculture)* 73; (High Commissioner's Office) 196 (i); (Marine) 138, 142 (i).  
*Fisheries (Salaries)* 1074; conc., 1607 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c.)* 975, 1361, 1450 (ii).  
*Marine Hospitals (Marine and Immigrant, Que.)* 976; (Que., N.S., P. E. I. and B. C.) 977 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous (Litigation)* 1460 (ii).  
*Ocean and River Services (Govt. Steamers)* 974; (River and Water Police) 975; (Wrecks and Shipping Disasters) 975 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.)* 808 (i), 912 (ii).  
*Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service)* 976 (ii).

**Turcot, Mr. G., Megantic.**

- Arthabaska Fishery Overseer, Appointment (Ques.) 302.  
 Fishery Overseer, Arthabaska, Revenue, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 Larue, Casgrain, Angers & Hamel, Law Fees paid (Ques.) 347 (i).  
 Letter Postage, Reduction of Rates (Ques.) 80 (i).  
 Lourdes and Somerset Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 751.  
 Mail Carriage, Bécancour Station and Ste Julie de Somerset, &c. (M. for Cor.)\* 304 (i).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.**

- Militia Clothing, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1568 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Immigration*, 951 (i).  
*Indians (Oka Indians, removal)* 1172 (ii).

**Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.**

- Cheese Exports to Eng. (Ques.) 1180 (ii).  
 Manuscripts respecting Can. Copying (Ques.) 1363.  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1634 (ii).  
 Volunteers' (9th Battalion) discipline (Ques.) 1327 (i).

**Waldie, Mr. J., Halton.**

- Franchise, Electoral, Act. Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1014, 1023 (ii).  
 Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Amt. (Mr. *Barrow*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1493 (ii).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1031; in Com., 1035 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Marine) 144 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues: Public Works* (Slides and Booms) 1231 (ii).

- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 254; in Com., 612.

**Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.**

- Business of the House, on adjmt. (remarks) 762 (i).  
 Combinations in Trade (B. 11, 1°) 19; Order for 2° read (remarks) 382 (i); 2° m., 1111; on M. to ref. to Com. on Banking, &c., 1115; on M. for Com., 1440; in Com., 1446; on Sen. Amts., 1689 (ii).  
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 834 (ii).  
 Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Denison*) M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 754 (i).

**Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 282; (Amt.) to recom., 298; neg. (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i).  
 Bedson, S. L., Appointment in Militia Force (Ques.) 1328 (ii).  
 ——— Appointment as A.D.C., in Com. of Sup., 1507.  
 Bressaylor Half-breeds, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 1082.  
 Concurrence, 1607, 1609 (ii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1537 (ii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1252 (ii).  
 Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1109 (ii).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 999; in Com., 1014; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1281 (ii).  
 Immigration Agents, in Com. of Sup., 955, 1324 (ii).  
 ——— Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).  
 Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 62, 1°\*) 269 (i).  
 Land Board, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 61 (i).  
 Legislative Assembly in N. W. T., Memorials, on M. for copies, 375 (i).

**Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.**

- Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1417 (ii).  
 Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. 138 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com. on Res., 1268 (ii).  
 Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1273 (ii).  
 ——— punishment of Constables, &c., on M. for Ret., 431 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 1135; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. on a div., 1283 (ii).  
 Post Offices Built since 1878, Revenues, &c., on M. for Ret., 233 (i).  
 Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry. and Steamboat Co.'s B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Rts., 1708 (ii).  
 Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 152 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1713; in Com. on B., 1721 (ii).  
 ——— (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1640 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 293 (i).  
*Civil Government* (Interior) 61, 65; (Mounted Police) 153 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* (Dom. Lands) 1252, 1254, conc., 1609; (Post Office) 1461 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.) 1078, conc., 1607 (ii).  
*Geological Survey*, 1030 (ii).  
*Immigration* (Agents) 955, 1324 (ii).  
*Indians* (Man. and N. W. T.) 1175, 1595; (Industrial Schools) 1177 (ii).  
*Legislation: House of Commons* (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).  
*Militia* (Military College) 1361 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (American Association) 1699; (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1216; (Commercial Agencies) 1180; (Half-breeds, relief) 1461; (Lands, O. P. R. Belt) 1571; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 1457 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Manitoba) 1507 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income: Dredging* (Lake Man.) 970. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 931. Roads and Bridges, 971, 1532 (ii).  
 Winnipeg and Assinboine Water Power (B. 63, 1°\*) 269 (i).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W., St. John, N.B., City and County.**

- Albert Ry. Co., Balance of Grant (Ques.) 348 (i).  
 American Fishing Vessels, authority to Enter and Clear (Ques.) 348 (i).  
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1580.  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 776; in Com., 778 (i).  
 Bills of Lading B. 92 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1691 (ii).  
 Business of the House (remarks) on adjmt., 761 (i).  
 Cape Enragé Lighthouse, change of Keeper (Ques.) 841 (ii).  
 Civil Service, Assessment of Salaries, authorisation B. 18 (Mr. *Ellis*) on objection to 2°, 366 (i).  
 Copyright Act Amt. B. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).  
 Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. 71 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 504 (i).  
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. that Com. rise, 360 (i).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

- Customs Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1142.  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions B. 84 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1470; in Com., 1471.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1046; on M. for 3°, 1117; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1118; neg. (Y. 72, N. 108) 1125 (ii).  
 Fishing Licenses in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).  
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 989; in Com., 1009, 1020, 1126 (ii).  
 Interior Dept., Clerks employed (Ques.) 1328 (ii).  
 Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. for Sup., 1160 (ii).  
 Lowry, W. G., Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 994 (ii).  
 Lumber Shipments from N. B. to U. S. (Ques.) 935.  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 659 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1402, 1413 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1131; in Com. on B., 1136 (ii).  
 Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 301, 605 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 336 (i).  
 Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 735 (i).  
 Rolling Stock, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1054 (ii).  
 St. John Harbor, Rep. of H. F. Perley (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Saw Logs, &c., Exported and Duty collected (M. for Ret.\*) 304 (i).  
 Seamen, Shipping in U. S. Vessels, Instructions to Shipping-masters (Ques.) 468 (i).  
 Seizure of British Schooner by U. S. Cutter *Woodbine*, despatch respecting (read) 510 (i).  
 Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) in Com. on Res., 1660; on M. to conc. in Res., 1669; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678; in Com. on B., 1685 (ii).  
 Speedy Trials of Indictable Offences B. 17 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 472 (i).  
 Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1500, 1619, 1650; in Com. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) 1686 (ii).  
 Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1266 (ii).  
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 105 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 787 (i).  
 Supreme Court (B. 95, 1°\*) 370 (i).

## SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court Reps., Printing, &c.) 205 (i).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1512 (ii).  
*Civil Government* (Marine) 147; (Railways and Canals) 1504 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Excise, 1223; (Preventive Service) 1225.  
 Customs (Miscellaneous) 1461. Minor Revenues, 1495. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1239, 1596 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Magdalen Islands) 1261 (ii).

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY—Continued.

- Marine Hospitals* (Que., N. S., N. B. and P. E. I.) 978 (ii).  
*Mounted Police*, 1214 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (additional, Ottawa) 800 (i); (B. O.) 1528 (ii); (N. B.) 806 (i). Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 924, 1447, 1530 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* (I. O. R.) 1597; (accommodation at Moncton) 1049; (Rolling Stock) 1054 (ii).  
 Winding-up Act Amt. B. 98 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 660 (i).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 614 (i).

**Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.**

- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. to restore to Order Paper, 368 (i).  
 Extradition Act, extension of provisions (B. 84, 1°) 346 (i); on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for 2°, 1469; in Com., 1471, 1476, 1479 (ii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1414, 1417 (ii).  
 Saw Logs, Export Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1593 (ii).  
 Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters, B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) in Com., 615, 618 (i).

**Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P.E.I.**

- China Point Piers, Repairs, &c. (Ques) 621 (i).  
 Dredge *Prince Edward*, Repairs, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 31 (i).  
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 44 (i).  
 Hickey Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 621 (i).  
 Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 656, 658 (i).  
 New London Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 620 (i).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1389, 1393, 1413 (ii).  
 Piers and Wharves in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 148 (i) — on M. for Com. of Sup., 921, 1222 (ii).  
 Pinette and Wood Island Harbor, Surveys (Ques.) 621.  
 Returns (enquiry) 621 (i).  
 Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1034 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Marine) 147; (Public Works) 148 (i).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 974 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine) 802; (Kingston Graving Dock) 801 (i). *Income*: Buildings (P. E. I.) 1519. Harbors and Rivers (P. E. I.) 920, 926 (ii).

**White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.**

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) in Com., 235 (i).  
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 5 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 779 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 669 (i).  
 Corn Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 125 (i).



**White, Mr. P.—Continued.**

Cullers Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. 1366; in Com. on B., 1536 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 982 (ii).

Loan (3 per cent.) of 1888 on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. on Sup., 1167 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. on Res., 1130; in Com. on B., 1134; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281 (ii).

Public Accts. Com., Printing of Evidence (remarks) 1368 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°\*) 782 (i).

— B. 115 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1283 (ii).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 495.

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1631, 1635 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Collection of Revenues: Public Works* (Slides and Booms) 1230. *Immigration*, 952 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges* (Ottawa City and River) 1448 (ii).

Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 662, 666 (i).

Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 79, 1°\*) 322; on Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to M. for 3°, 855 (ii).

**White, Mr. R. S., Cardwell.**

Address, The (moved) 3 (i).

Montreal Harbor Police (Ques.) 1423 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. J. C., Argenteuil.**

Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. 8 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 1109 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.**

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for 3°, 286 (i).

Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 160, 168.

Combinations in Trade B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 1690 (ii).

Cosgrove, John, of Buckingham, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 224 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 991 996, (ii).

— in Com., 1019, 1025 (ii).

Grosse, John A., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 171 (i).

Immigration Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Independent Order of Foresters B. 74 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 755 (i).

Inspectors of Hulls, Names, &c., of Commissioners (M. for Ret.\*) 943 (ii).

Labor Commission, Legislation (Ques.) 1422 (ii).

Middleton, W. H., Relief B. 125 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1098 (ii).

Mounted Police Pensions B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 772 (i).

Permanent Forces, Expenditure for Repairs on Works (Ques.) 171 (i).

**Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.**

Pork Duties, Increase (Ques.) 1146 (ii).

Repatriation of French Canadians (Ques.) 677 (i).

Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1038 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1620, 1633 (ii).

Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods, Sale (Ques.) 426.

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) 287 (i);

*Charges of Management* (Printing Dom. Notes) 205 (i).

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 71; (Contingencies) 156, 158, 160, 168; (Militia and Defence) 55 (i); (Railways and Canals) 1505 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues: Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1230. Post Office (Salaries, &c.) 1234. Weights and Measures, 1496 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents) 957, 1324 (ii).

*Indians* (Industrial Schools) 1178 (ii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (Returning Officers) 1362, 1511; (Printing, Paper and Binding) 276 (i).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff: Roads, Bridges, &c.) 1215; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1179; (Jukes, Dr., services) 1571 (i).

*Militia* (Permanent Forces, &c.) 789 (i).

*Mounted Police*, 1213 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 211; (Man.) 220 (i), 1508 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1510 (ii).

*Pensions* (Rebellion, N.W.T.) 791 (i).

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (B.C.) 1528; (Ont.) 1520. Dredging (N. S., P. E. I. and N. B.) 969. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 929 (ii).

*Quarantine* (Public Health) 932 (ii).

Threats, Intimidations, &c., Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 524 (i).

Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 156 (i).

Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. 6 (Mr. *Boyle*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Coma., 1102 (ii).

**Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.**

Electoral, Franchise, Act Amt. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1021 (ii).

Private Bills Pets. (M. to extend time) 30 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) to prop. Res., 89; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 264; Amt. agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 793 (i).

*Collection of Revenues: Public Works* (Esquimalt and Lévis Graving Docks) 1232 (ii).

Wrecking, &c., in Can. Waters B. 7 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 257 (i).

**Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.**

Corn, Importations, rebate of Duty, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) to prop. Res., 129 (i).

N. B. and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s (B. 21, 1°\*) 47 (i).

Ocean Steamship Subsidy (Can. and United Kingdom) in Com. on Res., 1411 (ii).

Reciprocity (unrestricted) with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 621.

Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) on Amt. to M. to conc. in Res., 1672 (ii).

**Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.**

Campbell, Capt. R., dismissal, on M. for Cor., &c., 743.



# INDEX-PART II.

## SUBJECTS

- ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1182 (ii).
- "ADAMS," SEIZURE OF, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks on adjunt. (Mr. Mitchell) 1402 (ii).
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. White, Cardwell) 3; seconded (Mr. Lépine) 6 (i).
- His Ex.'s Reply, 323 (i).
- AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES FOR: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1017 (ii).
- ADJOURNMENT, ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 782 (i).
- ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 436.
- GOOD FRIDAY: Remarks, 1235; M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1330 (ii).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i), 1362.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1.** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°\*, 2; *pro forma*.
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION:
- ARTISANS, IMPORTATION: attention of Govt. called to advertisement (Mr. McKay) 1668 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM, CENTRAL, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 436 (i).
- COST, &C.: Ques (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 235 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 235 (i).
- EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 428, 525 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS, ARRIVALS FROM '67 to '89, NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Brien) 304 (i).
- MANUSCRIPTS RESPECTING CANADA, COPYING: Ques. (Mr. Vanasse) 1363 (ii).
- POPE, MR. (Dep. Com. of Patents): in Com. of Sup., 71-78 (i).
- POPULATION OF DOM. BY PROVINCES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 170 (i).
- SEED WHEAT, PAYMENT BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 590 (i).
- SMYTH, HENRY, OF CHEATHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 224 (ii).
- WEBSTER, W. A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT., AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 979 (i).
- STEIN, LEONOR, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1533 (ii).
- SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 303; M. for Ret.\* 303 (i).
- Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49** (Mr. Davies). 1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 754 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1056 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 65.)
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14** (Mr. Shanly). 1°\*, 30; 2°\*, 33; in Com., 235; 3° m., 282; agreed to (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i). (52 Vic., c. 50.)
- ALBERT RY. CO., BALANCE OF GRANT: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 348 (i).
- ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCIENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1697.
- AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS, AUTHORITY TO ENTER AND CLEAR: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 348 (i).
- AMHERSTBURG, LAKE SHORE AND BLENHEIM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).
- AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352.
- AMMUNITION MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1222 (ii).
- ANGERS: See "Larue."
- ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 943 (ii).
- ANNUITIES TO INDIANS UNDER ROBINSON TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
- ARREARS: M. for Cor., &C. (Mr. O'Brien) 937 (ii).
- ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJUNT.: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 782 (i).
- ARCHIBALD, SIR ADAMS G., MEMBER FOR COLCHESTER: introduced, 1 (i).
- ARICHAU WEST, BREAKWATER: Ques. (Gen. Laurie) 841 (ii).
- ARMORIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i).
- ARTHABASKA FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Twrcot) 302 (i).
- ARTISANS, IMPORTATION: attention of Govt. called to advertisement (Mr. McKay) 1668 (ii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 287 (i), 1512; conc., 1598 (ii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJUNT.: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 436.
- Assets and Debenture Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 22** (Mr. Edgar). 1°\*, 47; 2°\*, 170; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 90.)
- ASSINIBOIA (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19** (Mr. Dawson). 1°\*, 47; 2°\*, 170; 3°\*, 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 53.)
- Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67** (Mr. Ross). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii) (52 Vic., c. 88.)
- Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65** (Mr. Hall). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com., 753; 3°\*, 754 (i). (52 Vic., c. 71.)

- ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*, Que.) 224 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).  
— REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).
- Bagwell, Geo. McD. See "DIVORCE."
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: 1st prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).  
— 2nd prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).
- BALLOT BOX, WADDELL'S PATENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 24 (i).  
— M. (Mr. *Hesson*) to add names to Sel. Com., 105 (i).
- BALLOT IN N. W. T., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 525 (i).
- BALTIC (P.E.I.) POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1423 (ii).
- BANFF: SURVEYS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY, DEFALCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 677 (i).
- Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°\*, 138; 2°\*, 239; in Com. and 3°\*, 397 (i), (52 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BARNARD, FRANK S., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARIBOO: introduced, 33 (i).
- BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.C., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier*, *Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (ii).
- Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Corby*) 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC, O.C., COR., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier*, *Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).  
— OPENING OF NAV.: Telegram read (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1285 (ii).  
— REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 304 (i).
- BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1328 (ii).  
— APPOINTMENT AS A. D. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii)
- BEEF SUPPLIES TO INDIANS IN N. W. T.: M. for Tenders\* (Mr. *Edgar*) 942 (ii).
- BEEB (4 per cent.) IMPORTED INTO N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 525 (i).
- BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES, PROCLAMATION BY U. S. GOV'T.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 811 (ii).  
— PARAGRAPH IN "EMPIRE" NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 287 (i).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 871 (ii).  
— SEIZURES: on M. for Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1582 (ii).
- BELL CREEK (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 347 (i).
- BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 948 (ii).
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burdett*) 85 (i).
- BELLEVILLE DRILL SHED, GOV'T. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 80 (i).
- Belleville Harbor B. No 116 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 762; 2° and in Com., 1042; 3°\*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1532 (ii).
- Benevolent Societies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Dickinson*). 1°\*, 370 (i).
- Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Bowman*). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com., and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*).  
1°\*, 2 (i); *pro forma*.
- BILL (No. 2) to permit Foreign Vessels to Aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*).  
1°\*, 13; 2° m., 250; 2° and M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; Rep. of Sel. Com. presented, 384; in Com. on B., 607; 3° m., 755; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom., 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761; 3°, 761 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) To make further provision as to the prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and to amend Chap. 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. *Brown*).  
1°, 13; 2° m., 240; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; 2°, 247; in Com., 357; M. to further consdr. B. in Com., 367; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; further consdrn. agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368; in Com. and M. that Com. rise agreed to, 607 (i).
- BILL (No. 4) Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir *John Thompson*).  
1°, 14 (i); 2° m., 950; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986; further consdrn. rsm'd. 996; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; 2° and in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; 3° m., 1278; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280; 3°\*, 1281 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 5) Relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(Sir *John Thompson*).  
1°, 14; 2°, 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778, 788, (i); withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 6) To prevent the practice of Fraud by Tree Peddlers and Commission Men in the Sale of Nursery Stock.—(Mr. *Boyle*).  
1°\*, 13 (i); 2° m., 1100; Amt. (Mr. *Brown*) 6 m. h., neg. on a div., 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).
- BILL (No. 7) To admit vessels registered in the United States of America to wrecking, Towing and Coasting Privileges in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*).  
1°, 15; 2° m., 256; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. deb., 258; agreed to, 259 (i); withdn., 1107 (ii).
- BILL (No. 8) To provide for the Examination and Licensing of all persons employed as Stationary Engineers, and

- all persons having charge of Steam Boilers or other devices under pressure.—(Mr. Cook.)  
1° , 17 (i); 2° m., 1107; Amt. (Mr. Tupper) 6 m. h., 1109; agreed to on a div., 1111 (ii).
- BILL (No. 9) To amend The Railway Act.—(Mr. Cook.)  
1° , 17; 2° , 362 (i); M. for Com., 1099; Amt. (Sir John Thompson) 6 m. h., agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).
- BILL (No. 10) To amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: An Act respecting Interest.—(Mr. Landry)  
1° , 19 (i).
- BILL (No. 11) For the Prevention and Suppression of Combinations formed in Restraint of Trade.—(Mr. Wallace.)  
1° , 19; Order for 2° read, 382 (i); 2° m., 1111; 2° , 1117; Govt. Order (Sir John Thompson)—in Com., 1368; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; 3° , 1468; Sen. Amts. consdrd., 1689; conc. in, 1691 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 12) To ensure regular crossing facilities between the City of Quebec and Town of Lévis.—(Mr. Chiquette.)  
1° , 29 (i).
- BILL (No. 13) To require the Owners of Elevators and Hoists to guard against Accidents.—(Mr. Madill.)  
1° , 29; 2° , 260 (i).
- BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)  
1° , 30; 2° , 33; in Com., 235; 3° m., 282; agreed to (Y. 49, N. 97) 299 (i). (52 Vic., c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 15) Respecting the Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)  
1° , 30; 2° , 33; in Com., 238; 3° , 299 (i). (52 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 16) To provide against Frauds in the supplying of Milk to Cheese and Butter Manufactories.—(Mr. Burdett.)  
1° , 30; 2° , 259; in Com. and 3° , 755 (i); M. (Mr. Howell) to transfr. consdn. of Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 17) To make further provision respecting the Speedy Trial of certain Indictable Offences.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1° , 33; 2° , 195; in Com., 470; 3° , 655 (i). (52 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 18) To authorise the Assessment of the Salaries or Incomes of persons in the Service of Canada.—(Mr. Ellis.)  
1° , 33; 2° m., 366; ruled out of order, 367 (i).
- BILL (No. 19) To incorporate the Assiniboia, Edmonton and Unjiga Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; in Com. and 3° , 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Hawkesbury Lumber Company.—(Mr. Labrosse.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; in Com. and 3° , 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 21) Respecting the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; 3° , 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Assets and Debenture Company of Canada.—(Mr. Edgar.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; in Com. and 3° , 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Boom Company.—(Mr. Girouard.)  
1° , 47; 2° m., 169; Order for 2° read, 424; withdn., 426 (i)
- BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Dominion Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Trow.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; in Com. and 3° , 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act incorporating the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Brown.)  
1° , 47; 2° , 170; in Com. and 3° , 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 26) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, Chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1° , 79; 2° , 195; in Com., 655; 3° , 647 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1029 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 27) To amend the Weights and Measures Act, Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes. (Mr. Costigan.)  
1° , 79; 2° , in Com., and 3° , 195 (i). (52 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 28) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Joncas.)  
1° , 79 (i).  
Statutes, respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada:
- BILL (No. 29) To amend Chapter 41 of the Revised—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)  
1° , 105 (i); withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Denison.)  
1° , 138; 2° , 239; in Com. and 3° , 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)  
1° , 138; 2° , 170; 3° , 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)  
1° , 138; 2° , 239; in Com. and 3° , 424 (i). (52 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 33) To amend the Act to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Edwards.)  
1° , 138; 2° m., 239; 2° , 299; in Com. and 3° , 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Canadian General Trusts Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)  
1° , 138; 2° , 239; in Com. and 3° , 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)  
1° , 138; 2° , 170; 3° , 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 86.)

- BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the St. Helen's Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Curran.)  
1°\*, 138; 2°\*, 299 (i).
- BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act incorporating the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)  
1°\*, 138; 2°\*, 23 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 38) To extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Charlton.)  
1°\*, 169 (i).
- BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Hamilton Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Denison.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Calgary, Alberta and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 42) To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i).
- BILL (No. 44) To incorporate the Canada Congregational Foreign Missionary Society.—(Mr. Holton.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 602 (i). (52 Vic., c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 45) To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 46) To amend the Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 300; M. for Com., 602; in Com. and 3°\* agreed to (Y. 104, N. 35) 607 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 855 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 47) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston, Simth's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)  
1°\*, 194; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 48) To consolidate the borrowing powers of the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, and to authorise them to issue Debenture Stock.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)  
1°\*, 194; 2° m., 299; 2°\*, 357; 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)  
1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 397 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 754; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1056 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 50) To amend the Act incorporating the London Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Marshall.)  
1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 397 (i).
- BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)  
1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Lac Seul Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)  
1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 53) For the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of Railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. Purcell.)  
1°\*, 223; Order for 2° read, 384 (i).
- BILL (No. 54) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 77, respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1°\*, 223 (i); 2° m., 1029; 2° and in Com., 1032; 3°\*, 1042 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 55) Respecting Rules of Court in relation to Criminal Matters.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 247; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 502 (i). (52 Vic., c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 56) To place on the Free List articles of merchandise, the production of which are controlled by Trusts and Combinations.—(Mr. Edgar.)  
1°\*, 248 (i).
- BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 59) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 60) Respecting Steam Vessels to be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 61) To incorporate the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. La Rivière.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1159 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Watson.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1160 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 63) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilise the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Watson.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 89.)

- BILL (No. 64) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com., 753; 3°\*, 754 (i). (52 Vic., c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 66) To ratify an Exchange of Land between the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the Land Security Company.—(Mr. Small.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Assiniboine Water Power Company.—(Mr. Ross.)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1056, 1094; 3°\*, 1098 (ii).
- BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick)  
1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 70) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Amyot.)  
1°\*, 299 (i).
- BILL (No. 71) Respecting corrupt practices in Municipal Affairs—(B) from the Senate.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 303; 2° and in Com., 502; 3°\*, 504 (i). (52 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 72) To make further provision respecting Enquiries concerning Public Matters—(A) from the Senate.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 303; 2° in Com. and 3°\*, 504 (i). (52 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 524; in Com. and 3°\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Jamieson.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397; in Com., 754; 3°\*, 792; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corby.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 510; in Com. and 3°\*, 673 (i). (52 Vic., c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 77) To further amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited.—(Mr. Cockburn.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 524 (i). (52 Vic., c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Wires of Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Companies in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397 (i).
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Union Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 510; in Com., 792 (i); 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. Bryson) to recom., neg. on a div., 854; 3° 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Super-phosphate Company.—(Mr. Colby.)  
1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 82) To amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)  
1°\*, 346; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)  
1°\*, 346; 2°\*, 510; in Com. and 3°\*, 676 (i). (52 Vic., c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 84) To extend the provisions of the Extradition Act.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)  
1°\*, 346 (i); M. (Sir John Thompson) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2°\*, 1463; in Com., 1470; 3°\*, 1480 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. McCarthy)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510; M. for Com., and Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to ref. back to Sel. Stand. Com., 754 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 87) To amend the Act to incorporate the Quebec Board of Trade.—(Mr. McGreevy.)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 755 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the Edmundston and Florenceville Railway Company.—(Mr. Landry.)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510 (i).
- BILL (No. 89) To amend the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510; in Com. and 3°\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)  
1°\*, 369; 2°\*, 510; in Com. and 3°\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 91) To permit the Conditional Release of First Offenders in certain cases—(E) from the Senate.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 369; 2° in Com. and 3°\*, 504 (i). (52 Vic., c. 44.)

- BILL (No. 92) Relating to Bills of Lading—(C) from the Senate.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
1°\*, 369 (i); 2° m., 1691; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1692 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 93) To amend the Post Office Act, Chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart.)**  
1°, 369; Res prop., 439 (i); in Com., 1130; 2° of B. and in Com., 1133; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281; 3°\*, 1283 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 94) Respecting Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. Dickinson.)**  
1°\*, 370 (i).
- BILL (No. 95) Relating to the Supreme Court.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John)**  
1°\*, 370 (i).
- BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island and Continental Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Landry.)**  
1°, 384; 2°\*, 524 (i).
- BILL (No. 97) To amend Chapter 179 of the Revised Statutes, respecting Recognizances.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)**  
1°, 384 (i).
- BILL (No. 98) To amend the Winding-up Act, Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes.—(Sir John Thompson)**  
1°, 424; 2° m., 659; 2° and in Com., 660; 3°\*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Three Rivers and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Riopel.)**  
1°\*, 468; 2°\*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 100) Farther to amend the Civil Service Act, Chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Haggart.)**  
Res. prop., 621; in Com., 672; 1° of B., 523; 2° m., 669; 2°, 672; 3° m., and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., neg. (Y. 65, N. 113) and 3°\*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 101) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
1°, 524 (i); 2°, 1399; in Com., 1401; 3° m., 1463; recom. and 3°\*, 1467 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 102) To amend Chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Threats, Intimidation and other Offences.—(Mr. Wilson, Elgin)**  
1°, 524 (i).
- BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Tupper.)**  
1°, 524; 2°, 774; in Com., 775; 3°\*, 785 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 104) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Dickey.)**  
1°\*, 524 (i).
- BILL (No. 105) Farther to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
1°, 556; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 106) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Cook)**  
1°, 557 (i).
- BILL (No. 107) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)**  
1°\*, 589; 2°\*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 103) to amend Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the House of Commons.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
1°, 589; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 109) To amend the law respecting the Exchequer Court of Canada.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
1°, 589; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 787 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 110) To repeal certain Acts relating to the Public Departments.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell)**  
1°, 589 (i).
- BILL (No. 111) To amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Skinner.)**  
1°, 590 (i).
- BILL (No. 112) Respecting the Wires of Telephone, Telegraph and Electric Light Companies.—(Mr. Perley.)**  
1°\*, 620 (i).
- BILL (No. 113) Respecting the inspection of Timber and Lumber.—(Mr. Costigan.)**  
Res prop., 469; in Com., 661; 1°\* of B., 669 (i).
- BILL (No. 114) To incorporate the Title and Mortgage Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdowall.)**  
1° and 2°, 676 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 992 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend the Railway Act—(D) from the Senate.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)**  
1°\*, 782 (i); 2°, 1283 (ii).
- BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Harbor of Belleville, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Tupper.)**  
1°, 762 (i); 2° and in Com., 1042; 3°\*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Customs Act, Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Bowell.)**  
Res. prop., 469; in Com., 763; 1°\* of B., 769 (i); 2° and in Com., 1138; recom. and 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 118) To authorise the granting of Pensions to members of the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**  
Res. prop., 469; in Com., 769; 1°\* of B., 774 (i); 2° m., 1269; Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1269; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277; 2° and in Com., 1267; 3°\*, 1278 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 119) For the relief of William Gordon Lowry—(G) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)**  
1°\*, 871; 2° m., 992; 2° neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; M. to restore 2° to Order Paper agreed to on a div., 1016; 2° on a div., 1160; M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3° on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 120) To amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Sir John Thompson.)**  
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 787 (i); 2°\* and in Com., 911; 3°\*, 912 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 10.)



- BILL (No. 121)** To amend the Summary Trials Act—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°\*, 1266 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 122)** Respecting the Collection of certain Tolls and Dues therein mentioned—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°\*, 1117 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 123)** For the relief of George McDonald Bagwell—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Brown.)  
1°\*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1233; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 124)** For the Relief of Arthur Wand—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Small.)  
1°\*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 125)** For the relief of William Henry Middleton—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Small.)  
1°\*, 871; 2° on a div., 1093; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 126)** To amend the Summary Convictions Act, Chapter 178 of the Revised Statutes, and the Act amending the same—(O) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 1081; 2°\*, 1130; in Com., 1266; 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 127)** In reference to the Western Counties Railway.—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°, 871; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1043 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 128)** To provide for the conveyance of certain Lands to British Columbia.—(Mr. Dewdney.)  
1°, 911; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1043 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 129)** To amend the Fisheries Act, Chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1°, 911; 2°\* and in Com., 1045; 3° m., 1117; Amt. (Mr. Ellis) 6 m. h., 1117; neg. (Y. 72, N. 102) and 3°, 1125 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 130)** Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, Chapter seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Tupper.)  
1°, 911; 2° m., 1043; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1044 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 131)** Respecting Expropriation of Lands—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°, 943; 2°\* and in Com., 1266; 3°\*, 1331 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 132)** To amend the Revised Statutes respecting Interest—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 979; 2°, 1130; in Com. and 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 133)** For better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen—(T) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)  
1°\*, 1180 (ii).
- BILL (No. 134)** To amend Chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the improper use of Fire-Arms and other Weapons—(S) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Brown.)  
1°\*, 1221 (ii).
- BILL (No. 135)** Further to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto—(W) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Small.)  
Rule suspended, 1°\*, 2°\* and 3°\*, 1262 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 136)** To consolidate and amend the Act respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Dewdney.)  
1°, 1262; withdn., 1498 (ii).
- BILL (No. 137)** Further to amend the General Inspection Act, Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)  
1°, 1236; 2°\* and in Com., 1398; 3°\*, 1399 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 138)** Respecting a Loan therein mentioned to certain Mennonite Immigrants.—(Mr. Carling.)  
Res. prop., 1146; in Com., 1267; 1° of B., 1268; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1399 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 139)** Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)  
Res. prop., 1221; in Com. and 1° of B., 1269; 2°\* and in Com., 1397; 3°\*, 1398 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 140)** To amend the Revised Statute respecting Escapes and Rescues—(V) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John Thompson.)  
1°\*, 1363; 2°\* and in Com., 1402 (ii).
- BILL (No. 141)** To amend the Act respecting the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada.—(Mr. Dewdney.)  
1°\*, 1363; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 142)** To amend The Cullers Act, Chapter 103 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)  
Res. prop., 1363; in Com., 1365; 1°\* of B., 1366; 2°\* and in Com., 1536; 3°\*, 1537 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 143)** To authorise the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Ordnance Lands in the City of Quebec.—(Mr. Dewdney.)  
1°, 1194 (ii).
- BILL (No. 144)** Relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Foster.)  
Res. prop. (B. C. and Australia) 1328; M. for Com., 1368; in Com., 1373; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1424; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426; Res. (B. C. and China) 1329; M. for Com., 1366; in Com., 1387; M. to conc., in Rep. of Com., 1426; Amt. (Mr. McMullen) neg. on a div., 1437. Res. (Can. and United Kingdom) 1329; in Com., 1389, 1402; rep., 1422; 1°\* of B., 1437; 2° on a div., in Com., and 3°\* 1629 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 145)** Further to amend The Dominion Lands Act—(X) *from the Senate.*—(Sir Hector Langevin.)  
1°\*, 1462; 2°\* and in Com., 1537; 3°\*, 1629 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 146)** To amend the Revised Statute respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force—(Y) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. Dewdney.)  
1°\*, 1572; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1709 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 147)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the

- 30th June, 1889, and the 30th June, 1890, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster*.) Res. conc. in, 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* and 3<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1712 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 148)** To authorise the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.) Res. (1st) prop., 1396; in Com., 1499; conc. in, 1535; Res. (2nd) prop., 1572; in Com., 1615, 1629; on M. to conc. in 1st Res., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; M. to conc. in 2nd Res. agreed to (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653; 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1654; in Com., 1685; 3<sup>o</sup> m. and Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1686 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 149)** To provide for the building and working of a line of railway from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.) Res. prop., 1424; in Com., 1658; M. to conc. in Res., 1669; Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1672; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1679; neg on a div., Res. conc. in, 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B. and in Com., 1673; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1685 (ii).
- BILL (No. 150)** To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 138, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson*.) Res. prop., 557 (i); M. for Com., 1687; in Com., 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1688; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1689 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 151)** Respecting an agreement therein mentioned with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.) Res. prop., 1572; M. for Com., 1706; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com. on B., 1709; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1711 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 152)** To authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney*.) Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1712, 1720; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1720; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 4)
- BILL (No. 153)** For the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg.—(Mr. *Foster*.) Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. on B. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO:** 745, 1286, 1726 (ii).
- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. No. 5** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 14; 2<sup>o</sup>, 194; M. for Com., 775; in Com., 778, 788; (i); withdn., 1629 (ii).
- Bills of Lading B. No. 92** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 369 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>m., 1691; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1692 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILLS RELATING TO N.W.T.:** Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1147 (ii).
- Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 25** (Mr. *Brown*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 47; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 397; (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BOISVERT, FABIEN, MEMBER FOR NICOLET:** introduced, 1 (i).
- BOSWELL AND GOWAN, JUDGES (REFUND):** in Com. of Sup., 1362 (ii).
- BOUNDARIES OF ONT. AND QUE., COR. BETWEEN LOCAL GOVTS.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).  
 — prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1329, 1423 (ii).  
 — Telegram from Mr. Mowat read, 1363 (ii).
- BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CANADA:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 426 (i).
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN:** in Com. of Sup., 139 (i), 1076 (ii).
- BRESALYOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).  
 — COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348 (i).
- "BRIDGEWATER," SEIZURE, CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).  
 — M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 752 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA:**  
 ALASKA AND CAN. BOUNDARY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 426 (i).  
 BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES: PROCLAMATION BY U. S. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 871 (ii).  
 — PARAGRAPH IN *Empire* NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills Bothwell*) 287 (i).  
 — REMARKS (Mr. *Mitchell*) 811 (ii).  
 — SEIZURES: on M. for Com of Sup., 1582 (ii).  
 COUNTY COURT JUDGES' APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 80 (i).  
 FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REP: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1146 (ii).  
 MINING IN RAILWAY BELT: Remarks (Mr. *Mara*) 980 (ii).  
 MINING LAWS: Remarks (Mr. *Barnard*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1540  
 MINING MACHINERY AND FREE LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Barnard*) 1265 (ii)  
 SIAMONS ON C. P. R., TO LAKE OKAWAGAN RY., SUBSIDY: prop. Res., (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1571; in Com., 1639 (ii).
- B. C. Lands.** See "LANDS."
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).
- BROKERAGE, &C., ON SINKING FUND:** in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
- BROWN, CAPT., PENSION TO FAMILY:** in Com. of Sup., 791 (ii).
- BUDGET, THE** (Mr. *Foster*) 436; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 456; (Amt.) 468 (i). See "RECIPROCITY."  
 — FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 171 (i).
- BUDGET SPEECHES, COST OF ISSUING:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 20 (i).
- BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, ERECTED SINCE 1867 TO 1889:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 303 (i).
- BUOYS, LIGHTS, FOG-WHISTLES, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 97, 1361, 1450 (ii).  
 — See "LAKE ST. JOHN," &C.
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE:** Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 269 (i), 761, 1721 (ii).
- CAB HIRE:** in Com. of Sup., 160 (i).
- CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL:** M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 741 (i).
- Calgary, Alberta and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 41** (Mr. *Davis*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- CAN. AND UNITED KINGDOM STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1329; in Com 1389, 1402 (ii).
- Can. Congregational Foreign Missionary Societies incorp. B. No. 44** (Mr. *Holton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 602 (i). (52 *Vic.* c. 106.)
- CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES:** Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Roome*) 80 (i).

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, Working of, and Home Govt: M. for Stndt (Mr. Jamieson) 541 (i).

Can. General Trusts Co.'s incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. Kirkpatrick). 1°\*, 133; 2°\*, 239; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 92.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:

- ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (ii).
- EXAMINING LANDS IN RY. BELT: in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
- EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID AND TO WHOM: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 248 (i).
- INTEREST ON \$15,000,000 BONDS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 348 (i).
- LAND AND MONEY SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. Macdowall) 925 (ii).
- RY. CROSSING LINE IN MAN., VALIDITY OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 20 (i).
- SALE OF \$15,000,000 MORTGAGE BONDS, RECEIPTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 438 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 841, 1363, (ii).
- Co. and B. No. 68: Remarks (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 701 (i).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. Kirkpatrick). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); M. for Com., 855; in Com., 1056, 1094; 3°\*, 1098 (ii).

C.P.R. Steam Vessels B. No. 60 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 73.)

Can. Super-phosphate Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. Colby). 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 101.)

CANALS:

- BEAUMARNOIS, OPENING OF NAVY: Telegram read (Mr. Bergeron) 1285 (ii).
- REPORT OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 304 (i).
- CANAL WORKS, TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 593 (i).
- CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 80 (i).
- CORNWALL AND GALOPS CANAL, TENDERS FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies\* (Mr. Trow) 943 (ii).
- CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
- PROP. LOCATION IN 1834, REPS., &c., OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. Bergin) 595 677 (i).
- RECENT BREAK, COB., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Bergin) 303 (i).
- LACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
- MURRAY: conc., 1614 (ii).
- REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1211, 1495 (ii).
- RIDEAU: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
- ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES CAUSED THROUGH: M. for Repr., &c. of Engineers (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 936 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
- TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies\* (Mr. Trow) 943.
- TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. McMullen) 304 (i).
- SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Rykert) 304.
- TAY: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
- TRENT RIVER NAVY: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
- WELLAND CANAL, WATER POWER, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Rykert) 304 (i).
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
- WILLIAMSBURG: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).

CAPE BRETON:

- CAPE BRETON RY., CONTRACT FOR STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Flynn) 1327 (ii).
- EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 762 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1069, (ii).
- PAYMENT OF LABORERS: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Vic.) 871 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Flynn) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).
- DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABORERS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 427 (i).

CAPE BRETON—Continued.

- DREDGE LOST IN STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques (Mr. Cameron) 469 (i).
- GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE, C.B., PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Flynn) 1266 (ii)
- MACDONALD AND DOWLING'S GULCHES, DRIVING OF PILES: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 677 (i).
- SIMMS & SLATER, RETURN OF DEPOSITS TO SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 677 (i).
- CAPE ENRAGÉ LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 841 (ii).
- CAPE TORMENTINE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 802 (i).
- CAPITAL ACCOUNT, I. C. R., EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 676 (i).
- CAPE ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1499 (ii).
- CARBONNEAU, JOS., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 1328 (ii).
- CARDWELL, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1.
- CARIBOO, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1.
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 793, 1352 (ii).
- CARTRIDGE MANUFACTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (ii).
- CARTIER, LADY: in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
- CASCUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 348 (i).
- CASGRAIN. See "LARUE."
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 427 (i).
- SURVEY OF RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 468 (i).
- Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Doyon) 501 (i).
- CAVALRY SCHOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
- TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 302.
- CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 303 (i).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 298 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).
- Central Counties Ry. Co. See "PRESCOTT COUNTY."
- CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKE TO I. C. R., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
- Certificates to Masters and Mates (Chap. 73, Rev. Statutes) Act. Amt. B. No. 26 (Mr. Tupper). 1°, 79; 2°, 195; in Com., 655; 3°\*, 657 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1029 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 21.)
- CHAMBLY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 80 (i).
- CHANNEL SUB-WAY Co.'s ACT, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 1628 (ii).
- CHAPLAINS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Innes) 24 (i).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 49, 203 (i).
- Chattel and Mortgage Guarantee Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 114 (Mr. Macdowall). 1° and 2°, 676 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 992 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 91.)
- CHEESE EXPORT TO ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. Vanasse) 1180 (ii).
- CHESTER, QUE., POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Laverne) 468 (i).
- CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY COUNTIES, EXPENDITURE OF SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 427 (i).
- CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PROSPECTUS: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1423 (ii).

- CHINA POINT PIER, P. E. I., & CO., REPAIRS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 621 (i).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION:** in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- CHIPMAN, MR.:** in Com. of Sup., 139, 196 (i); conc., 1614 (ii).
- CIGARS, REDUCTION OF LICENSE FEES:** Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 171 (i).
- CIVIL GOVT.:** in Com. of Sup., 49, 138, 196, 1502 (i); conc., 1604 (ii).
- Civil Servants, Assessment of Salaries authorisation B. No. 18** (Mr. *Ellis*). 1°, 33; 2° m., 366; ruled out of Order, 367 (i).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 106** (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 557 (i).
- Civil Service Act (Chap. 17 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 100** (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop. 621; in Com. 672; 1° of B., 523; 2° m., 669; 2°, 672; 3° m. and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom. neg. (Y. 63, N. 113) and 3°, 763 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS:** in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
- CLARKE, JUDGE, SUPERANNUATION:** in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii).
- CLOTHING, MILITIA:** in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).
- Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co's incorp. B. No. 57** (Mr. *Guillet*). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- COBOURG TOWN RELIEF B. No. 153** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com., and 3°\* of B., 1721 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- COCHRANE, EDWARD, ESQ.:** Member for East Northumberland introduced, 3 (i).
- COLOCHESTER, RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.
- COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, PAPERS RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 371 (i).
- **THREE RIVERS, DUTY ON FOREIGN CATALOGUES:** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 739 (i).
- COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION:** in Com. of Sup., 1512 (ii).
- COMMANDANT'S HOUSE, KINGSTON:** in Com. of Sup., 1693; conc., 1705 (ii).
- Combinations in Trade Prevention B. No. 11** (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 19; Order for 2° read, 332 (i); 2° m., 1111; 2°, 1117; Govt. Order (Sir *John Thompson*) for Com., 1368; M. for Com., 1437; in Com., 1446; 3° 1468; Sen. Amts. consid., 1689; conc. in, 1691 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES:** prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 66, N. 94) 193.
- COMMERCIAL UNION WITH UNITED STATES:** Telegram *re Hitt's Res.* read (Mr. *Charlton*) 384 (i).
- Commission Men, &c.** See "TREE PEDDLERS."
- COMMITTEES:**
- BALLOT BOX, WADDELL'S PATENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 24 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: M. for Sp. Com. to supervise (Mr. *Bowell*) 8 (i).
- FRAUDULENT PRACTICES: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Brown*) 16 (i).
- FREIGHT TRANSIT THROUGH CAN.: prop. M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Jess*) 87 (i).
- LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782.
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).
- PRINTING: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19 (i).
- SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2 (i).
- COMMITTEES—Continued.**
- SELECT STANDING: M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 17 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, ACQUISITION BY GOVT.: prop. M. (Mr. *Denison*) for Sel. Com., 80, 87 (i).
- COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF LAND:** in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
- CONFEDERATION AND P.E.I. CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 525 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 24 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.:** in Com. of Sup., 155 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 223 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, DATE OF RECEIPT BY SPEAKER OF JUDGES' CERTIFICATES:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 303 (i).
- CONVICT LABOR:** in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
- Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 101** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 524 (i); 2°, 1399; in Com., 1401; 3° m., 1463; recom. and 3°\*, 1467 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- CORN IMPORTATIONS, REBATE OF DUTY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 92, 105 (i).
- Deb. on Res. (Gen. *Laurie* and Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 107; (Mr. *Masson*) 109; (Mr. *Fisher*) 111; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137; Amt to Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 112; deb. (Messrs. *Corby* and *Flynn*) 112; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i). Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) 112; deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 112; (Mr. *Gigault*) 114; (Mr. *Lister*) 115; (Gen. *Laurie*) 116; (Mr. *Campbell*) 116; (Messrs. *Bechard* and *Mitchell*) 117; (Mr. *Brown*) 119; on M. to adjn. House (Mr. *Mitchell*) 120; (Mr. *McKeen*) 121; (Mr. *Charlton*) 122; (Mr. *Hesson*) 123; (Messrs. *Brien* and *White, Renfrew*) 125; (Messrs. *Chisholm* and *Amyot*) 127; (Mr. *Sproule*) 128; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 129; (Messrs. *Davin* and *McDougall, Pictou*) 130; (Mr. *Cargill*) 132; (Mr. *Bowell*) 134; (Mr. *Scriver*) 135; (Messrs. *Kirk* and *Laurier*) 136; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 136 (i).
- CORNWALL AND GALOPE CANALS, TENDERS FOR ENLARGEMENT:** M. for copies\* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).
- CORNWALL CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
- PROP. LOCATION IN 1834, REPS., &c., OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergin*) 595 (i).
- RECENT BREAK, COR., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Bergin*) 303 (i).
- CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. CO'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).
- Corrupt Practices in Municipal Affairs B. No. 71** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°\*, 303; 2° and in Com., 502; 3°\*, 504 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS, PICTON:** Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).
- COSGROVE, JOHN, OF BUCKINGHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 224 (i).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES (B. C.) APPOINTMENT:** Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 80 (i).
- COUNTY SAVINGS BANKS:** in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
- CRANBERRY HEAD BREAKWATER, REMOVAL OF GRAVEL:** Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).
- Criminal Law (escapes and rescues) B. No. 140** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°\*, 1363; 2°\* and in Com., 1402 (ii).
- Criminal Law (Extradition Act Amt, extension of provisions) B. No. 84** (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*). 1°\*, 346 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to transfr. to Govt. Orders, 1395; 2°, 1468; in Com., 1470; 3°\*, 1480 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

**Criminal Law (first offenders, conditional release) B. No. 91** (Sir John Thompson). 1°\*, 369; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 504 (i). (52 Vic., c. 44.)

**Criminal Law (summary convictions, Chap. 178 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 126** (Sir John Thompson). 1°\*, 1081; 2°\*, 1130; in Com., 1266; 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 45.)

**Criminal Law (speedy trials of indictable offences) B. No. 17** (Sir John Thompson). 1°, 33; 2°, 195; in Com., 470; 3°\*, 655 (i). (52 Vic., c. 47.)

**Criminal Law (summary trials) B. No. 121** (Sir John Thompson). 1°\*, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°\*, 1266 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 46.)

**Criminal Law (threats, intimidations, &c., Chap. 173 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 102** (Mr. Wilson, Elgin). 1°, 524 (i).

**Criminal Law (Recognisances Act Amt., Chap. 179 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 97** (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.). 1°, 384 (i).

**CRIMINAL LAWS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, DISTRIBUTION :** Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 171 (i).

**Criminal Matters (rules of court) B. No. 55** (Sir John Thompson). 1°\*, 247; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 502 (i). (52 Vic., c. 40.)

**Cruelty to Animals prevention Act (Chap. 172 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. Brown). 1°, 13; 2°m., 240; Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m. h., 242; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; 2°, 247; in Com., 357; M. to further consdr. B., in Com., 367; Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; further considn. agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368; in Com. and M. that Com. rise agreed to, 607 (i).

**"CRUISER," GOVT. STEAMER, ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE :** Ques. (Mr. Cook) 739 (i).

**Cullers Act (Chap. 103 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 142** (Mr. Costigan). Res. prop., 1303; in Com., 1365; 1°\* of B. 1366; 2°\* and in Com., 1536; 3°\*, 1537 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 18.)

**CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER :** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

**Customs Act Amt. (Chap. 32 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 117** (Mr. Bowell). Res. prop., 469; in Com., 763; 1°\* of B., 769 (i); 2° and in Com., 1138; recom. and 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 14.)

**CUSTOMS AND EXCISE :**

**AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES :** Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1017 (ii).  
**APPRAISERS IN QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS :** Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 370 (i).

**AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS, AUTHORITY TO ENTER AND CLEAR :** Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 348 (i).

**BUILDINGS IN CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000 :** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casey) 303 (i).

**CHEESE EXPORTS TO ENGLAND :** Ques. (Mr. Vanasse) 119 (ii).

**CIGARS, REDUCTION OF LICENSE FEES :** Ques. (Mr. Lépine) 171 (i).

**COLLECTOR AT HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, PAPERS RESPECTING :** Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 371 (i).

**COLLECTOR AT THREE RIVERS, DUTY ON FOREIGN CATALOGUES :** Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Que.) 740 (i).

**COMMERCIAL TREATIES :** Remarks on adjmt., 105, 168 (i).

**COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES :** prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 172; neg. (Y. 66, N. 94) 193 (i).

**CORN IMPORTATIONS, BEMATE OF DUTY :** prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 92, 105; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).

**CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.**

**COSGROVE, JOHN, OF BUCKINGHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. :** Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 224 (i).

**SEIZURES AND OFFICERS' SALARIES :** in Com. of Sup., 67 (i).

— prop. Res. (Mr. Holton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1290 (ii).

**DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT :** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Ellis) 943 (ii).

**EXPORTS AND IMPORTS :** M. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).

**EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES TO AUSTRALIA :** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1423 (ii).

**EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN via U. S. :** Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bethwell) 428 (i).

**FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY :** prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 37; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).

**FISH, FOREIGN, CHANGE OF BONDING SYSTEM :** Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 224 (i).

**FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT :** M. for Oor. (Gen. Laurier) 1082 (ii).

**FISH IMPORTS IN BOND :** Explanation (Mr. Eisenhauer) 1089 (ii).

**FLOUR DUTIES, INCREASE :** Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 1145 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 1721 (ii).

**FREE LIST, EXTENSION, GRAINS AND SEEDS :** prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 684 (i).

**FRUITS AND SEEDS, IMPORTED FROM THE U. S., VALUE, &c. :** Ques. (Mr. Boyle) 224 (i).

**FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES, AMOUNT OF DUTY COLLECTED :** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 804 (i).

**GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. :** Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 171 (i).

**HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL :** M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Curran) 23 (i).

**LARD ADULTERATED, IMPORTS FROM U.S. :** Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 763 (i).

**LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N.B. TO THE U.S. :** Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 935 (ii).

**MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C. :** M. for O.O. (Mr. Edwards) 942 (ii).

— IN B. O., AND FREE LIST : Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1265 (ii).

— ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP., 1583 (ii).

**NATIONAL POLICY, REF. TO IN DEB. ON CORN IMPORTATIONS, 112-136 (i).**

**NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY, RENTAL AND ARRANGEMENTS :** Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 348 (i).

**OILS, IMPORTATION INTO MAN. :** Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1533 (ii).

**PREVENTIVE OFFICES IN P.E.I. :** Ques. (Mr. Perry) 15 (i).

**PORK DUTIES, INCREASE :** Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 1146 (ii).

**QUEBREL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST :** Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 1145 (ii).

**ROSS, HON. WILLIAM, DISMISSAL :** M. for O.C., Repts., &c. (Mr. Laurier) 24 (i).

**ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF GOODS BY CUSTOMS DEPT. :** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 428 (i).

**SAW LOGS, &c., EXPORTED AND DUTY COLLECTED :** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 304 (i).

— EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 33 (i).

— EXPORT DUTY : Res. (Mr. Barron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1591 (ii).

— IMPORTATION : M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 33 (i).

**TARIFF CHANGES :** Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 1266 (ii).

— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1221 (ii).

— FRENCH EDITION : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 935.

**TRACT, A. R., SEIZURE OF GOODS AT MEDICINE HAT :** Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1016 (ii).

**TRADE COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AMERICA, SUMS PAID :** Ques. (Mr. Mc Mullen) 30 (i).

**VINCENT, JOSEPH F., AND CUSTOMS DEPT. :** M. for Oor. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 935 (ii).

**WAYS AND MEANS re MILLERS OF ONTARIO** (Mr. Mulock) 1711 (ii).

**WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U. S. :** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Smith, Ontario) 33 (i).

**WEST BAY, N. S., CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER :** Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 427 (i).

## CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.

- WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE, COSTS OF SUITS: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 935 (ii).
- WRIGHT, F. P., REFUND OF DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).
- DAIRYING INTERESTS (DEVELOPMENT): in Com. of Sup., 1513 (ii).
- DEAF AND DUMB INSTITUTE, BELLEVILLE: in Com. of Sup., 70 (i).
- DEBATES: M. for Sp. Com. to supervise (Mr. *Bowell*) 3 (i).  
 — M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to substitute Mr. Prior for Mr. Baker, 269 (i).  
 — DELAY IN PRINTING FRENCH EDITION: Remarks, 654 (i), 944, 1462 (ii).  
 — 1ST REP.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 247 (i).  
 — 2ND REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 871, 933 (ii).
- DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 935 (ii).
- DELANEY, MRS.: in Com. of Sup., 739 (i).
- DERBY BRANCH AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN RYS.: M. for Cor., &c\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 854, 871 (ii).  
 — CLAIMS FOR LAND DAMAGES: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 749 (i).
- DESCHENES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNT PAID FOR SERVICES IN N.W.T.: Quos. (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*) 1327 (ii).
- DETECTIVE SERVICE (CUSTOMS): in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- DEWDNEY, HON. EDGAR, MEMBER FOR EAST ASSINIBOIA: introduced, 1 (i).
- DICKEY, ARTHUR R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND: introduced, 1 (i).
- DICTIONNAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DES FAMILLES FRANÇAISES: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
- DINGMAN, A., PAYMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1172, 1451 (ii).
- DISALLOWANCE, QUE. ACTS, O. C., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- DIVISION LIST: Correction (Mr. *Mara*) 1330 (ii).
- DIVISIONS:
- ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.'S B. 14 (Mr. *Shanly*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 298; neg. (Y. 49, N. 97) 499 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE ACT (Postmasters' Salaries) Amt. B. 100 (Mr. *Haggart*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 68, N. 113) 764 (i).
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES WITH FOREIGN STATES: prop. Rés. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 88, N. 94) 194 (i).
- CORN IMPORTATIONS, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 92; Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 112; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Flynn*) 112; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 136; Amt. neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137; Res. neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 137 (i).
- CRUELTY TO ANIMALS PREVENTION B. 3 (Mr. *Brown*): Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 243; neg. (Y. 71, N. 72) 247; on M. for Com., Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h.; neg. (Y. 91, N. 92) 368; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 92) 368 (i).
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Holton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1289; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314 (ii).
- DIVORCE (W. G. LOWRY) B. 119 (Mr. *Small*): 2°; neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; on M. for Com., Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) 1265 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS, COST OF MANAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flynn*) on conc., 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1610 (ii).
- FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY (Mr. *Mulock*): prop. Res., 93; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).
- FISHERIES ACT AMT. B. 129 (Mr. *Tepper*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Ellis*) 6 m. h., 1118; neg. (Y. 72, N. 108) 1125 (ii).

## DIVISIONS—Continued.

- FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423.
- FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT AMT. B. 4 (Sir *John Thompson*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 986; neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280 (ii).
- FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) on conc., neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; conc. in (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION (EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SMYTH): prop. Res. (Mr. *Somer-ville*) on conc., 1613; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1613 (ii).
- I.O.R. (WORKING EXPENSES AND REPAIRS). Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) on conc., 1605; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1607 (ii).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1331; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).
- JESUITS ESTATES' ACT, DISALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).
- LOAN (3 per cent.) OF 1888: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1152; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169 (ii).
- MARINE, DEPT. (C. G. CHIPMAN'S SALARY): prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) on conc., neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1614 (ii).
- MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553; neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS B. 118 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1271; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277 (ii).
- OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES (B.C. AND AUSTRALIA): on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. of Whole, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426 (ii).
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., 1604; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES, REDUCTION OF VOTE: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., neg. (Y. 47, N. 73) 1598 (ii).
- POST OFFICE ACT AMT. B. 93 (Mr. *Haggart*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281 (ii).
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 89; neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 128) 267; Amt. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).
- QUEEN'S COLLEGE (KINGSTON) B. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*): M. for 3° agreed to (Y. 104, N. 37) 607 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, REDUCTION OF VOTE: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on conc., neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1563 (ii).
- RECIPROcity (UNRESTRICTED) WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i).
- SAW LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1685; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 1594 (ii).
- SHAWANAKISHIC INDIANS, SURRENDER OF PINE LANDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1488; neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494 (ii).
- SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY TO SALISBURY): prop. Res. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) on conc., 1674; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES (MONEY) TO RYS. B. 148 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) 1686 (ii).
- WRECKING (FOREIGN VESSELS AID) B. 2 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 759; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).
- Divorce (Bagwell, Geo. McD.) B. No. 123 (Mr. *Brown*). 1°\*, 871; 2° on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1233; 3° on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 107.)
- Divorce (Lowry, W. G.) B. No. 119 (Mr. *Small*). 1°\*, 871; 2° m., 992; -° neg. (Y. 79, N. 80) 995; M. to restore to Order Paper, agreed to on a div., 1016; 2° on a div., 1160; M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3° on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 108.)

- Divorce (Middleton, W.) B. No. 125 (Mr. Small).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 871; 2<sup>o</sup> on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; M. for Com., 1264; Amt. (Sir John Thompson) 6 m. h., 1264; neg. (Y. 55, N. 69) and 3<sup>o</sup> on a div., 1265 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 109.)
- Divorce (Wand, A.) B. No. 124 (Mr. Small).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 871; 2<sup>o</sup> on a div., 1098; in Com. on a div., 1234; 3<sup>o</sup> on a div., 1264 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 110.)
- Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 70 (Mr. Amyot).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 299 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act (Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. Joncas).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 79 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 145 (Sir Hector Langevin).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1462; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1537; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1629 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 27.)
- DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. Davin) 34, 762 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS:** Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to reduce vote on conc., 1607 (ii).  
— in Com. of Sup., 1240, 1258 (ii).
- Dom. Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. Trow).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 47; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 95.)
- DOM. LOANS REDUCED:** in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
- Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp B. No. 80 (Mr. Kirkpatrick).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 322; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 102.)
- DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.:** presented (Sir John Thompson) 3 (i).  
— in Com. in Sup., 211 (i).
- DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Ellis) 943 (ii).
- DREDGING:** in Com. of Sup., 968; conc., 1448 1600 (ii).
- DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABOURERS FOR LOSSES:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 427 (i)
- DREDGE LOST IN STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 469 (i).
- DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," COST OF REPAIRS:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Perry) 31 (i).  
— Ques. (Mr. Perry) 302 (i).  
— PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 30 (i).
- DRESDEN TURNING GROUND, IMPROVEMENTS:** in Com. of Sup., 151 (i).
- DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION:** M. for Cor. (Mr. Burdett) 699 (i).
- DRILL SHEDS, CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIRS:** in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).
- DRILL PAY, MILITIA:** conc., 1593 (ii).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY KY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD:** M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 34 (i).  
— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1628 (ii).
- Edmundston and Florenceville Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. Landry).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 379; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 510. (i).
- ELECTORAL LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPARING, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 30, 33 (i).
- ELECTIONS:**  
**CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 213 (i).
- ELECTIONS—Continued.**  
**CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, DATE OF RECEIPT BY SPEAKER OF JUDGES CERTIFICATES:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 303 (i).
- CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HALTON CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- MASKINONGE CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED:** Supreme Court Judgment (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- SHELburnE CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- Elevators and Hoists, prevention of Accidents B. No. 13 (Mr. Madill).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 29; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 260 (i).
- EMPLOYÉS OF PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL GOVTS, DUAL OFFICES:** Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 525 (i).
- Engineers (stationary) Examination and Licensing B. No. 8 (Mr. Cook).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 17 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1107; Amt. (Mr. Twpper) 6 m. h., 1109; agreed to on a div., 1111 (ii).
- Enquiries concerning Public Matters further provision B. No. 72 (Sir John Thompson).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 303; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 504 (i). (52 Vic., c. 33)
- ESTIMATES, THE:** presented, (Mr. Foster) 30 (i).  
— SUPPL.: presented, 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).  
— Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 1391 (ii).
- ESQUIMALT AND LEVIS GRAVING DOCKS:** in Com. of Sup., 1232 (ii).
- ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE:** Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 935.
- EXCHEQUER COURT CLERK:** in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
- Exchequer Court of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Sir John Thompson).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 589; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 737 (i). (52 Vic., c. 38.)
- EXCISE:** in Com. of Sup., 12 3 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, EXPENDITURE:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 436 (i).  
— COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 225 (i); M. for Ret.\*, 235 (i).  
— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 428, 525 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS:** in Com. of Sup., 288 (i), 971 (ii); conc., 1598 (ii).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).
- EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN *vid* U.S.:** Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 423 (i).
- EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES TO AUSTRALIA:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1423 (ii).
- Expropriation. See "LANDS."**
- Extradition. See "CRIMINAL LAW."**
- FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup., 1179, 1361 (ii).
- FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Fisher) 433 (i).
- FARMERS, FRAUDS UPON:** M. for Sp. Com. (Mr. Brown) 16 (i).
- FEEs PAID LAW FIRMS IN QUÉBEC:** Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 347.
- FERGUSON, MR., LEGAL EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 51 (i).

**FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res.**

(Mr. Mulock) 87 (i).

Deb. (Mr. Hall) 38; (Mr. Casey) 39; (Mr. Armstrong) 40; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 40; (Mr. Sproule) 41; (Mr. Fisher) 42; (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 43; (Messrs. Haggart, Welch and Bain, Wentworth) 44; (Mr. Foster) 45; (Mr. Mills) 46; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 83; (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 86; (Mr. Mulock) 91; (Mr. Spibule) 98; (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 99; (Mr. Carling) 99; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 101; (Mr. McMullen) 101; (Mr. Porter) 102; (Mr. Mason) 103; (Mr. Semple) 104; neg. (Y. 71, N. 101) 105 (i).

**FIFTEEN-POINT (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques.** (Mr. Perry) 1423 (ii).

**FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).**

**FINANCE:**

**BUDGET SPEECHES, COST: M. for Ret.** (Mr. Lindarkin) 70 (i).

**BUDGET, THE: ANNUAL STATEMENT** (Mr. Foster) 436 (i).

**BUDGET SPEECH, PRINTING IN FRENCH: Ques.** (Mr. Bergeron) 171 (i).

**U. P. R. CO.'S SALE OF \$15,000,000 MORTGAGE BONDS, RECEIPTS FROM SALE: M. for Ret.** (Mr. Ste. Marie) 436 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 841; 1363 (ii).

— **INTEREST DUE ON \$5,000,000 BONDS: Ques.** (Mr. Edgar) 348 (i).

**CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.** (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).

**INTEREST ON SINKING FUND, AMOUNTS CHARGED AGAINST: Ques.** (Mr. Charlton) 1363 (ii).

**LOAN (3 per cent.) OF 1888: Ques.** (Sir Richard Cartwright) 944, 1044 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 946 (ii).

— prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. 1147, 1160 (ii).

— **PAB. IN PROPECTUS re SINKING FUND: Ques.** (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1328 (ii).

— **AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT: M. for Ret.** (Sir Richard Cartwright) 30 (i).

**MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS LOAN: prop. Res.** (Mr. Carling) 1146 (ii).

**PUB. ACCTS.: M. (Mr. Rykert) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 47 (i).**  
— presented (Mr. Foster) 2 (i).

**SUBSIDY TO P. E. I.: Ques.** (Mr. Perry) 15 (i).

**SUBWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques.** (Mr. Perry) 16 (i).

**TRADE COMMISSIONER TO S. AMERICA: Ques.** (Mr. McMullen) 30 (i).

**Fire-Arms, &c., Improper Use Act (Chap. 148 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 134 (Mr. Brown).** 1°\*, 1221 (ii).

**First Offenders. See "CRIMINAL LAW."**

**Fisheries Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Dickey).** 1°\*, 524.

**Fisheries Act (Chap. 95 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 129 (Mr. Tupper).** 1°, 411; 2°\* and in Com., 1045; 3° m., 1117; Amt. (Mr. Ellis) 6 m. h., 1117; neg. (Y. 72, N. 102) and 3°, 1125 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 24.)

**Fishermen (safety) better security B. No. 133 (Mr. Jones, Halifax).** 1°\*, 1180 (ii).

**FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S.: prop. Res.** (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323 (i).

Deb. on Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 329; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 331; (Mr. Foster) 337; (Mr. Edgar) 342; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 385; (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 390; (Mr. Kenny) 395; (Mr. Mitchell) 397; (Mr. Casey) 407; (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 404; (Sir John Thompson) 411; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 419; Amt. neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).

**FISHERIES:**

"ADAMS," SEIZURE OF PAPERS, &c: Remarks on adjmt. (Mr. Mitchell) 1462, 1463 (ii).

**ARTHABASKA, FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: (Ques.)** (Mr. Turcot) 302 (i).

**BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques.** (Mr. Charlton) 1081 (ii).

**BEHRENS'S SEA FISHERIES, PROCLAMATION OF U. S. GOVT.: Ques.** (Mr. Prior) 874 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 811 (ii).

**FISHERIES—Continued.**

**BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).**

**FISHERY BOUNTY CLAIMS IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret.** (Mr. McIntyre) 434 (i).

— **COMMISSIONER (ASSISTANT) P. E. I., APPOINTMENT: Ques.** (Mr. Perry) 171 (i).

— **OVERSEER, IN ARTHABASKA, REVENUE, SALARY AND EXPENSES, &c.: Ques.** (Mr. Turcot) 80 (i).

**FISH, FOREIGN, CHANGE IN BONDING SYSTEM: Ques.** (Mr. Eisenhauer) 224 (i).

**FISHING LICENSES OF THE NATASHQUAN: Ques.** Mr. (Fiset) 1533, 1627 (ii).

— **ONT. INLAND WATERS: M. for Ret.** (Mr. Dawson) 82 (i).

— **RIVER MATANE: Ques.** (Mr. Casgrain) 171 (i).

**FISH PROPAGATION IN N. W. T.: Ques.** (Mr. Davin) 749 (i).

**FISHING REGULATION IN BERTHER: M. for copies** (Mr. Beausoleil) 743 (i).

**FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER: M. for Cor.** (Mr. Casgrain) 938.

**LOBSTER AND OYSTER COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 159 (i).**

**LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P. E. I., NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret.** (Mr. Perry) 31 (i).

**MATANE RIVER FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques.** (Mr. Fiset) 469 (i).

**Modus Vivendi: Remarks,** 30 (i), 811 (ii).

**SALMON RIVERS IN QUEB., LEASES, &c., QUES.** (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 224 (i).

**SMELT FISHING IN THE MIRAMICHI: in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).**

**FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT: M. for Cor.** (Gen. Laurier) 1082 (ii).

**FISH IMPORTS IN BOND, EXPLANATION: (Mr. Eisenhauer)** 1099 (ii).

**FISHERIES IN LUNenburg COUNTY: M. for Cor.** (Mr. Eisenhauer) 940.

**FLOUR DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques.** (Mr. Mulock) 1115; remarks, 1721 (ii).

**Foreign Vessels. See "WRECKING."**

**Foresters, Independent Order (Supreme Court) incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. Jamieson).** 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 397; in Com., 754; 3°\*, 792 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 104.)

**FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 1253 (ii).**

**FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REP.: Ques.** (Mr. Prior) 1146 (ii).

**FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS SERVICES: M. for Ret.\*** (Mr. Charlton) 303 (i).

— **EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1511; conc., 1615 (ii).**

**Franchise, Electoral, Act (Chap. 5 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 4 (Sir John Thompson).** 1°\*, 14 (i); 2° m., 980; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 986; further considrn. rsmd., 996; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1007; 2° and in Com., 1008, 1019, 1125; 3° m., 1278; Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 1279; neg. (Y. 59, N. 88) 1280; Amt. (Mr. Davies) neg. (Y. 55, N. 88) 1280; 3°\*, 1281 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 9.)

Deb. on M. for 2° (Messrs. Laurier and Edgar) 980; (Mr. Charlton) 981; (Messrs. White, Renfrew and Colter) 982; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 983; (Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Laurier) 985; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 986 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Mitchell) 987; (Mr. Weidon [St. John] and McMullen) 989; (Mr. Colter) 1000; (Mr. Daly) 1001; (Messrs. Macdonald [Huron] and Mulock) 1002; (Messrs. Denison and Waldie) 1005; (Messrs. L'evergne, Platt and Barron) 1006; (Mr. Campbell) 1007; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 105) 1008 (ii).

**Frauds. See "MILK," "TREE PEDDLERS, &c."**

**FRAUDULENT PRACTICES COM.: M. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 10.**

— **M. to reduce quorum, 222 (i)**

**Free List, Articles controlled by Combines B. No. 56 (Mr. Edgar).** 1°, 248 (i).



**FREE LIST EXTENSION (GRAINS AND SEEDS):** prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 684 (i).  
 Deb. on Res. (Mr. McWilliam, Huron) 684; (Messrs. Haggart, Charlton and Somerville) 685; (Mr. Mulock) 686; (Mr. Bowell) 686, 692; (Messrs. Taylor, Scriber and Sproule) 687; (Messrs. Rowand and Gen. Laurie) 688; (Mr. Platt) 689; (Messrs. Kirkpatrick and McNeill) 690; (Messrs. Casey, Landerkin and Hesson) 691; (Mr. Gillmor) 692 (i).  
**FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1619 (ii).  
**FREIGHT RATES, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).  
**FREIGHT TRANSIT THROUGH CANADA:** prop. M. (Mr. Ives) for S.I. Com., 87; Order read, 591 (i).  
**FRUITS AND SEEDS, IMPORTED FROM U.S., VALUE, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Boyle) 224 (i).  
**FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES. AMOUNT OF DUTY COLLECTED:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Charlton) 304 (i).  
**FRUIT GROWING INTEREST (DEVELOPMENT):** in Com. of Sup., 1513 (ii).  
**GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE:** Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1627 (ii).  
**GAS (NATURAL) IN WESTERN ONT., MR. COSTE'S REP:** Ques. (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 468 (i).  
**General Inspection Act (Chap. 99 Rev. Statutes)**  
**Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. Costigan). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1236; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1398; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1399 (ii). 52 (Vic., c. 17.)  
**GEOLOGICAL SURVEY:** in Com. of Sup., 58 (i), 1079 (ii).  
**GOOD FRIDAY, ADJMT.:** Remarks, 1235; M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1330 (ii).  
**GOVT. ADVERTISING:** in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).  
**GOVT. BUSINESS:** M. to take in Saturday (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1534 (ii).  
 ——— Thursday (Sir Hector Langevin) 423 (i).  
 ——— Wednesday (Sir Hector Langevin) 653 (i).  
 ——— Monday (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1181 (ii).  
**GOVT. IN N. W. T. (EXPENSES):** in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).  
**GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 974.  
**GOV. GEN.'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).  
**GOWAN, HON. J. R., SENATOR, PENSION:** Ques. (Mr. Cook) 676 (i).  
**GOWANLOCK, MRS:** in Com. of Sup., 792 (i).  
**GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE (C. B.) PAPERS RESPECTING:** Remarks (Mr. Flynn) 1266 (ii).  
**GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK:** Ques. (Mr. Colter) 171 (i).  
 ——— M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Colter) 304 (i).  
**G. T. R., PETITIONS FROM SHAREHOLDERS:** Ques. (Mr. Shanly) 1081 (ii).  
 ——— **GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).  
**GRAVING DOCK, KINGSTON:** in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).  
**GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED IN N. W. T.:** Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 935 (ii).  
**GREAT EASTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** M. for Pe's, Reps., &c. (Mr. Rinfret) 20 (i).  
 ——— prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).  
**GREAT NORTHERN RY., ENGINEER'S REP.:** Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 370 (i).  
**Great North-West Ry. Co. See "ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA."**

**Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act**  
**Amt B. No. 89** (Mr. Daly). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 369; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 510; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 67.)  
**GRIFFIN, W. H., EX DEP. P. M. G.:** in Com of Sup., 1453 (ii).  
**GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.:** (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 171 (i).  
**GROVE J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, DISMISSAL:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Guay) 943 (ii).  
**HAGGART HON. JOHN G., MEMBER FOR NORTH LANARK:** introduced, 1 (i).  
**HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).  
**HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION AT (I. C. R.):** in Com. of Sup., 1048 (ii).  
**HALIFAX GRAVING DOCK:** in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).  
**HALTON, RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).  
**HAMEL. See "Larus."**  
**Hamilton Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39** (Mr. McKay). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 191; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 509 (i). (52 Vic., c. 76)  
**HARBORS AND RIVERS:** in Com. of Sup., 807 (i), 912, 931, 1447, 1528; cono., 1579, 1615 (ii).  
**Harvey to Salisbury. See "SHORT LINE"**  
**HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).  
**Hawkesbury Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20** (Mr. Labrosse). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 47; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 170; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 397 (i). (52 Vic., c. 93)  
**HEALTH, PUBLIC, PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES:** in Com. of Sup., 932 (ii).  
**HEALTH STATISTICS:** in Com. of Sup., 287 (i); cono., 1598.  
**HEBEN RIVER TO YOUNG'S MILL RY SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1616 (ii).  
**HEREFORD RY. Co. AND PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES:** Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 1017 (ii).  
 ——— **SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1638 (ii).  
**HICKEY WHARF (P. E. I.) REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621.  
**HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL:** M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Curran) 23 (i).  
**HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 151, 196 (i), 1503, 1597 (ii).  
**HOME RULE FOR IRELAND:** Res. (Mr. Cook) allowed to stand, 304 (i).  
**HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:** M. for Reps. (Mr. McMullen) 22, 29 (i).  
**HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE:** Ques. (Mr. Barron) 590 (i).  
**HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION:** Ques (Mr. Lépine) 302; M. for Ret.\*. 303 (i).  
**House of Commons Act (Chap 13 Revised Statutes)**  
**Amt. B. No. 108.** (Sir John Thompson). 1<sup>o</sup>, 589; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 785; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 787 (i) (52 Vic., c. 11.)  
**HOUSE OF COMMONS:**  
 . ADDRESS IN ANS. TO SPEECH, 3: HIS EX.'S REPLY, 323 (i).  
**ASHUBOIN (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1.  
**BILLS ASSENTED TO,** 745 (i), 1286, 1726, (ii).  
**BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.,** 1262.  
 ——— **LETTER FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.** (Mr. Speaker) 739 (i).  
**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE:** Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 288 (i).  
**CARDWELL, RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

# INDEX.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

CARIBOO RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 COLCHESTER RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL. See general heading.  
 DIVISION LIST, CORRECTION (Mr. *Marz*) 1330 (ii).  
 HALDIMAND, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 HALTON, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 IN COM. OF SUP.: 270 (i), 1382, 1511, 1615; conc., 1593 (i).  
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 29 (i).  
 JOLIETTE, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 KING'S CO., P. E. I., REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).  
 LANARK (SOUTH) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).  
 ——— REP. OF JOINT COM.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1669 (ii).  
 LIBRARY OF PARLT.: M. for Joint Com (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).  
 ——— REP. OF JOINT LIBRARIANS: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).  
 MEMBER INTRODUCED, 1, 3, 13, 29, 33 (i).  
 MEMBERS' SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1710.  
 MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, 29, 332 (i), 1018, 1467, 1627 (ii).  
 MONTREAL (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 NICOLET, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 PAIRS: Personal explanation (Mr. *Trow*) 1574 (ii).  
 PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 1727 (ii).  
 PICTOU, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 PRINTING: M. for Joint Com (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19 (i).  
 PRIVILEGES, QUES. OF (Mr. *Trow*) MEMBER LEAVING SEAT DURING VOTE: remarks 249 (i).  
 PROROGATION, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN'S. SEC., 1711 (ii).  
 PROVENCHER, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).  
 SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See general heading.  
 SHELburne, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) not to sit after 12 o'clock, 432, 526 (i).  
 SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).  
 TODD'S PARLIAMENTARY GOVT., DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1600 (ii).  
 VANANCOIS: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).  
 HUBERT, MISS ANNABWLLA, COMPENSATION FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 841 (ii).  
 HUDSON'S BAY RY. AND MAN. REPUDIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1628 (ii).  
 HUBON TRIBE OF LOBETTE INDIANS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 33 (i).  
 IMMIGRATION. See "AGRICULTURE," "SUPPLY," &c.  
 INDIANS:  
 AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1264 (ii).  
 ANNUITIES TO INDIANS, ARRARS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 937 (ii).  
 BEEF SUPPLIES, INDIAN AGENCIES, N. W. T.: M. for copies of Tenders (Mr. *Edgar*) 942 (ii).  
 BREASTLOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).  
 ——— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348.  
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).  
 ——— SURVEY OF RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 468 (i).  
 ——— AGENTS' SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1265 (ii).  
 INDIAN AFFAIRS: depl. Rep., presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 39 (i).  
 LANDS, GRAND RIVER, CAYUGA, SALES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Colter*) 304 (i).  
 RESERVE, SALE OF PINE TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 20, 30 (i).  
 SHAWANAKISIC INDIANS, SURRENDER OF PINE LANDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1488; neg. (Y. 62, N 91) 1494 (ii).  
 TREATIES, ASSIGNMENT OF LAND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 841 (ii).  
 ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 347 (i).  
 SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue Act (*Chap. 34 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 139 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1269; 1° of B., 1269; 2°\* and in Com., 1397; 3°\*, 1398 (ii). (52 *Vic., c. 15.*)  
 INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 66 (i).  
 ——— correction (Mr. *Costigan*) 17 (i).  
 ——— Rep. presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 3 (i).  
 INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &c., OF COMMISSIONERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 943 (ii).  
 INSPECTORS, REGISTRARS' AND CLERKS' SALARIES, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1180, 1215 (i).  
 INSURANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1361 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°\*, 979; 2°, 1130; in Com. and 3°\*, 1330 (ii). (52 *Vic., c. 31.*)  
 Interest Act (*Chap. 127 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Landry*). 1°, 19 (i).  
 INTEREST ON SINKING FUND, AMOUNTS CHARGED AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1363 (ii).  
 INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 53 (i), 1502 (ii).  
 INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:  
 CAPITAL ACCOUNT, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 676 (i).  
 DINING ROOMS AT STATIONS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Guzy*) 428 (i).  
 FRENCH LANGUAGE: QUES. (Mr. *Choquette*) 29 (i).  
 INDIANTOWN BRANCH, CLAIM OF ALLAN WRIGHT: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).  
 McDONALD, A. E., SUPERINTENDENT, PET. FROM EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 248 (i).  
 NOEL, FORTIN, ACCIDENT TO: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Fiset*) 303.  
 ——— M. for Ret., \*304 (i).  
 PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302, 348 (i).  
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, FROM OPENING TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 427 (i).  
 REDUCTION OF VOTE: conc., 1604 (ii).  
 REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1496 (ii).  
 ROLLING STOCK: conc., 1614 (ii).  
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).  
 ——— ENTIRE COST: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).  
 SUMMER FREIGHT RATES: Remarks, 1330, 1535 (ii).  
 INTERIOR:  
 BALLOP IN N. W. T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 525 (i).  
 BEER (4 per cent.) IMPORTED INTO N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 535.  
 CANTEN AT REGINA BARRACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1082 (ii).  
 DESCHENES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNTS PAID FOR SURVEYS IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Middill*) 1327 (ii).  
 DOM LANDS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 34, 762 (i).  
 GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED IN ALBERTA: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 935.  
 HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 23, 29 (i).  
 HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 590 (i).  
 INDIAN TREATIES, SURRENDER OF LANDS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 841 (ii).  
 CLERKS EMPLOYED IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1328 (ii).  
 LA CLOCHE ISLAND, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 428 (i).  
 ——— PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1081 (ii).  
 LAND BOARD, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 59, 65 (i).  
 LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T., COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Jamieson*) 550 (i).  
 MORMON SETTLEMENT IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 980 (ii).  
 MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 169 (i).  
 ——— DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 303 (i).  
 ——— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 429.

## INTERIOR—Continued.

- ORDNANCE LANDS, QUB., EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Pets., Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 943 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, SALE: QUES. (Mr. *Taylor*) 34 (i).
- SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: QUES. (Mr. *Mulock*) 347, 525 (i).
- STEPHENSON, RUFUS, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Brien*) 223.
- SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: QUES. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).
- SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 426 (i).
- TOWN SITES, IN N.W.T., RECEIPTS FROM SALES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 29 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. AND C.P.R.: QUES. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 769 (i).
- CO.'S SUBSIDY, DISTRIBUTION: M. for O. C.'s, &c., (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 943 (i).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: MESS. FROM HIS EX, 29 (i).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1331 (ii).
- Deb. on Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1336; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1338; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1340; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1342; (Mr. *Davin*) 1342; (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1344; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1345; (Messrs. *Kirk, Taylor and Freeman*) 1346; (Messrs. *Armstrong and Dewdney*) 1347; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1348; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 1350; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1351; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351 (ii).
- See "PROHIBITION."
- IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).
- JAMES, MR. JUSTICE, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: QUES. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 525 (i).
- JESUITS' ESTATES ACT: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 79 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 384 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 436, 524 (i).
- PAPERS RESPECTING: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 526 (i).
- MR. O'BRIEN'S RES.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 675 (i).
- PAPERS PRESENTED (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 701 (i).
- DAY FOR DISCUSSION: QUES. (Mr. *Laurier*) 740 (i).
- TEST OF LEGALITY: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 1327 (ii).
- JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, DISALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *O'Brien*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 811 (i).
- Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Rykert*) 816; (Mr. *Barron*) 828; (Mr. *Wallace*) 834; (Mr. *Colby*) 836; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 839; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 842; (Sir *John Thompson*) 856; (Mr. *McNeill*) 869; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 872; (Mr. *Charlton*) 883; (Mr. *Mulock*) 892; (Mr. *Scriver*) 893; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 895; (Mr. *McMullen*) 898; (Mr. *Laurier*) 897; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 903; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 908; neg. (Y. 13, N. 188) 910 (ii).
- JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT: QUES. (Mr. *Thérien*) 170 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: QUES. (Mr. *Neveu*) 762.
- RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- JOBIN, ACHILLES, DISMISSAL: QUES. (Mr. *Perry*) 348 (i).
- JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, ONT., PETS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 540 (i).
- JONES, SIMEON, SUMS PAID AS TRADE COMMISSIONER: QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 30 (i).
- JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
- LEGISLATION: QUES. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1629 (ii).
- Judges' (Provincial) Salaries Act (*Chap. 138 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 150 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 557 (i); M. for Com., 1687; in Com., 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1688; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1689 (ii). (52 *Vic., c. 39.*)

JUGEMENTS DU CONSEIL SOUVERAIN, VOL. IV: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

JUKES, DR., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).

## JUSTICE:

- BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s, &c.: M. for copies,\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- O. P. R., RAILWAYS CROSSING IN MANITOBA, VALIDITY OF ACT: QUES. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).
- QUES. (Mr. *Roome*) 80 (i).
- CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COUNSEL: QUES. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES FOR B. C., APPOINTMENT: QUES. (Mr. *Mars*) 80 (i).
- CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES OF THE PEACE: QUES. (Mr. *Bernier*) 171 (i).
- DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 935 (ii).
- DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACTS, O. C.'s, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- DOM. POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 (i).
- GOWAN, HON. J. R., SENATOR, PENSION: QUES. (Mr. *Cook*) 678 (i).
- JAMES, MR. JUSTICE, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: QUES. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 525 (i).
- JESUITS' ESTATES ACT. See general heading.
- JOLIETTE DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT: QUES. (Mr. *Thérien*) 170 (i).
- JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
- LEGISLATION: QUES. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1629 (ii).
- LARUE, CASGRAIN, AUGER & HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID: QUES. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).
- LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. re TRIAL: QUES. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16 (i).
- LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1453, 1697 (ii).
- MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s, COR., &c.: (M. for copies) 303 (i).
- O'CONNOR, D., AMOUNT PAID FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 31 (i).
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. vs. QUEEN, ORIGINAL CHEQUES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).
- COSTS, &c.: QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1146 (ii).
- LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 50 (i), 1455 (ii).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 33 (i).
- SCUOGOG RIVER: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).
- SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).
- YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &c., TO GOVT. TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 436 (i).
- KING, JAMES, COMPENSATION FOR CANCELLING CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
- KING'S CO., P. E. I., REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) challenging Seat, 169 (i).
- Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic., c. 79.*)
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. and Napanee Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Bell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 369; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 510; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 755 (i). (52 *Vic., c. 77.*)
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 269; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 397; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 663 (i). (52 *Vic., c. 78.*)
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: conc., 1615 (ii).

- Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 15** (Mr. *Mara*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 30; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 33; in Com., 238; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 299 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- KYLE, CONVICT: Remarks** (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).
- LABOR COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 1497; conc., 1614 (ii).
- **LEGISLATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1422 (ii).
- **REP.:** presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 1285 (ii).
- LACHINE CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
- **NEW BRIDGE:** Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 20 (i).
- LA CLOCHE ISLAND, PROVINCIAL CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1081 (ii).
- **SALE:** Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 428 (i).
- Lac Seul Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52** (Mr. *Daly*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 222; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- LAKE, JAMES P., PAYMENT FOR WIRE ROPE:** Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1628 (ii).
- Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62** (Mr. *Watson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 269; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1160 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1719 (ii).
- Lake Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40** (Mr. *Denison*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- LAKE ST. JOHN BUOYS AND LIGHTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).
- **HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY:** Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146.
- **MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1628 (ii).
- **RY. SUBSIDY:** Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 979 (ii).
- **WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181.
- LAKE ST. LOUIS BUOYS AND LIGHTS:** Remarks 1534, 1574, 1652 (ii).
- LAKE ST. PETER BUOYS:** Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 979 (ii).
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION AND RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).
- LANARK (SOUTH) RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- LAND BOARD, WINNIPEG:** in Com. of Sup., 59 (i).
- LAND DAMAGES, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 1065, 1597 (ii).
- Lands, Expropriation of, B. No. 131** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 943; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1266; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1331 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- Lands in B. C. (Conveyance) B. No. 128** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 911; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
- LARD (ADULTERATED) IMPORTS FROM U.S.:** Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 763 (i).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N.S., SURVEYS, COR., &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 698 (i).
- LA RIVIÈRE, ALPHONSE A. C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER:** introduced, 13 (i).
- LARUE, CASGRAIN, ANGERS & HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID:** Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).
- Laurie, Gen., MEMBER FOR SHELBURNE:** introduced, 29.
- LAWs, PRINTING AND BINDING, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
- LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. re TRIAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16.
- LE CARON, THE INFORMER:** Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Flynn*) 93, 97.
- **Remarks** (Mr. *Costigan*) 323 (i).
- LEDUC, CHARLES, OF HULL, EMPLOYMENT BY GOV'T.:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 171 (i).
- LEGAL FEES AND EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1455, 1597 (ii).
- LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF N.W.T., MEMORIALS TO: M. for copies** (Mr. *Davin*) 348, 371 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Charlton*) 371; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 374; (Mr. *Watson*) 375; (Mr. *Daly*) 376; (Mr. *McMullen*) 378; (Mr. *Davis*) 380; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 382 (i).
- LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY, JOINT COM.:** M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 782 (i).
- **REP. OF JOINT COM.:** Ques. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1669.
- LÉPINE, ALPHONSE T., ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONTREAL EAST:** introduced, 1 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF RATES:** Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 80 (i).
- **Ques.** (Mr. *Thérien*) 34 (i).
- LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &c., FOR BUILDING:** M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 433 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLT., REP. OF LIBRARIANS:** presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- **M. for Joint Com.** (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).
- **in Com. of Sup.**, 272 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE:** in Com. of Sup., 975, 1361, 1450 (ii).
- LIQUOR LICENSES IN ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 249 (i).
- LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., COR., &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Jamieson*) 550 (i).
- LITIGATED MATTERS:** in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 590 (i).
- LOAN (3 PER CENT.) OF 1888, AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT:** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- **Ques.** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 944 (ii).
- **Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup.** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 946 (ii).
- **prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1147, 1160 (ii).
- **PAR. IN PROSPECTUS, re SINKING FUND:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1328 (ii).
- **MENNONITE IMMIGRANTS:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Carling*) 1146 (ii). See B. 138.
- LOBSTER AND OYSTER COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 159 (i).
- LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P. E. I., NUMBER, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 31 (i).
- LOGAN, WM., MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 677 (i).
- London and Can. Loan and Agency Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 77** (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 322; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 397; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 524 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- London Mutual Fire Ins. Co. of Cana., incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 50** (Mr. *Marshall*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 222; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 397 (i).

LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).

— WHARVES, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80.

LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Turcott*) 751 (i).

Lowry, W. G. See "DIVORCE."

Lumber Inspection. See "TIMBER."

LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N. B. TO U. S., EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 935 (ii).

LUNENBURG HARBOR, SURVEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 749 (i).

— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).

MACDONALD AND DOWLING'S GULCHES, DRIVING OF PILES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 677 (i).

MCCARTHY, MR., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 52 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1450 (ii).

MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.C., COR., &C.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE, BÉCANOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &C.: M. for Cor., &C.\* (Mr. *Turcot*) 304 (i).

MAIL CARRIAGE AT BRUSSELS, ONT., CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 249 (i).

MAIL SERVICE WITH ENGLAND: Remarks. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1574 (ii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1450, 1532, 1701 (ii).

MAJORS' HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1449; conc., 1599 (ii).

Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. *La Rivière*). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1159 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

MANITOBA:

BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1328 (ii).

— APPOINTMENT AS A. D. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii).

BRESALYOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1082 (ii).

— COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 348.

C. P. R., RYS. CROSSING LINE IN MAN., VALIDITY OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 20 (i).

GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER, MORDEN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Guay*) 943 (ii).

HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Repts. (Mr. *McMullen*) 22; remarks, 29 (i).

HUDSON BAY RY. AND MAN. REPUDIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1628 (ii).

LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1572; in Com., 1719 (ii).

OILS, IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1532 (ii).

ROSSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 347 (ii).

SEED WHEAT, PAYMENTS BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 590 (i).

SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1533 (ii).

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1017 (ii).

— Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1094, 1698 (ii).

— STOCKHOLDERS, &C., COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 591 (i).

MANUSCRIPTS RESPECTING CANADA, COPYING: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1363 (ii).

MAP OF CANADA IN CHAMBER: request (Mr. *Charlton*) 469 (i).

## MARINE:

ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182 (ii).

"ADAMS" SEIZURE, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks on adjmt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1402 (ii).

"BRIDGEWATER" SEIZURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 752 (i).

— CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1423 (ii).

CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 741 (i).

CAPE ENRAGE LIGHTHOUSE, CHANGE OF KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 841 (ii).

"CRUISER," GOVT. STEAMER, ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 739 (i).

HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 312; M. for Ret.\* 303 (i).

INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &C., OF COMMISSIONERS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 943 (ii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).

LAKE ST. LOUIS, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks 1534, 1574, 1652 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Kinfred*) 979 (ii).

MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 976 (ii).

MARINE HOSPITALS: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 934 (ii).

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1423 (ii).

OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1397 (ii).

PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1146 (ii).

PILOTAGE DUES, CHANGE OF TARIFF: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 942 (ii).

SAGUENAY RIVER, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).

— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1422 (ii).

SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN OTTAWA RIVER, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Edwards*) 370 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 223 (i).

— IN CANADIAN RIVERS, FINES FOR VIOLATING LAW: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1082 (ii).

SEIZURE OF BRITISH SCHOONER BY U. S. CUTTER "WOODBINE": Despatch respecting (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 510 (i).

SHIPPING SEAMEN IN U. S. VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING-MASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 468 (i).

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS FUND: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 1710.

STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR: Ques. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 224 (i).

Maritime Court of Ont. (extension of jurisdiction) B. No. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°\*, 169 (i).

Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Colby*). 1°\*, 138; 2°, 239 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 84.)

MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).

MASKINONGE AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).

Masters and Mates. See "CERTIFICATES."

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 938 (ii).

MEMBERS, LIST OF, v (i).

— OF THE GOVT., iii (i).

— INTRODUCED, 1, 3, 13, 29, 33 (i).

MEMBERS' SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1710 (ii).

Mennonite Immigrants Loan B. No. 138 (Mr. *Carling*). Res. prop., 1146; in Com., 1267; 1° of B., 1268; in Com. and 3°\*, 1399 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 322 (i).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 29 (i).

ESTIMATES, THE: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 30 (i).

## MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—Continued.

ESTIMATES, Suppl. for 1888-89, 1018 (ii).

— 1889-90, 1467 (ii).

— further Suppl. for 1889-90, 1627 (ii).

MESSENGER, SPECIAL: in Com. of Sup., 1503 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 976 (ii).

Middleton, W. See "DIVORCE."

Militia and Defence Act (Chap. 41 Rev. Statutes)

Amt. B. No. 29 (Sir Adolphe Caron). 1°, 105 (i);  
withdn., 1629 (ii).MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.  
(Mr. Mulock) 1542 (ii).Deb. on Amt. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1553; (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1560;  
(Mr. Kenny) 1564; (Mr. Lister) 1565; (Mr. Hesson) 1566; (Mr.  
Hickey) 1567; (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 1568; (Mr. Prior) 1569; (Mr.  
Denison) 1569; neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1570 (ii).

## MILITIA:

AMMUNITION MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1222 (ii).

BEDSON, S. L., APPOINTMENT IN MILITIA FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Watson)  
1328; in Com. of Sup., 1507 (ii).BONSBOUCRS MARKET HALL AND VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. Curran)  
19 (i).

CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).

CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency)  
302 (i).

DEPT. REP.: presented (Sir Adolphe Caron) 13 (i).

DRILL SHED, BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Burdett)  
699 (i).FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fisher)  
433 (i).LAKE, JAMES P., PAYMENT FOR WIRE ROPE: Ques. (Mr. Macdowall)  
1628 (i).

MILITARY COLLEGE, COMMANDANT'S RESIDENCE: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1534 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. Platt) 34 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1357; conc., 1705 (ii).

MILITIA CLOTHING: prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) in Amt. to Com. of  
Sup., 1542 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1352 (ii).

NATIONAL DEFENCE COM.: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 1423 (ii).

PERMANENT FORCES, EXPENDITURE FOR REPAIRS ON WORKS: Ques.  
(Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 171 (i).REBELLION IN N.W.T.: Documents re 9th Battalion read (Mr.  
Amyot) 234 (i).— OFFICIAL COP. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. Amyot) 304;  
withdn., 322 (i).REGULATIONS AND ORDERS, FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint)  
171 (i).

TETE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 427 (i).

TORONTO SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, BREAD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. McMullen)  
1082 (ii).VOLUNTEERS' (9TH BATTALION) DISCIPLINE: Ques. (Mr. Vanasse)  
1327 (ii).YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE; prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock)  
85; remarks, 428 (i).MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry)  
1146, 1423 (ii).

MINING IN RY. BELT, B. C.: Remarks (Mr. Mara) 980 (ii).

MINING LAWS, B. C.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) on M. for  
Com. of Sup., 1540 (ii).MINING MACHINERY, DUTY ON: M. for O.C.\*, &c. (Mr.  
Edwards) 942 (ii).— IN B. C. AND FREE LIST: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1265.  
— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

MINISTERIAL CHANGES: Explanation (Sir John A. Macdonald) 24 (i).

MINISTERS, LIST OF, iii (i).

MINOR REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1229, 1495 (ii).

Milk (Adulteration) prevention of Fraud B.  
No. 16 (Mr. Burdett). 1°, 30; 2°, 259; in Com.,  
and 3°, 755; M. (Mr. Bowell) to transfr. consdrn. of  
Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1397 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 43.)

MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

Modus Vivendi: Ques. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 811 (ii).

MONTREAL (EAST) RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr.  
Speaker) 1 (i).

— FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING REP.: M. (Mr. Curran) 1687.

Montreal Harbor Commissioners. See "TRINITY  
HOUSE."

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Remarks, 1423, 1573, 1687 (ii).

MORMON SETTLEMENT IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 980.

MONTGOMERY, ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1048 (ii).

MONEY ORDER OFFICES IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne)  
468 (i).

MONTCALM POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 1081 (ii).

Moose Jaw, Battleford and Edmonton Ry.  
Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. Davis). 1°, 368;  
2°, 510 (i); in Com. and 3°, 921 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 54.)Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. Dewdney). 1°, 1572; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1709 (ii). (52  
Vic., c. 25.)Mounted Police Pensions authorisation B. No.  
118 (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 469; in  
Com., 769; 1° of B., 774 (i); 2° m., 1269; Amt. (Mr.  
Jones, Halifax) 1269; neg. (Y. 66, N. 106) 1277; 2°  
and in Com., 1267; 3°, 1278 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 26.)MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: presented (Sir John  
A. Macdonald) 169 (i).— DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr.  
Davin) 303 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 62, 151 (i), 1212, 1451, 1497.

— PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr.  
Davin) 429 (ii).MOUNT STEWART (P.E.I.) WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr.  
Welsh) 621 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 171 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 921 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL: conc., 1614 (ii).

MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE, P. E. I., MAIL  
SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 468 (i).

Municipal Affairs. See "CORRUPT PRACTICES."

NATIONAL DEFENCE COM.: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 1423 (ii).

NATIONAL POLICY, REF. TO IN DEB. ON CORN IMPORTATIONS:  
112-136 (i).NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop.  
Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1627 (ii).NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy,  
(Mr. McIntyre) 33 (i).NEVEU, HILAIRE, ESQ., MEMBER FOR JOLIETTE: introduced  
1 (i).N. B. and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. Wood  
Westmoreland). 1°, 47; 2°, 170; 3°, 357 (i). (52  
Vic., c. 85.)

**NEW BRUNSWICK:**

- ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1182 (ii).
- ALBERT RY. CO., BALANCE OF GRANT: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 348 (i).
- CAPE ENRAGE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 841 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKE TO I. C. R. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PROSPECTUS: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1423 (ii).
- DERBY BRANCH RY. AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 854, 871 (ii).
- M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1182 (ii).
- FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1619 (ii).
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, CLAIM OF ALLAN WRIGHT: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1094 (ii).
- LUMBER SHIPMENTS FROM N. B. TO U. S., EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 935 (ii).
- NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY., COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 248 (i).
- PARKER, GEO. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1182 (ii).
- ST. JOHN AND BASIN OF MINAS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1262 (ii).
- ST. JOHN HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 304 (i).
- RIVER, BRIDGE AT FREDERICTON, COST: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 526 (i).
- WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1094 (ii).
- NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY, RENTAL AND ARRANGEMENTS:** Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 348 (i).
- NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 620 (i).
- NICOLET, RET. OF MEMBER:** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 35** (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). 1°\*, 138; 2°\* 170; 3°\*, 357 (i). (52 Vic., c. 86.)
- Nipissing and James' Bay, Ry. Co.** See "LAKE NIPISSING."
- NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY., COMMUNICATION WITH:** Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 248 (i).
- Northern Pacific and Man. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76** (Mr. Daly). 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 510; in Com. and 3°\*, 676 (i). (52 Vic., c. 58.)
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1501 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT. BY G.T.R. &C.:** M. for O.C.\* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 943 (ii).
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY.** See "DERBY BRANCH."
- NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 1572; in Com., 1712, 1717.
- North-Western Junction and Lake of the Woods Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. Davis). 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 524; in Com. and 3°\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 59.)
- NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. OF CAN., SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 1572; in Com. 1717 (ii).
- N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. Dewdney). 1°, 1262; withdn., 1498 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Davin) 105 (i).

**NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:**

- BALLOT IN N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Elgar) 515 (i).
- BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 677 (i).
- BEEF SUPPLIES TO INDIANS: M. for Tenders\* (Mr. Elgar) 912 (ii).
- BEER (4 PER CENT.) IMPORTED: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 525 (i).
- BILLS RELATING TO N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1147 (ii).
- DESCHÊNES, LUDGER MIVILLE, AMOUNT PAID FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Madill) 1327 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: Ques. (M. Davin) 762 (i).
- FISH PROPAGATION: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 740 (i).
- GRAZING LEASES CANCELLED: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 935 (ii).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Fisher) 1361 (ii).
- LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MEMORIALS TO: M. for copies (Mr. Davin) 348 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSES IN ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 249 (i).
- PERMITS: Cor., &c., M. for copies (Mr. Jamieson) 550 (i).
- MORMON SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 980 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE, DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Davin) 303 (i).
- PENSIONS: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 469 (i).
- PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 429 (i).
- NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 1572; in Com., 1712 (ii).
- N.W.T. Act Amt.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 105 (i).
- RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 1572; in Com., 1717 (ii).
- REGINA BARRACKS CANTEN: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1082 (ii).
- SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 347, 525 (i).
- TOWN SITES, RECEIPTS FROM SALES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Davin) 29 (i).
- TRACEY, A. R., ARREST AND SEIZURE OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1016 (ii).
- NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- NOVA SCOTIA:**
- ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 943 (ii).
- CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).
- CRANBERRY HEAD BREAKWATER, REMOVAL OF GRAVEL (Mr. Lovitt) 34 (i).
- CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- FISHERIES IN LUNENBURG COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 940 (ii).
- HEBEN RIVER TO YOUNG'S MILLS RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1616 (ii).
- INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY CO. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 769 (i).
- SUBSIDY, DISTRIBUTION: M. for O. C., &c.\* (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 943 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Flynn) 698 (i).
- LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 590 (i).
- LUNENBURG HARBOR, SURVEY, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 749 (i).
- POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 591 (i).
- OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTERSHIP, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 591 (i).
- PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 348 (i).
- COST: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 302 (i).
- PORT NATAL BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lovitt) 34 (i).
- ROSS, HON. WILLIAM, DISMISSAL: M. for O. C., Reps., &c. (Mr. Laurier) 24 (i).
- SHELburne CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker).

## NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.

- TRURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- WEST BAY, CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 427 (i).
- WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. Co.'s, COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Borden) 529 (i).
- Oaths of Office.** See "ADMINISTRATION."
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).
- OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1397 (ii).
- Ocean Steamship Subsidies B. No. 144** (Mr. Foster). Res. prop. (B. C. and Australia) 1328; M. for Com., 1368; in Com., 1373; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1424; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1425; neg. (Y. 55, N. 77) 1426. Res. (B. C. and China, &c.) 1329; M. for Com., 1386; in Com., 1387; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1426; Amt. (Mr. McMullen) neg. on a div., 1437. Res. (Can. and United Kingdom) 1329; in Com., 1389, 1402; rep., 1422; 1° of B., 1437; 2° on a div., in Com. and 3°, 1629 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 2.)
- Deb. in Com. on Res.: B. C. and Australia (Mr. Laurier) 1372, 1377; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1373, 1376, 1384; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1373, 1377; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1374; (Messrs. McMullen and Jones, Halifax) 1375; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1377; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1376; (Mr. Foster) 1378, 1381; (Messrs. Macdonald [Huron] and Platt) 1379; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1380; (Messrs. Hesson and Gillmor) 1382; (Mr. Taylor) 1383; (Mr. McNeill) 1384; (Mr. Mulock) 1385 (ii).
- Deb. in Com. on Res.: Canada and United Kingdom, (Mr. Foster) 1389; (Mr. Laurier) 1389; (Mr. Welsh) 1389, 1393, 1413; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1389; (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1390, 1393; (Mr. Trow) 1391; (Mr. Kenny) 1391, 1394, 1413; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1402, 1413; (Mr. Skinner) 1404; (Mr. O'Brien) 1405; (Mr. Platt) 1406; (Mr. Campbell) 1407; (Messrs. Gillmor and Ellis) 1408; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 1411; (Gen. Laurie) 1412; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1414, 1416; (Mr. Weldon, Albert) 1414, 1417; (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1415, 1434; (Mr. Shanly) 1417; (Mr. Watson) 1417; (Messrs. McNeill and McMillan, Huron) 1418; (Messrs. Dawson, McMullen and Mulock) 1419; (Mr. Landerkin) 1420; (Mr. Foster) 1421; (Mr. Laurier) 1422, 1427; (Mr. Amyot) 1437 (ii).
- O'CONNOR, D., AMOUNT PAID FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 31 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 51 (i), 1239 (ii).
- OILS, IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1533 (ii).
- OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
- Ont. Loan and Debenture Co.'s (consolidation, &c.) B. No. 48** (Mr. Moncrieff). 1°, 194; 2°, m., 299; 2°, 357; 3°, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 94.)
- Ont., Man. and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 83** (Mr. Macdowall). 1°, 346; 2°, 510; in Com. and 3°, 676 (i). (52 Vic., c. 61.)
- Ont. Mutual Life Ass. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 42** (Mr. Bowman). 1°, 194; 2°, 299; in Com. and 3°, 510 (i). (52 Vic., c. 96.)
- ONT. AND PACIFIC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396, in Com., 1499 (ii).
- Ont. and Que. Ry. Co. and Land Security Co. (Exchange of Land) ratification B. No. 66** (Mr. Small). 1°, 269; 2°, 397; in Com. and 3°, 663 (i). (52 Vic., c. 74.)
- ONTARIO:**
- AIRD, W. B., JR., NAMES OF SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1017 (ii).
- AMHERSTBURG, LAKE SHORE AND BELMORIS RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

## ONTARIO—Continued.

- BASS FISHING PERMITS, LAKE ERIE: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1081 (ii).
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Burdett) 85 (i).
- BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO: prop. Res., 1329, 1423 (ii).
- Telegram from Mr. Mowat, 1363 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).
- CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 302 (i).
- CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 303 (i).
- CORNWALL AND GALOPE CANALS, TENDERS FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies\* (Mr. Trow) 943 (ii).
- CORNWALL CANAL, PROP. LOCATION IN 1834, REFS., &c., OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies (Mr. Bergin) 595, 677 (i).
- RECENT BREAK, COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Bergin) 303 (i).
- CORRUPT PRACTICES TRIALS, PICTON: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 427 (i).
- DEFENCE OF INDIAN CHARGED WITH SHOOTING: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 935 (ii).
- DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Burdett) 80 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. Burdett) 699 (i).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 34 (i).
- SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1628 (ii).
- FISHING LICENSES IN INLAND WATERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Dawson) 82.
- GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1627 (ii).
- GAS (NATURAL) IN WESTERN ONT., MR. COSTE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 468 (i).
- GRAND RIVER, BRIDGE AT YORK VILLAGE, HALDIMAND: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Colter) 304 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Colter) 171 (i).
- GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).
- GROSSE, JOHN A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 171 (i).
- HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1.
- HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HASTINGS (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HORSE ISLAND, GEORGIAN BAY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 590 (i).
- INDIAN LANDS, GRAND RIVER, CAYUGA, SALES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Colter) 304 (i).
- RESERVES, SALE OF PINE TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 30 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. Barron) 1484 (ii).
- IRONDALE, BANGROFT AND OTTAWA RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, PETS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Taylor) 540.
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
- LA OLOCHE ISLAND, PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1081.
- SALE: Ques. (Mr. Fisher) 428 (i).
- LOGAN, WM, MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 677 (i).
- MAIL CARRIAGE AT BRUSSELS, ONT., CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 249 (i).
- NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1627 (ii).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- NORTHUMBERLAND (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDINGS, TENDERS FOR PAINTING: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1286 (ii).
- PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 303 (i).
- PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (ii).
- ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES CAUSED BY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 936 (ii).
- ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF PROPERTY BY CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 428 (i).



ONTARIO—Continued.

- ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. vs. QUEEN, ORIGINAL CHECKS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 943 (ii).
- COSTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1146 (ii).
- ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1618 (ii).
- RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 591 (i).
- RIVER, LIGHTHOUSE ON STAG ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Moncrieff) 224 (i).
- ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL DEFECTS: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 1081 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 34 (i).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, TENDERS: M. for copies\* (Mr. Trow) 943— (Mr. McMullen) 304 (i).
- SAWDUST AND MILL REFUSE IN OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 370 (i); Ques. (Mr. Cook) 223 (i).
- SCUGOG RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1533 (ii).
- SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 428 (i).
- SOUTH ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
- SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 426 (i).
- TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE OR LEASE: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 427.
- THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 20, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
- WELLAND CANAL WATER POWER, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Rykert) 304 (i).
- YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE: prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 85; remarks, 428 (i).
- YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &c., TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE: M. for copies (Mr. Taylor) 436 (i).

ORANGE ORDER, INCORPORATION: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1082 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

- ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.: on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> of B., objection taken by Sir Hector Langevin to prop. Amt. of Mr. Watson, no notice having been given; Ruled (Mr. Speaker) that notice of important Amts. must be given in writing, and entered in Votes and Proceedings, as required by Rule 67 of the House, 283 (i).
- CAPRÉ BRETON RY.: Attention of First Minister called to an answer given by him to a question asked by Mr. Flynn; Mr. Speaker ruled that the same was not a proper subject to bring up for discussion, 1574 (ii).
- COMBINATIONS IN TRADE: on M. to ref. B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, Member's argument on general merits of the B. arrested by Mr. Speaker, 1116 (ii).
- COMMERCIAL UNION WITH U. S., &c.: Members checked in remarks after Orders of the Day are called (Mr. Speaker) 384 (i).
- CRUELTY TO ANIMALS: on M. to restore B. to Order Paper and Amt. of Mr. Tisdale to consider same six months hence,—objection taken by Mr. Trow and ruling of Mr. Speaker asked on point whether Com. of Whole having rose without reporting B. the same is finally disposed of; Ruled (Mr. Speaker) M. and Amt. both in Order, 368 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. Choquette) to ref. back *re* indemnity to dismissed Translators, ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker, a similar motion being on Order Paper, &c., 934 (ii).
- DOMINION LANDS: on Minister reading Speech in Com. of Sup., objection (Mr. Barron) and Rule read, 1244 (ii).
- FISHERIES AND TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S.: Member requested by Mr. Speaker to confine his speech to subject-matter before the House, 388 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

- MINISTERIAL CHANGES: Irregularity of debate, Member's remarks checked by Mr. Speaker, no motion being before the House, 27 (i).
- MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION: On M. to ref. back part of a Rep., objection taken by Mr. Somerville, &c., as to regularity of motion and ruled out of Order by Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1687.
- MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS: on 2<sup>o</sup> of B., Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) as drawn, not in Order (Mr. Speaker) 1270 (ii).
- PRESBOTT COUNTY RY. CO.: 2<sup>o</sup> objected to by Mr. Bergin, B. not being printed in both languages, 239 (i).
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on Amt. (Mr. Moncrieff) objection taken by Mr. Mills (Bothwell) and ruled out of Order by Mr. Deputy Speaker, amendment not being relevant to subject-matter before the House, 268 (i).
- TENDERS, TRANSLATION OF FORMS: Remarks (Mr. Choquette) not admissible, 1535 (ii).
- WRECKING (FOREIGN VESSELS' AID) B. 2 IN CAN. WATERS: on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) to ref. to Sel. Com. ruled out of Order by Mr. Speaker, 253 (i).
- PRIVILEGE:
- JUDGES' SALARIES: Personal Explanation (Mr. Curran) *re* paragraph in Montreal Herald, 1498 (ii).
- LE CARON, INFORMER: Cablegram in newspaper read (Mr. Flynn) 93, 97 (i).
- MEMBERS LEAVING SEAT DURING VOTE: Authorities quoted (Mr. Trow) 249 (ii).
- PAIRS: Explanation (Mr. Trow) 1574 (i).
- PUB. ACCTS. COM., EVIDENCE TAKEN: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on non-production of Rep., 1366, 1600 (ii).
- OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES: Personal Explanation (Mr. Amyot) *re* speech of Mr. Jones (Halifax) as reported in Hansard, 1534 (ii).
- SECRET SERVICE FUND AND INFORMER LE CARON: Remarks (Mr. Costigan) 323 (i).
- PROCEDURE:
- BILLS, SECOND READINGS: Objection taken by Mr. Mitchell to informal manner of passing Bills certain stages and printed only in one language, 357 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE, ASSESSMENT OF SALARIES: Objection taken by Mr. Rykert to 2<sup>o</sup>, the Bill involving a charge upon the people, and Bourinot quoted in support of same, 368; Ruled (Mr. Speaker) out of Order, and that said B. must originate in Com. of Whole and emanate from the Govt., 367 (i).
- LEGISLATIVE ECONOMY: on M. for Joint Com., ruling of Mr. Speaker asked by Mr. Laurier as to constitutionality; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 783 (i).
- SUPPLY: on M. for Com., objection taken by Mr. Mills (Bothwell) no motion having been made referring Estimates to the Com., and Bourinot quoted; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 48 (i).

Ordinance Lands in Quebec, authorisation of conveyance B. No. 143 (Mr. Dewdney). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1194 (ii).

ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 942 (ii).

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1491 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. Girouard). 1<sup>o</sup>, 47; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 169; Order for 2<sup>o</sup> read, 424; withdn., 426 (i).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. Hickey). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 509 (i).

OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDINGS, TENDERS FOR PAINTING: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1266 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 799 (i).

— PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 303 (i).

OTTAWA RIVER AND CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).

- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1073; conc., 1603 (ii).
- OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTERSHIP, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 591 (i).
- PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 34 (i).
- PAGANS IN JOLIETTE COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1710 (ii).
- PAIRS DURING SESSION, viii (i).
- PARKER, GEO. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1182 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT, OPENING, 1; PROROGATION, 1727 (ii).
- PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396; in Com., 1499 (ii).
- "PATENT RECORD": conc., 1598 (ii).
- PAUPER IMMIGRATION (CHILDREN): in Com. of Sup., 964 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 211 (i); 1315, 1507, 1615; conc., 1597 (ii).
- REP.: presented (Sir John Thompson) 169 (i).
- PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 796 (ii).
- PICTOU BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 302 (i).
- LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 348 (i).
- PICTOU, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- PIERS AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS IN P. E. I.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Robertson) 942 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 148 (i), 919 (ii).
- REPAIRS IN 1888: M. for Rets.\* (Mr. Welsh) 942 (ii).
- PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 942 (ii).
- PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1146 (ii).
- PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).
- POLICE. See "Dominion," "Montreal," "Mounted."
- PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572 (ii).
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co's B. No. 51 (Mr. Bryson). 1°\*, 222; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- POPE, MR. (DEP. COM. OF PATENTS): in Com. of Sup., 71-78 (i).
- POPE, LATE HON. J. H.: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) &c., 943, 1017 (ii).
- POPULATION OF DOM. BY PROVINCES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 170 (i).
- PORK DUTIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 1146 (ii).
- PORT ARTHUR HARBOR AND KAMINISTIGUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 801 (ii).
- PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).
- PORT NATAL BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lovitt) 34 (i).
- POSTAGE RATES, CAN. AND U. S.: in Com. of Sup., 70 (i).
- REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 34 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 80 (i).
- POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 740 (i).
- POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 68 (i).
- REP.: presented (Mr. Haggart) 17 (i).
- Post Office Act (*Chap. 35 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 93 (Mr. Haggart). 1°, 369; Res. prop., 469 (i); in Com., 1130; 2° and in Com., 1133; 3°m., Amt. (Mr. White, Renfrew) neg. (Y. 55, N. 85) 1281; 3°\*, 1283 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS.: in Com. of Sup., 1503.
- in Com. of Sup., 1234, 1461, 1596 (ii).
- POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Burdett) 225 (i).
- Deb. (Messrs. Cook and Casey) 226; (Mr. Lister) 227 (Messrs. Roome and Porter) 228 (Messrs. Sutherland and Hesson) 229; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 230; (Mr. Eisenhauer) 231; (Messrs. Sproule and McMullen) 232; (Mr. Watson) 233; (Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Trow) 233 (i).
- POST OFFICE:
- ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 224 (i).
- BALTIC POST OFFICE ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1423 (ii).
- BANNERMAN, WM., LATE POSTMASTER AT CALGARY, DEFALCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 677 (i).
- BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Bourassa) 943 (ii).
- CARBONNEAU, JOSEPH, PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Desautniers) 1328 (ii).
- CHESTER, QUE., COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 468 (i).
- GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Pets., &c.\* (Mr. Guay) 942 (ii).
- INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1181 (ii).
- JOLIETTE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Neveu) 762 (i).
- LAKE ST. JOHN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1628 (ii).
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF RATES: Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 80 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 34 (i).
- LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &c. FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. Guay) 433 (i).
- LITTLE DOVER MAIL SERVICE AND CANSO MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Mr. Haggart) 590 (i).
- LOGAN, WM., MAIL CONTRACTOR, PICKERING VILLAGE, SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 677 (i).
- LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 80 (i).
- LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. Turcot) 751 (i).
- MAIL CARRIAGE, BEGANCOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Turcot) 304 (i).
- IN BRUSSELS, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 249 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE WITH ENGLAND: Remarks, 1574 (ii).
- MONEY ORDER OFFICES, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 468 (i).
- MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 468 (i).
- OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT, EXTENSION WITH ALLAN LINE: Ques. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1397 (ii).
- OYSTER PONDS' POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 591.
- PACIFIC MAIL SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 34 (i).
- POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 740 (i).
- POST OFFICES IN MONTCALM COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 1082 (ii).
- RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1533 (ii).
- REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 525 (i).
- ST. BARTHELEMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 591 (i).
- ST. BEATRIX POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. Neveu) 590 (i).
- Prescott County Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. Edwards). 1°\*, 138; 2° m., 239; 2°\*, 299; in Com. and 3°\*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 15.
- P. E. I. and Continental Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. Landry). 1°, 384; 2°\*, 524 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BALTIC POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1423 (ii).  
 BELL ORBEK BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 347 (i).  
 CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c (Mr. Perry) 741.  
 CASUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 348 (i).  
 CHINA POINT PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).  
 CONFEDERATION AND P. E. I., CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 525 (i).  
 DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," COST OF REPAIRS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Perry) 31, 302 (i).  
 ——— PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 30 (i).  
 FIFTEEN-POINT BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1423 (ii).  
 FISHERY BOUNTY, CLAIMS MADE AND REJECTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mc Intyre) 434 (i).  
 FISHERY COMMISSIONER (ASSISTANT) APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 171 (i).  
 HICKEY WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).  
 JOBIN, ACHILLES, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 318 (i).  
 KING'S CO., REPRESENTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) challenging Seat, 169 (i).  
 LOBSTER FACTORIES, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Perry) 31 (i).  
 MAIL SUBSIDY, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1261 (ii).  
 MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1146, 1423.  
 MOUNT STEWART WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 171, 621 (i).  
 MURRAY HARBOR SOUTH AND MONTAGUE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 468 (i).  
 NAUFRAGE HARBOR, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. McIntyre) 33 (i).  
 NEW LONDON BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 620 (i).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Davis, P. E. I.) 468 (i).  
 PIERS AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Robertson) 942 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Welsh) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 148 (i).  
 ——— REPAIRS IN 1888: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Welsh) 942 (ii).  
 PINNITZ AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).  
 PREVENTIVE OFFICERS IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 15 (i).  
 SUBSIDY TO P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 15 (i).  
 FURWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 16 (i).  
 SUMMERSIDE, HARBOR AND BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Perry) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).  
 TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1146 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Perry) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).  
 WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1498 (ii).  
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 57 (i), 1503 (ii).  
 ——— REP.: presented (Mr. Bowell) 346 (i).  
 PRINTING BUREAU AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).  
 ——— COST OF BUILDING, PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mc Mullen) 1863 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 428 (i).  
 PRINTING COMMITTEE: M. for Joint Com. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 19 (i).  
 ——— M. to add names (Mr. Bowell) 346 (i).  
 PRINTING DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).  
 PRINTING, PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).  
 PRIVILEGE: See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," &c.  
 PRIVATE BILLS PETs.: M. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) to extend time, 30 (i).  
 ——— REFS. FROM COM.: M. to extend time (Sir Hector Langevin) 555 (i), 841 (ii).  
 PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i), 1501 (ii).  
 PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).  
 PROCEDURE: See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," &c.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 88; Amt. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 89; deb. resmd., 260; neg. (Y. 58, N. 86) 261; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 261; neg. (Y. 35, N. 108) 267; Amt. agreed to (Y. 99, N. 59) 269 (i).

Promissory Notes. See "BILLS OF EXCHANGE."

PROROGATION: Closing Remarks (Mr. Trow) 1724 (ii).

—— Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1711 (ii).

PROVENCHER, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

PUBLIC ACCTS. COM., PAPERS ORDERED: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 470 (i).

—— MEETING: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) 500 (i).

—— REP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 2 (i).

—— M. (Mr. Rykert) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 47 (i).

Public Departments (certain Acts re) Repeal B. No. 110 (Mr. Mills, Bothwell). 1°, 589 (i)

Public Matters. See "ENQUIRIES."

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 148, 805 (i), 913, 927, 931, 1229, 1362, 1448, 1528, 1599 (ii).

—— REP.: presented (Sir Hector Langevin) 2 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

ARICHAU WEST BREAKWATER: Ques. (Gen. Lawrie) 841 (ii).

BUILDINGS ERECTED SINCE 1867 TO 1889: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 303 (i).

CASUMPEQUE HARBOR, DISMISSAL OF BLASTING FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 348 (i).

CAYUGA POST OFFICE, COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 803 (i).

CHINA POINT PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).

CUSTOMS BUILDINGS (CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000): M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casey) 308 (i).

DREDGE "CAPE BRETON," COMPENSATION TO CAPTAIN AND LABORERS FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 427 (i).

DREDGE LOST IN NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 469 (i).

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," PAYMENT TO CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 30 (i).

—— REPAIRS AND COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Perry) 31 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Perry) 302 (i).

DRESDEN TURNING GROUND, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 151 (i).

DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Burdett) 80 (i).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MASADAMISED ROAD: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 34 (i).

—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1628 (ii).

ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. Fiast) 935 (ii).

FIFTEEN POINT, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1423 (ii).

FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT, COL. O'BRIEN'S REPORT: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1146 (ii).

GANNON NARROWS FLOATING BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 1627 (ii).  
 GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE, C. B., PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Flynn) 1266 (ii).

GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Colter) 171; M. for Ret.,\* 804 (i).

HICKEY WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 20 (i).

LAKE ST. LOUIS, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 80 (i).

LAKE ST. JOHN, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1146.  
 ——— WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1181 (ii).

LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE: Ques. (Mr. Dayon) 427 (i).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c., COR.: M. for copies (Mr. Flynn) 698 (i).

LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Landerlein) 171 (i).

**PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.**

LUNenburg HARBOR SURVEY, &c. : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 749 (i).  
 — REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 591 (i).  
 LONGUEUIL WHARVES, COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 80 (i).  
 MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1146, 1423  
 MOUNT STEWART WHARF, P. E. I., CONSTRUCTION : (Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 171, 621 (i).  
 NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP. : M. for copy (Mr. McIntyre) 33 (i).  
 NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 620 (i).  
 — SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 468 (i).  
 OTTAWA NEW DEPTL. BUILDING, TENDERS FOR PAINTING : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1266 (ii).  
 — PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT PAID : M for Ret.\* (Mr. McMullen) 303 (i).  
 PIER AND HARBORS IN P. E. I. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Robertson) 942 (ii).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Welsh) 942 (ii).  
 PINETTE AND WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, SURVEYS : Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 621 (i).  
 PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 150 (i).  
 POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Burdett) 225 (i).  
 PRINTING BUREAU, COST OF BUILDING, PLANT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1363 (ii).  
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERRECTED SINCE 1867 TO 1889 : M. for Ret.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 303 (i).  
 PUBLIC WORKS REP : presented (Sir Hector Langevin) 2 (i).  
 RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS : Ques. (Mr. Gigault) 22, 29 (i).  
 RIMOUSKI WHARF, REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 302 (i).  
 ST. ALPHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1181, 1363 (ii).  
 ST. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF, CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 525 (i).  
 ST. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1265 (ii).  
 ST. CLAIR RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD : Ques. (Mr. Lister) 591 (i).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER OVERFLOW, PREVENTION : Ques. (Mr. Beauvois) 591 (i).  
 ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1363 (ii).  
 ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 34 (i).  
 SUMMERSIDE, P. E. I., HARBOR AND BREAKWATER SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).  
 TELEGRAPH LINES, ACQUISITION BY GOVT : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Denison) 80 (i).  
 TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques (Mr. Perry) 1146 (ii).  
 VENTILATION OF CHAMBER : in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).  
 WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques (Mr. Perry) 1498 (ii).  
 YARMOUTH COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Lovitt) 34 (i).

**Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 151** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 1572; M. for Com., 1706; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and B. in Com., 1709; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1711 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 5.)

**QUARANTINE** : in Com. of Sup., 931 (ii).

**Quebec and Lévis Ferry B. No. 12** (Mr. Choquette). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 29 (i).

**Quebec Board of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 87** (Mr. McGreevy). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 369; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 510; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 755 (i). (52 Vic., c. 99.)

**QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1887** : M. for copies of Res., &c. (Mr. Edgar) 20 (i).

**Quebec Skating Club.** See "ORDNANCE LANDS."

**QUEBEC** :

ARTHABASKA FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 302 (i).  
 BAIN DES CHALURES RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. (1st) Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1396 (i).  
 — prop. (2nd) Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1643 (ii).

**QUEBEC—Continued.**

BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O. C.'s, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 303 (i).  
 BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC, O. C.'s, COR., &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 303 (i).  
 BEAUFORT CANAL IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 34 (i).  
 — REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 304 (i).  
 — OPENING OF NAV. : Telegram read (Mr. Bergeron) 1285 (ii).  
 BELLE VALLÉE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bourassa) 943 (i).  
 C.P.R., EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, AMOUNT PAID AND TO WHOM : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 248 (i).  
 CAPE TORMENTINE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii)  
 CAP ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1395 (ii).  
 CARBONNEAU, JOB., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 1328 (ii).  
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF COUNCILLORS : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 427 (i).  
 — AGENT'S SALARY : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 1264 (ii).  
 — SURVEY OF RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 468, 501 (i).  
 CHAMBLAY-LONGUEUIL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 80 (i).  
 CHESTER POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques (Mr. Lavergne) 468 (i).  
 CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY COUNTIES, EXPENDITURE OF SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 427 (i).  
 COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, THREE RIVERS, DUTY ON FOREIGN CATALOGUES : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 739 (i).  
 CUSTOMS APPRAISERS, APPOINTMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 370 (i).  
 DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACTS, O. C.'s, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 303 (i).  
 DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).  
 ESQUIMAUX POINT TELEGRAPH LINE : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 935 (ii).  
 FEES PAID LAW FIRMS IN QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 347 (i).  
 FISHERY OVERSEER, ARTHABASKA, REVENUE, SALARY, EXPENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 80 (i).  
 FISHING LICENCES, RIVER MATANE : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 171; (Mr. Fiset) 469 (i).  
 — RIVER NATASHQUAN : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1533, 1627 (ii).  
 FISHING REGULATIONS IN BERTHIER : M. for copies (Mr. Beauvois) 743 (i).  
 GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY : M. for Pets., Repts., &c. (Mr. Rinfret) 20 (i).  
 — prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).  
 GREAT NORTHERN RY., ENGINEER'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 370 (i).  
 HEREFORD RY. Co., AND PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS : Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 1017 (ii).  
 — SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1573; in Com., 1638 (ii).  
 HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Curran) 23 (i).  
 HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION : Ques. (Mr. Lépine) 302; M. for Ret.,\* 303 (i).  
 INDIANS, HURON TRIBE OF LORETTE : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 33 (i).  
 I. O. R. See general heading.  
 JOLIETTE CONVERTED ELECTION : Judge's Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1.  
 — DISTRICT JUDGE, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 170 (i).  
 — MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Neveu) 762 (i).  
 LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. Curran) 20 (i).  
 LAKE ST. JOHN HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1146.  
 — MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1628 (ii).  
 — RY. SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. De St. Georges) 979 (ii).  
 — WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1181 (ii).  
 LAKE ST. LOUIS BUOYS AND LIGHTS : Remarks, 1534, 1652 (ii).  
 LAKE ST. PETER BUOYS : Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 979 (ii).  
 LAKE TEMISCAMINGUS COLONISATION AND RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1572; in Com., 1631 (ii).

## QUEBEC—Continued.

- LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.  
LAPRAIRIE VILLAGE, PROTECTION AGAINST ICE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 427 (i).
- LARUE, CASGRAIN, ANGERS AND HAMEL, LAW FEES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 347 (i).
- LEBUC, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 171 (i).
- LEBOURDAIS BROS., COR. *re* TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 16 (i).
- LÉVIS POST OFFICE, PETS., &C., FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 433 (i).
- LONGUEUIL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
- WHARVES, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
- LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Turcot*) 751 (i).
- MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT, O.O.'S, COR. &C.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 303 (i).
- MAIL CARRIAGE (BÉCANOUR STATION AND STE. JULIE DE SOMERSET, &C.): M. for Cor., &C.\* (Mr. *Turcot*) 304 (i).
- MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).
- MASKINONGÉ CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1
- MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1640 (ii).
- MATANE RIVER, FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 938 (ii).
- MONEY ORDER OFFICES IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Laverigne*) 468 (i).
- MONTCALM POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1081 (ii).
- MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING OF REP.: M. (Mr. *Curran*) 1687 (ii).
- MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1423 (ii).
- Remarks, 1573, 1687 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT. BY G.T.R., &C.: M. for O.C.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 943 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).
- ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 942 (ii).
- PAGANS IN JOLIETTE COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1710 (ii).
- PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &C.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 942 (ii).
- PILOTS, AMOUNTS RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1146 (ii).
- PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572 (ii).
- POSTMASTER AT THREE RIVERS, NEWSPAPER POSTAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 740 (ii).
- POST OFFICE INSPECTOR, THREE RIVERS DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1181 (ii).
- QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1637 (ii).
- QUESNEL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Laverigne*) 1145.
- QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1619 (ii).
- RY. SUBSIDIES FOR CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181 (ii).
- LAKE ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 427 (i).
- RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 22, 29 (i).
- RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- RIMOUSKI WHARF REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 302 (i).
- SAGUENAY RIVER, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146 (ii).
- TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1422 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 525 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1265 (ii).
- STE. BEATRIX (JOLIETTE) POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 590 (i).
- ST. ALPHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181, 1363 (ii).
- ST. ANDREWS TO C. P. R. AT OR EAST OF LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396 (ii).
- ST. BARTHÉLÉMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).
- ST. CÉSaire TO ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSTOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).

## QUEBEC—Continued.

- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER OVERFLOW, PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1363 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS LAKE, BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Remarks, 1574 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTION OF PIER: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).
- ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).
- ST. ROCH DES AULNIER'S WHARF, COR., REP., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casgrain*) 529 (i).
- SALMON RIVERS IN QUEBEC, LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).
- SHAWINIGAN DISTRICT, SENATOR FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Laverigne*) 1628 (ii).
- TÉMISCOUATA RY. CO., SHAREHOLDERS, SHARES AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 24 (i).
- SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 676 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 943 (ii).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, COST OF MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1081 (ii).
- WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 935 (ii).
- Queen's College (Kingston) Act Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>, 300; M. for Com., 602; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 104, N. 35) 607 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- QUESNEL, JULES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Laverigne*) 1145 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Cook*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 17; 2<sup>o</sup>, 362 (i); M. for Com., 1099; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h, agreed to on a div., 1100 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 782 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 1283 (ii).
- Ry. Employés Protection B. No. 53 (Mr. *Purcell*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 223; Order for 2<sup>o</sup> read, 384 (i).
- RAILWAYS. See
- ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.
- ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA RY. CO.
- ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
- ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY.
- ASSINIBOIA, EDMONTON AND UNJIGA RY. CO.
- ATLANTIC AND NORTH-WEST RY. CO.
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.
- BERLIN AND CANADIAN PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
- CALGARY, ALBERTA AND MONTANA RY. CO.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.
- CAPE BRETON RY.
- CHIGNECTO SHIP RY. CO.
- COBBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
- EDMUNDSTON AND FLORENCEVILLE RY. CO.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
- GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
- HAMILTON CENTRAL RY. CO.
- INTERCOLONIAL RY.
- INTERNATIONAL RY. CO.
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE AND NAPAWEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT.
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
- KOOTENAY AND ATHABASCA RY. CO.
- LAC SEUL RY. CO.
- LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
- LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
- MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
- MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. CO.
- MOOSE JAW, BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
- NEW BRUNSWICK AND PRINCE EDWARD RY. CO.
- NORTHERN PACIFIC AND MANITOBA RY. CO.
- NORTH SHORE RY.
- NORTH-WESTERN JUNCTION AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RY. CO.
- ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.
- ONTARIO, MANITOBA AND WESTERN RY. CO.
- OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.
- PRESBOTT COUNTY RY. Co.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND CONTINENTAL RY. AND FERRY Co.
- QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.
- RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL Co.
- SHORT LINE RY., HARVEY TO SALISBURY.
- SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING Co.
- SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co.
- ST. GABRIEL LEVEE AND RY. Co.
- ST. LAWRENCE AND ATLANTIC JUNCTION RY. Co.
- THREE RIVERS RY. Co.
- TEMISQUATA RY. Co.
- UNION RY. Co.
- WESTERN COUNTIES RY.
- WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY.
- WINNIPEG AND NORTH PACIFIC RY. Co.
- WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. Co.

[See "SUBSIDIES."]

RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 151 (i), 1504; conc., 1615 (ii).

— REP.: presented (Sir John A. Macdonald) 250 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1069, 1048, 1064, 1202, 1498, 1597, 1601; conc., 1615 (ii).

RY. SUBSIDIES, CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1181 (ii).

— LAKE ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 427 (i).

REBELLION IN N. W. T., MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

— 9TH BATTALION: Documents read (Mr. Amyot) 234.

— OFFICIAL COB. re 9TH BATTALION: M. for copies (Mr. Amyot) 304-317 (i).

RECIPROCITY (UNRESTRICTED): Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for Com. of Sup., 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i).

Deb. (Mr. Tupper) 472; (Mr. Charlton) 479; (Mr. White, Renfrew) 495; (Mr. Armstrong) 504; (Mr. Porter) 510; (Mr. McMullen) 516; (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 557; (Mr. Coker) 563; (Mr. Landry) 566; (Mr. Perry) 577; (Mr. Daly) 580; (Mr. Campbell) 585; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 621; (Mr. Béchard) 628; (Mr. Gigault) 631; (Mr. Amyot) 633; (Mr. Sproule) 937; (Mr. McDougall, C. B.) 643; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 646; (Mr. Gockburn) 701; (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) 705; (Mr. Madill) 713; (Mr. Hudspeth) 717; (Mr. Semple) 718; (Mr. Haggart) 720; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 723; (Mr. Dickey) 730; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 735 (i).

Recognisances. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. Davis). 1°\*, 138; 2°\*, 170; 3°\*, 257 (i). (52 Vic., c. 52.)

RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 1572; in Com., 1717 (ii).

RED RIVER POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1533.

REGINA BARRACKS, CANTEN: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1082 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR LOSS: \*Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 525 (i).

REGULATIONS AND ORDERS, MILITIA, FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 171 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.: CONC., 1599 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 913.

REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS: Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 677 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

- AUDITOR GENERAL: (Mr. Foster) 13 (i).
- DOMINION POLICE: (Sir John Thompson) 3 (i).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS: (Mr. Dewdney) 29 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE: (Mr. Conynan) 3 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—Continued.

- INTERIOR: (Mr. Dewdney) 436 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
- LABOR COMMISSIONERS' REP.: (Mr. Bowell) 1285 (ii).
- MARINE: (Mr. Tupper) 2 (i).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE: (Sir Adolphe Caron) 13 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: (Sir John A. Macdonald) 169.
- PENITENTIARIES: (Sir John Thompson) 169 (i).
- POSTMASTER GENERAL: (Mr. Haggart) 17 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY: (Mr. Bowell) 346 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (Mr. Foster) 2 (i).
- PUBLIC WORKS: (Sir Hector Langevin) 2 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: (Sir John A. Macdonald) 250 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE: (Sir Hector Langevin) 33 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION TABLES: (Mr. Bowell) 3 (i).

RETURNING OFFICERS (payments) in Com. of Sup., 1511 (ii).

RETURN re FIRE INSURANCE Co.'s: Ques. (Mr. Bowman) 323.

RETURNS IN HANDS OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. Somerville). 1573, 1600, 1668 (ii).

RETURNS, PRODUCTION OF: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) 621 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:

- ADAMS, A. & J., CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF "CARRIER DOVE": Mr. Mitchell, 1182 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND LIVERPOOL RY. SURVEY: (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 943.
- ANNUITIES TO INDIANS, ARREARS: Mr. O'Brien, 937 (ii).
- BAR OF QUEBEC, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT: \*Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 303 (i).
- BEACH LOTS IN QUEBEC: \*Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 303 (i).
- BEAUBARNOIS CANAL, REP. OF ENGINEER CRAWFORD: \*Mr. Bergeron, 304 (i).
- BEEF SUPPLIES (INDIAN) IN N.W.T.: Mr. Edgar, 912 (ii).
- BELLE VALLEE POST OFFICE, LOCATION: \*Mr. Bourassa, 943 (ii).
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. SUBSIDY AND G. T. R.: Mr. Burdett, 85 (i).
- BOUNDARIES OF ONT. AND QUE., COB. BETWEEN LOCAL GOVTS.: Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 303 (i).
- "BRIDGEWATER," SEIZURE: Mr. Edgar, 752 (i).
- BUDGET SPEECHES: Mr. Landerkin, 20 (i).
- BUILDINGS (PUBLIC) ERECTED, 1867-1889: Sir Richard Cartwright, 303 (i).
- CAMPBELL, CAPT. R., DISMISSAL: Mr. Perry, 741 (i).
- CANAL WORKS, TENDERS: Mr. Casey, 593 (i).
- CANALS, OPENING FOR SUNDAY TRAFFIC: \*Mr. Rykert, 304 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT, WORKING OF, AND HOME GOVT.: Mr. Jamieson, 541 (i).
- "CARRIER DOVE," CLAIMS FOR LOSS: Mr. Mitchell, 1182 (ii).
- CHAPLAINS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS: Mr. Innes, 24 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: Sir Richard Cartwright, 24 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, DATE OF RECEIPT BY SPEAKER OF JUDGES' CERTIFICATES: \*Mr. Mills (Bothwell) 303 (i).
- CORNWALL AND GALOPE CANALS, ENLARGEMENT: Mr. Trow, 943 (ii).
- CORNWALL CANAL, PROP. LOCATION IN 1834: Mr. Bergin, 595, 677 (i).
- CORNWALL CANAL, RECENT BREAK: Mr. Bergin, 303 (i).
- CUSTOMS BUILDINGS, CITIES AND TOWNS OF LESS THAN 20,000: Mr. Casey, 303 (i).
- C. P. R. See general heading.
- DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," REPAIRS, COST, &c.: Mr. Perry, 31 (i).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMISED ROAD: \*Mr. Bain (Wentworth) 34 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS OF QUEBEC LEGISLATURE: Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 303 (i).
- DRILL SHED AT BELLEVILLE, CONSTRUCTION: Mr. Burdett, 699 (i).
- DRAWBACK ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT: \*Mr. Ellis, 943 (ii).
- DERBY BRANCH AND NORTHERN AND WESTERN RYS.: \*Mr. Mitchell, 1182 (ii).
- ESSEX AND YOUNG TOWNSHIPS UNION ACT, PETE. re DISALLOWANCE: Mr. Taylor, 436 (i).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir Richard Cartwright, 24 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM (OTTAWA) COST: Mr. McMillan (Huron) 285; Expenditure, 436 (i).
- FARLEY, GUNNER, CLAIM FOR LOSS OF HORSE: Mr. Fisher, 433 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- FISH IMPORTED IN BOND FOR EXPORT: Gen. *Laurie*, 1082 (ii).  
 FISHERY BOUNTY, CLAIMS MADE AND REJECTED IN P. E. I.: Mr. *Mc Intyre*, 434 (i).  
 FISHING REGULATIONS IN BERTHIER, &c.: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 743 (i).  
 FISHING LICENSES, INLAND WATERS: Mr. *Dawson*, 82 (i).  
 FLOUR AND WHEAT IMPORTATIONS FROM U. S.: Mr. *Smith (Ontario)* 33 (i).  
 FORTIN, NOEL, ACCIDENT TO ON L. O. R.: Mr. *Fiset*, 303, 304 (i).  
 FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS SERVICES: Mr. *Charlton*, 303 (i).  
 FRUIT BASKETS AND BOXES, DUTY COLLECTED: Mr. *Charlton*, 304 (i).  
 GRAND RIVER BRIDGE AT YORK VILLAGE, HALDIMAND: Mr. *Colter*, 304 (i).  
 GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY: Mr. *Rinfret*, 20 (i).  
 GROVER, J. M., POSTMASTER AT MORDEN, MAN.: Mr. *Guay*, 943 (ii).  
 HIDE AND LEATHER INSPECTOR, MONTREAL: Mr. *Curran*, 23 (i).  
 HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 22 (i).  
 HOSPITAL DUES ON SHIPS, COLLECTION: Mr. *Lépine*, 303 (i).  
 I. C. R. See general heading.  
 INDIANS, HUSBAND TRIBE OF LOBETTE: Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 33 (i).  
 INDIAN LANDS, GRAND RIVER, SALES, &c.: Mr. *Colter*, 304 (i).  
 INSPECTORS OF HULLS, NAMES, &c., OF COMMISSIONERS: Mr. *Wilson (Elgin)* 943 (ii).  
 INTERNATIONAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Mr. *Jones (Halifax)*, 943 (i).  
 JONES' CREEK, LEEDS, ONT., PETS., &c.: Mr. *Taylor*, 540 (i).  
 L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N. S., SURVEYS: Mr. *Flynn*, 693 (i).  
 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF N. W. T., MEMORIALS: Mr. *Davin*, 348, 371 (i).  
 LEVIE POST OFFICE BUILDING: Mr. *Guay*, 433 (i).  
 LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T.: Mr. *Jameson*, 550 (i).  
 LOAN, RECENT, AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 30 (i).  
 LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P. E. I.: Mr. *Perry*, 31 (i).  
 LOURDES AND SOMERSET MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Turcot*, 751 (i).  
 LUNenburg HARBOR SURVEY: Mr. *Eisenhauer*, 749 (i).  
 COUNTY FISHERIES: (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 940 (ii).  
 MAGISTRATES, DISALLOWANCE OF ACT: Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 303 (i).  
 MAIL CARRIAGE, BÉCANOUR STATION AND STE JULIE DE SOMERSET: Mr. *Turcot*, 304 (i).  
 MANUFACTURERS' INSURANCE CO.'S STOCKHOLDERS: Mr. *Lister*, 591.  
 MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS; Mr. *Casgrain*, 938 (ii).  
 MINING MACHINERY, DUTY: Mr. *Elgar*, 941 (ii).  
 MOUNTED POLICE, DESERTIONS DURING TEN YEARS: Mr. *Davin*, 393 (i).  
 PUNISHMENT OF CONSTABLES, &c.: Mr. *Davin*, 429 (i).  
 NAUFRAGE HARBOR, P. E. I., ENGINEER'S REP.: Mr. *McIntyre*, 33 (i).  
 NORTH SHORE RY., CONVEYANCE TO GOVT.: Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 943 (ii).  
 O'CONNOR, D., ACCOUNT FOR LAW CASES, FEES, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 31 (i).  
 ORDNANCE LANDS IN QUEBEC: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)*, 942 (ii).  
 OTTAWA PUBLIC ROADS, IMPROVEMENTS: Mr. *McMullen*, 303 (i).  
 PIERS, &c., IN P. E. I., REPAIRS IN 1888: Mr. *Welsh*, 942 (ii).  
 IMPROVEMENTS IN P. E. I.: Mr. *Robertson*, 942 (ii).  
 PILOTAGE DUES, QUEBEC HARBOR, &c.: Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 942 (i).  
 POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1878, REVENUES, &c.: Mr. *Burdett*, 225 (i).  
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERUPTED, 1867-1889: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 303 (i).  
 QUEBEC CONFERENCE, 1887, RES., &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 29 (i).  
 REBELLION, IN N. W. T., OFFICIAL COR. re 9TH BATTALION: Mr. *Amyot*, 304 (i).  
 ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES BY: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 936 (ii).  
 ROSS, HON. WM., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Laurier*, 24 (i).  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, TENDERS: Mr. *Trow*, 943 (ii).  
 Mr. *McMullen*, 304 (i).  
 SAW LOGS, IMPORTATION, &c.: Mr. *Charlton*, 33 (i).  
 EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED: Mr. *Charlton*, 33, 304 (i).  
 SHORT LINE RY., ST. LAWRENCE, ST. ANDREWS, via SHREBROOKE, MATTAWAMBEAG, &c.: Mr. *Kenny*, 541 (i).

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- ST. CATHERINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO. vs. QUEEN: Mr. *McMullen* 33 (i).  
 ORIGINAL CHECKS: Mr. *McMullen*, 943 (ii).  
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., COST: Mr. *McMullen*, 943 (ii).  
 ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY: Mr. *Walden (St. John)*, 304 (i).  
 ST. ROCH DES AULNETS WHARF: Mr. *Casgrain*, 529 (ii).  
 SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS: Mr. *Rykert*, 304 (i).  
 TARIFF, FRENCH EDITION; Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 935 (ii).  
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.; SHAREHOLDERS, &c.: Mr. *Dessaint*, 24 (i).  
 SUBSIDY: Mr. *Dessaint*, 943 (ii).  
 TOWN SITES, N. W. T., RECEIPTS FROM SALES: Mr. *Davin*, 29 (i).  
 TENDERS FOR CANAL WORKS: Mr. *Casey*, 593 (i).  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U. S.: Mr. *Smith (Ontario)* 33 (i).  
 WEBSTER, W. A., SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES: Mr. *Colter* 303 (i).  
 WELAND CANAL WATER POWER, ENGINEERS' REPS.: Mr. *Rykert*, 304 (i).  
 WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RYS.: Mr. *Borden*, 629.  
 WRIGHT, E. P., DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY: Mr. *Edwards*, 942.  
 WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Mr. *Mitchell*, 1094.  
 YOUNG AND ESSEX TOWNSHIPS UNION ACT, PETS. re DISALLOWANCE: Mr. *Taylor*, 436.  
 RICHELIEU RIVER, SURVEY AND SOUNDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 22, 29 (i).  
 RICHMOND REPAIR SHED FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 1064.  
 RIDEAU HALL: in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).  
 RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 794 (i).  
 RIMOUSKI WHARF, REPAIRS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 302 (i).  
 RIVER AND WATER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).  
 RIVER MATANE FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 469.  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 970, 1419, 1532; CONC., 1615 (ii).  
 ROBILLARD, HONORÉ, PURCHASE OF TIMBER ON INDIAN RESERVES: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 30 (i).  
 Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (ii).  
 ROCK LAKE DAM, DAMAGES BY: M. for Cor., &c (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 946 (ii).  
 Rocky Mountains Park of Can. Act Amt. B. No. 141 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1363; withdn., 1629 (ii).  
 ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1066 (ii).  
 ROSS, HON. WM., DISMISSAL: M. for O.C., Reps., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 24 (i).  
 ROSS, JOSIAH, SEIZURE OF PROPERTY BY CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 428 (i).  
 ROSSEAU RIVER (MAN.) INDIAN RESERVE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 347 (i).  
 Rules of Court. See "CRIMINAL MATTERS."  
 STE. ANNE DE CHICOUTIMI WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 525.  
 STE. ANNE DE LA POCAIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. Mr. *Dessaint* 1265 (ii).  
 STE. BEATRIX POST OFFICE, LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 590 (i).  
 ST. ANTHONSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1181, 1363 (ii).  
 ST. ANDREWS TO C. P. R. ST OR EAST OF LACHUTE: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1500 (ii).  
 ST. BARTHELEMY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591.  
 ST. CATHERINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1672; in Com., 1634 (ii).

- ST. CATHERINES MILLING AND LUMBER CO. *vs.* QUEEN, LAW COSTS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 33 (i).  
 — ORIGINAL CHEQUES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).  
 — COSTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1146 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 41 (i), 1455 (ii).  
 ST. CÉSAIRE TO ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSD RD. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1634 (ii).  
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 302 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 943 (ii).  
 ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1618 (ii).  
 ST. CLAIR RAPIDS, DREDGING AT POINT EDWARD: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 591 (i).  
 ST. CLAIR RIVER, STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 224 (i).  
 St. Gabriel Levee Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Curran*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 194; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 509 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 83.)  
 ST. GEORGE'S BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL DEFECTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1081 (ii).  
 St. Helen's Island Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Curran*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 138; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 299 (i).  
 ST. JOHN AND BASIN OF MINAS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 262 (ii).  
 ST. JOHN, EXTENSION OF CITY FRONT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).  
 ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOR, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).  
 ST. JOHN RIVER, BRIDGE AT FREDERICTON, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 526 (i).  
 St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Hall*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 269; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 357; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 72.)  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, OVERFLOW, PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 591 (i).  
 — SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 34 (i).  
 — SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1516 (ii).  
 — SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).  
 — TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1363 (ii).  
 ST. LOUIS LAKE, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 80 (i).  
 ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 34 (i).  
 ST. ROCH DES AULNETS WHARF, COB., REP., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casgrain*) 529 (i).  
 SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS AND LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1146, 1422 (ii).  
 SALMON RIVERS IN QUEBEC, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 224 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 369; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 510; M. for Com. and Amt (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref. to Sel. Stand. Com., 754 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 56.)  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).  
 — TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *McMullen*) 304 (i).  
 — M. for copies\* (Mr. *Trow*) 943 (ii).  
 SAVARY, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 427 (i).  
 SAWDUST AND MILL REFUSE IN OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 370 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 223 (i).  
 SAWDUST IN CANADIAN RIVERS, FINES FOR VIOLATING LAW: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 591 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1082 (ii).  
 SAW LOGS, EXPORTATION AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 304 (i).  
 — EXPORT DUTY: Res. (Mr. *Barron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1480, 1534, 1591 (ii).  
 — IMPORTATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 33 (i).  
 SEAMEN SHIPPING IN U. S. VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING-MASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 468 (i).  
 SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 33 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 57 (i).  
 SECRETARY OF STATE:  
 CAN. TEMP. ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF FINES: Ques. (Mr. *Roome*) 80.  
 — WORKING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 541 (i).  
 CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 234 (i).  
 — DATE OF RECEIPT OF CERTIFICATES FROM JUDGES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 303 (i).  
 CRIMINAL LAWS FOR JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 171 (i).  
 FRANCHISE ACT, AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR ALL SERVICES IN CONNECTION: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Charlton*) 303 (i).  
 LABOR COMMISSION, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1422.  
 LIQUOR LICENSES, ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 249 (i).  
 MONTREAL FLOOD COMMISSION, PRINTING REPORT: M. (Mr. *Curran*) 1687 (ii).  
 PRINTING BUREAU, EXPENDITURE FOR PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 428 (i).  
 SAVARY, CHARLES, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 427 (i).  
 SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 33.  
 VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPARING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 30, 33 (i).  
 — DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 15 (i).  
 SEED WHEAT, MAN., PAYMENT BY SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 590 (i).  
 SEIZURE OF BRITISH SCHOONER BY U. S. CUTTER "WOODBINE": Despatch respecting read (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 510 (i).  
 SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Com. to prepare Lists, 2 (i).  
 — Rep. presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 17 (i).  
 — M. to conc. in Rep. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 18 (i).  
 — M. to add names (Mr. *Laurier*) 169 (i).  
 — M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to add names, 269 (i).  
 Senate and House of Commons Act (Chap. 11 *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 111 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 590 (i).  
 Senate and House of Commons Act (Chap. 11 *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 120 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 787 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 911; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 912 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 10.)  
 SENATOR FOR SHAWINIGAN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1628 (ii).  
 SENATE, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i); conc., 1597 (ii).



SENATE, MESS. TO, SUMMONING SENATOR SANFORD BEFORE  
 PUB. ACCTS. COM.: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 620 (i).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 271 (i).

SETTLERS (OLD) CLAIMS IN MAN.: QUES. (Mr. *La Rivière*)  
 1533 (ii).

SCHREIBER, MR., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 1604; conc.,  
 1615 (ii).

SCOTT, CAPT.: in Com. of Sup., 146 (i).

SCRIP (LAND) OUTSTANDING: QUES. (Mr. *Mulock*) 347, 525.

SCUGOG RIVER: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 1533 (ii).

**Ships' Safety Act (Chap. 77 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B.**  
**No. 54** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 223 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1029; 2<sup>o</sup> and  
 in Com., 1032; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1042 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 22.)  
 Deb. in Com. (Messrs. *Davies* [P. E. I.] and *Mitchell*) 1032; (Mr.  
*Baird*) 1033; (Messrs. *Charlton*, *Gillmor* and *Welsh*) 1034; (Mr.  
*Waldie*) 1025; (Messrs. *Kenny* and *Mulock*) 1036; (Messrs.  
*Jones* [Halifax] and *Freeman*) 1037; (Messrs. *O'Brien* and *Wilson*  
*Elgin*) 1038; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1039; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1039; (Mr. *McKay*)  
 1039; (Mr. *Ellis*) 1040; (Mr. *Riopel*) 1041 (i).

SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. (Mr.  
*Speaker*) 1 (i).

SHELBURNE, RET. OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1.

SHORT LINE (HARVEY AND MONCTON): prop. Res. (Sir *John*  
*A. Macdonald*) 1424 (ii).

**Short Line Ry. (Harvey to Salisbury) B. No.**  
**149** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1424; in  
 Com., 1658; M. to conc. in Res., 1669; Amt. (Mr.  
*Weldon, St. John*) 1672; neg. (Y. 34, N. 70) 1678;  
 Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1679; neg. on a div.,  
 Res. conc. in, 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B. and in Com., 1683; 3<sup>o</sup>\*,  
 1685 (ii).  
 Deb. on Amt. (Messrs. *Ellis* and *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1672; (Mr.  
*Davies, P. E. I.*) 1673; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1674; (Messrs. *Colter*  
 and *Mulock*) 1675; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1677; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard*  
*Cartwright*) 1678 (ii).  
 Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1679; (Messrs. *Davies*,  
 [P. E. I.] *Skinner, Mitchell* and Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1681;  
 (Messrs. *Jones* [Halifax], *Beausoleil* and *Armstrong*) 1684; (Mr.  
*Casey*) 1683 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY., DEFEAT OF B. IN SEN.: Remarks, 1724

— AMOUNT PAID INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OR C. P. R.:  
 QUES. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 769 (i).

— OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW, N. S., TOTAL LENGTH:  
 QUES. (Mr. *Kirk*) 529 (i).

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 740 (i).

— ST. LAWRENCE TO ST. ANDREWS, & C., *vid* SHERBROOKE,  
 MATTAWAMKEAG, & C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kenny*) 541.

SICAMONS ON C. P. R., TO LAKE OKANAGAN, RY. SUBSIDY:  
 prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com.,  
 1629 (ii).

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS FUND: QUES. (Sir *Donald*  
*Smith*) 1710 (ii).

SIMCOE (EAST) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep.  
 (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

SIMMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS FOR CAPE BRETON RY.:  
 QUES. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 871 (ii).

— RETURN OF DEPOSIT TO SURETIES: QUES. (Mr.  
*Cameron*) 677 (i).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: prop. Res. not to sit after 12  
 o'clock (Mr. *Charlton*) 432, 526 (i).

SIX NATION INDIANS, SALE OF LANDS: QUES. (Mr. *Colter*)  
 423 (i).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 970, 1229 (ii).

SMYTH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.:  
 QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 224 (i).

SMYTH AND WEBSTER, MESSRS, IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in  
 Com. of Sup., 956 (ii).

SMELT FISHING IN THE MIRAMICHI: in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).

**South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr.  
*Sutherland*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 269; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 357; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*,  
 510 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

SOUTH ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir  
*John A. Macdonald*) 1572; in Com., 1632 (ii).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY (SALARY): in Com. of Sup., 270 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

STEIN, LEONCE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*)  
 1533 (ii).

**Steamboat Inspection Act (Chap. 78 Rev. Statutes)**  
**Amt. B. No. 130** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 911; 2<sup>o</sup> m.,  
 1043; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1044 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

STEPHENSON, RUFUS, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr.  
*Brien*) 223 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).

**Subsidies (land) to Rys. authorisation B. 152**  
 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 1572; in Com., 1712, 1720;  
 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com. on B., 1720; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1721 (ii). (52  
*Vic.*, c. 4)

**Subsidies (money) to Rys. authorisation B. No.**  
**148** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. (1st) prop., 1396;  
 in Com., 1499; conc. in, 1535. Res. (2nd) prop., 1572;  
 in Com., 1615, 1629; on M. to conc. in 1st Res., Amt.  
 (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; Amt.  
 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1653; M.  
 to conc. in 2nd Res. agreed to (Y. 66, N. 35) 1653;  
 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1654; in Com., 1685; 3<sup>o</sup> m., and  
 Amt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) neg. (Y. 27, N. 48) and  
 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1686 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

SUBSIDIES. *See*

ALBERT SOUTHERN RY. CO.  
 AMHERSTBURG AND LAKE SHORE RY. CO.  
 BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.  
 BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.  
 CAPE TORMENTINE TO MURRAY BAY RY.  
 CAP ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. CO.  
 CENTRAL RY. FROM GRAND LAKES TO I. U. R.  
 CHICOUTIMI RY. CO.  
 CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. CO.  
 DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.  
 FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.  
 GANANOQUE, PERTH AND JAMES' BAY RAILWAY CO. AND THOUSAND  
 ISLANDS RY. CO.  
 GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.  
 GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.  
 HEREFORD RY. CO.  
 IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.  
 JOGGINS RY. CO.  
 KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.  
 LAKE MAN. RY. AND CANAL CO.  
 LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. CO. (Mattawa to Long Sault).  
 MASHINGOÉ AND NIPISSING RY.

**SUBSIDIES—Continued.**

MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RY. Co.  
 NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.  
 NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION Co.  
 NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co. OF CANADA.  
 NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.  
 OCEAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.  
 ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. Co.  
 OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. Co.  
 PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. Co.  
 PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. Co.  
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. Co.  
 QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY.  
 QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY.  
 RED DEER VALLEY RY. AND COAL Co.  
 ST. ANDREWS TO C. P. R. AT OR EAST OF LACHUTE RY.  
 SIOAMONS ON C. P. R. TO LAKE OKANAGAN RY.  
 SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co.  
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. Co.  
 ST. CÉSAIRE TO ST. PAUL D'ABBOTTSFORD RY.  
 ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL Co.  
 SHUSWAP AND LAKE OKANAGAN RY.  
 TRURO TO NEWPORT RY.  
 THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. Co.

See "RAILWAYS," "SUPPLY," &c.

SUBSIDY TO P. E. I. : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 15 (i).  
 SUBWAY, STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 16 (i).  
 SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS, SALE : Ques. (Mr. Barron) 426 (i).  
**Summary Convictions.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."  
**Summary Trials.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."  
 SUMMERSIDE (P. E. I.) HARBOR, SURVEY AND BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 303 (i), 1423 (ii).  
 SUNDAY TRAFFIC ON CANALS : M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Rykert) 304 (i).  
**Supply B. No. 147** (Mr. Foster). Res. conc. in, 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\* and 3<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1712 (ii). (52 Vic., c. 1.)

**SUPPLY :**

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Ques. of Procedure (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 43; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) Fisheries and Trade Relations with U. S., 323; deb. adjd., 346; rsmd., 385; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Unrestricted Reciprocity, 468; neg. (Y. 77, N. 121) 739 (i); Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) Jesuits' Estates Act, 813; neg. (Y. 13, N. 186) 910; Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Recent Loan, 946, 1044; Amt., 1147; neg. (Y. 74, N. 117) 1169; Amt. (Mr. Flynn) Cape Breton Ry., 1182; Amt. (Mr. Holton) Customs Seizures, 1285; neg. (Y. 71, N. 111) 1314; Amt. Mr. Fisher) Intoxicants in N. W. T., 1331; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 1351; Remarks (Mr. Charlton, &c.) Export Duty on Logs, 1480; Amt. (Mr. Barron) 1488; neg. (Y. 62, N. 91) 1494; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) Militia Clothing, 1542; neg. (Y. 54, N. 95) 1569; Remarks (Mr. Prior) Behring's Sea Seizures, 1575; Remarks (Mr. Barnard) Duty on Mining Machinery, 1583; Amt. (Mr. Barron) Duty on Saw Logs, 1585; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1594; Amt. (Mr. Ross) Man. Rys., 1692; neg. on a div, 1693; Remarks (Mr. Charlton) Jesuits' Estates Act, 1692 (ii).  
 MESS. from His Ex., transmitting Estimates for 1889-90, 30 (i); Suppl. for 1888-89, 1018; Suppl. for 1889-90, 1467; further Suppl. for 1889-90, 1627 (ii).  
 RES. (Mr. Foster) for Com., 13; in Com., 48, 138, 196, 270, 287, 423, 739, 788 (i), 912, 947, 1047, 1064, 1169, 1203, 1223, 1234, 1315, 1352, 1447, 1494, 1501, 1570, 1595.

**COMMITTEE :**

*Administration of Justice.* See "Justice."

**SUPPLY—Continued.**

**COMMITTEE—Continued.**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :*

Census and Statistics, 298 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).  
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1512 (ii).  
 Dairying Interests (development) 1513 (ii).  
 Experimental Farms, 288 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).  
 Fruit Growing Interest (development) 1513 (ii).  
 Health Statistics, 287 (i); conc., 1598 (ii).  
*Patent Record*, conc., 1598.

*Canals.* See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

*Charges of Management :*

Brokerage, &c., on Sinking Fund, 204 (i).  
 Country Savings Banks, 203 (i).  
 Dominion Loans reduced, 204 (i).  
 General Vote, 48 (i).  
 Printing Dominion Notes, 205 (i).

*Civil Government :*

Agriculture Dept., 71 (i).  
 Auditor General's Office, 66 (i).  
 Civil Service Examiners, 203 (i).  
 Contingencies, Departmental :  
     General Vote, 155 (i).  
     High Commissioner's Office, 198 (i), 1593, 1597.  
     Post Office and Finance Depts., 1503 (ii).  
 Departments generally (special messenger), 1503.  
 Customs Dept., 67, 152, 155 (i).  
 Finance and Treasury Board, 66 (i).  
 Fisheries Dept., 148 (i).  
 Governor General's Secretary's Office, 49 (i).  
 High Commissioner's Office, London, 151 (i).  
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 65 (i), 1502 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue Dept., 66 (i).  
 Interior, Dept. of, 58; 62, 63 (i), 1502 (ii).  
     Geological Survey, 58 (i).  
 Justice Dept., 49 (i).  
     Penitentiaries Branch, 54 (i).  
 Marine Dept., 138 (i); conc., 1614 (ii).  
 Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 54 (i).  
 Mounted Police, 62, 151, 152 (i).  
 Postmaster General's Dept., 68 (i).  
 Printing and Stationery Dept., 57 (i), 1593 (ii).  
 Privy Council Office 49 (i), 1501 (ii).  
 Public Works Dept., 148 (i).  
 Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 151 (i), 1504 (ii); conc., 1615 (ii).  
 Secretary of State's Dept., 57 (i).

*Collection of Revenues :*

Adulteration of Food, 1227 (ii).  
 Canals :  
     Repairs and Working Expenses, 1211, 1495 (ii).  
 Customs :  
     Chinese Immigration Act (administration) 1221.  
     Detective Service (outside) 1221 (ii).  
     Miscellaneous, 1461 (ii).  
     Nova Scotia, 1217 (ii).  
 Dominion Lands (Income) 1240; conc., 1607 (ii).  
 Forestry Commissioner's Salary, 1233 (ii).

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

## Collection of Revenues—Continued.

## Excise :

- Officers and Inspectors (salaries) 1223 (ii).
- Officers in Distilleries and Factories, 1225 (ii).
- Preventive Service, 1224 (ii).

## Minor Revenues, 1229, 1495 (ii).

## Post Office, 1234, 1461, 1596 (ii).

## Public Works :

- Esquimaux and Lévis Graving Docks, 1232 (ii).
- Slide and Boom Dues (collection) 1229 (ii).
- Telegraph, P.E.I., and Mainland, 1233 (ii).
- Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 1233 (ii).

## Railways :

- Intercolonial, Repairs and Working Expenses, 1074, 1496 (ii).

## Weights and Measures :

- Inspector's and Asst. Inspector's Salaries, 1226, 1496 (ii).

*Customs.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Dominion Lands.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Dominion Police :*

- General Vote, 211 (i).

*Excise.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Fisheries :*

- General Vote, 1074 conc., 1607 (ii).

*Geological Survey :*

- General Vote, 1079 (ii).

*Government Steamers.* See "Ocean and River Service."

*Immigration :*

- Agent, Montreal, 947 (ii).
- Assistant Agent, Victoria, B.C., 957 (ii).
- Contingencies, Canadian Agency, 962 (ii).
- Immigration and Immigration Expenses, 1319, 1498; conc., 1611 (ii).

*Indians :*

- British Columbia, 1178 (ii).
- Man. and N.W.T., 1173, 1595.
- Man. (Industrial Schools) 1177 (ii).
- Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B. generally:
  - Annuities under Robinson Treaty, 1171 (ii).
  - Dingman, A., payment *re* Dundee Lands, 1172, 1451 (ii).
  - Quebec (relief of distress) 1169 (ii).
  - Removal of Indians from Oka to Gibson, 1171.
  - Schools, 1170 (ii).
- Prince Edward Island, 1173 (ii).

*Insurance :*

- Superintendence, Expenses in connection, 1361 (ii).

*Justice, Administration of :*

- Clerk, Exchequer Court, 205 (i).
- Judges' Salaries, 207 (i).
- Judges Boswell and Gowan (refund) 1362 (ii).
- Miscellaneous, including N. W. T., 205 (i).
- Printing, &c., Supreme Court Reports, 205 (i).
- Supreme Court, Senior Messenger, 205 (i).

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

## Legislation :

## House of Commons :

- Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c., 271 (i).
- Contingencies, conc., 1593 (ii).
- Deputy Speaker's Salary, 270 (i).
- Elections (payment to J. Wilson as Returning Officer) 1362 (ii).
- Franchise Act (expenses) 1511 (ii); conc., 1615 (ii).
- Library of Parliament, 272 (i).
- Laws: Printing, Binding, &c., 272 (i).
- Printing, Paper and Binding, 272 (i).
- Returning Officers (payment) 1511 (ii).
- Salaries, Clerk's Estimate, 270 (i).
- Voters' List, Printing, 271 (i).

## Senate :

- Salaries and Contingencies, 207 (i); conc., 1597.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

- Buoys, Lights, Fog Whistles, &c. (maintenance) 975, 1450 (ii).
- Lighthouses and Fog Alarms (completion, &c.) 1361 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

- Halifax and St. John (either) and W. Indies and S. America (either) 1701 (ii).
- King, Jas., compensation for cancelling Contract, 1451 (ii).
- Magdalen Islands, 1261, 1450 (ii).
- New Westminster and Victoria, 1532 (ii).
- P. E. I. and Mainland, 1261 (ii).
- St. John and Ports in Basin of Minas, 1262 (ii).
- St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 1532 (ii).

*Marine Hospitals :*

- Marine and Immigrant Hospital, Que., 976 (ii).
- Hospitals in Que., N.S., N.B., P.E.I. and B.C., 977.

*Meteorological Service.* See "Scientific Institutions."

*Militia :*

- Ammunition, Cartridge Factory, Clothing, &c., 793 (i), 1352 (ii).
- Armories, care of Arms, &c., 793 (i).
- Drill Sheds, Construction and Repairs, 795 (i).
- Drill Pay, conc., 1593 (ii).
- Military College, 1357 (ii).
- Military College, House for Commandant, 1693; conc., 1705 (ii).
- Permanent Forces, Cavalry, &c., Schools, 796 (i).
- Rifled Ordnance, improved, 794 (i).

*Miscellaneous :*

- American Association of Science, aid to entertaining, 1697 (ii).
- Banff, Survey, Roads, Bridges, &c., 1180 (ii).
- Costs in litigated matters, 1460 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, 1180 (ii).
- Examining Lands in C.P.R. Belt, 1570 (ii).
- Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, 1179, 1361 (ii).
- Govt. in N.W.T.; Printing, Roads, Bridges, Ferries, Schools, &c. (expenses) 1179 (ii).

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Miscellaneous*—Continued.

- Griffin, W. H., Ex-Dop. P. M. G., 1453 (ii).  
 Jukes, Dr., Medical Services, 1571 (ii).  
 Jugements du Conseil Souverain, Vol. IV., 1453 (ii).  
 Labor Commission, 1497; conc., 1614 (ii).  
 Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, 1543 (ii).  
 N. W. T., Inspectors', Registrars and Clerks Salaries, &c., 1180, 1215 (ii).  
 Printing Bureau and Binding, 1571 (ii).  
 St. Lawrence River Survey, 1461 (ii).  
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. vs. Queen, Costs, 1455 (ii).

*Mounted Police* :

- General Vote, 1212 (ii).  
 Supplementary Vote, 1451, 1497 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* :

- Govt Steamers, maintenance and repairs, 974 (ii).  
 River and Water Police, Mont. and Que., 974 (ii).  
 Wrecks and Shipping Disasters, 974 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* :

- British Columbia, 222 (i).  
 Dorchester, 1507 (ii).  
 Kingston, 211 (i), 1509; conc., 1615 (ii).  
 Manitoba, 216 (i), 1507; conc., 1597 (ii).  
 St. Vincent de Paul, 1315, 1510 (ii).

*Pensions* :

- Compensation in lieu of Land, 788 (i).  
 Delaney, Mrs., 739 (i).  
 Gowanlock, Mrs., 792 (i).  
 Lady Cartier, 423 (i).  
 Veterans of War of 1812, 788 (i).

*Police.* See "Dominion Police."*Post Office.* See "Collection of Revenues."*Public Works\*—Capital* :

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, N. B., 802 (i).  
 Kingston Graving Dock, 801 (ii).  
 Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River, 801 (i).  
 St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 1516 (ii).

*Public Works—Income* :

## Buildings :

- British Columbia, 1528 (ii).  
 New Brunswick, 805 (i); conc., 1599 (ii).  
 Ontario, 806 (i), 1519 (ii).  
 Quebec 806 (i); 1362 (ii).  
 North-West Territories, 807 (i), 1527 (ii).  
 Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:  
 Dom. Immigration Buildings, 919 (ii).  
 Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa, 918 (ii).  
 Major's Hill Park, conc., 1599 (ii).  
 Rideau Hall, 913 (ii).  
 Nova Scotia, 1518 (ii).  
 Prince Edward Island, 1519 (ii).

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Public Works—Income*—Continued.

## Dredging :

- Lake Manitoba, 970 (ii).  
 New Plant, 1448 (ii).  
 P. E. I. and N. B., 968; conc., 1600 (ii).

## Experimental Farm, 971 (ii).

## Harbors and Rivers :

- British Columbia, 931 (ii).  
 Manitoba, 931 (ii).  
 Maritime Provinces generally, 910, 1448 (ii).  
 New Brunswick, 924, 1447, 1530; conc., 1615 (ii).  
 Nova Scotia, 807 (i), 913, 1417, 1523; conc., 1579 (ii).  
 Ontario, 928, 1531; conc., 1579 (ii).  
 Prince Edward Island, 919, 1529 (ii).  
 Quebec, 927, 1448, 1531 (ii).

## Miscellaneous: Surveys and Inspections, 1450.

## Roads and Bridges, 970; conc., 1615 (ii).

## Belly River Bridge at Lethbridge, 1532 (ii).

## Ottawa River and City Bridges, 1449 (ii).

## Slides and Booms, 970 (ii).

## Telegraph Lines, 971, 1532 (ii).

*Quarantine* :

- General Vote, 931 (ii).  
 Public Health, precautionary measures, 932 (ii).

*Railways and Canals\*—Capital* :

## Canals (conc., 1601) (ii) :

- Cornwall, 1205 (ii).  
 Lachine, 1205 (ii).  
 Murray, conc., 1614 (ii).  
 Sault Ste. Marie, 1202 (ii).  
 Tay, 1211 (i).

## Trent River Navigation, 1207 (ii).

## Welland (deepening) 1207 (ii).

## Williamsburg, 1205 (ii).

## Railways conc., 1601 (ii) :

## Canadian Pacific (Arbitration) 1047 (ii).

## Cape Breton Ry., 1069 (ii).

## Intercolonial, conc., 1607 (ii) :

## Halifax, increased accommodation, 1048 (ii).

## Land Damages, Legal Expenses, &amp;c., 1597 (ii).

## Moncton, increased accommodation, 1048 (ii).

## Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 1073; conc., 1603.

## Richmond, Shed extension to repair Cars, 1064.

## Rolling Stock, 1049; conc., 1614 (ii).

## St. John, extension of City Front, 1068 (ii).

## ———, increased accommodation, 1063 (ii).

## Supplementary Vote, 1498 (ii).

*Railways and Canals\*—Income* :

## Canals :

- Rideau, 1211 (ii).  
 Welland, 1514 (ii).

*Scientific Institutions* :

## Meteorological Service, 976 (ii).

\* See "Collection of Revenues"

\* For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Steamship Subventions.* See "Mail Subsidies."

*Superannuation:*

Railways, allowance to W. Wallace, 1597 (ii).

*Territorial Accounts:*

Militia Expenses, re Rebellion in N. W. T., 1461.

*Unprovided Items*, 1494 (ii).

## CONCURRENCE:

Census and Statistics, 1598 (ii).

Dredging, P. E. I., N. S. and N. B., 1600 (ii).

Dominion Lands Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to reduce vote, 1607; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1611 (ii).

Experimental Farms, 1598 (ii).

Fisheries, 1607 (ii).

Franchise Act, Dom., 1615 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers, Ont. and N. S., 1599; N. B., 1615.

Health Statistics, 1598 (ii).

House of Commons, Contingencies, 1598 (ii).

Intercolonial Ry., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) to reduce Vote, 1604; neg. (Y. 39 N. 71) 1607 (ii).

Immigration, Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to reduce Vote, 1611; neg. (Y. 39, N. 71) 1613 (ii).

I. C. R., Rolling Stock, 1614 (ii).

Kingston Penitentiary, 1615 (ii).

Labor Commission, 1614 (ii).

Marine Dept., Salaries, Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) re C. C. Chipman, neg. (Y. 33, N. 65) 1614 (ii).

Man. Penitentiaries, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to reduce Vote, 1597; neg. (Y. 47, N. 73) 1598 (ii).

Militia (drill pay), 1598 (ii).

Military College, Commandant's House, 1705 (ii).

Murray Canal, 1614 (ii).

Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction, Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1603; neg. (Y. 39, N. 70) 1604 (ii).

*Patent Record*, 1598 (ii).

Public Buildings, N. B., 1599 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1601; neg. (Y. 40, N. 73) 1603.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1599 (ii).

Rys. and Canals, Mr. *Schreiber's* Salary, 1615 (ii).

Roads and Bridges, 1615 (ii).

Senate, Salaries and Contingencies, 1597 (ii).

SUPPLIES, MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B.

No. 105 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 556; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 737 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 49 (i).

Supreme Court B. No. 95 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1°, 370 (i).

SUPREME COURT REPORTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).

TARIFF, FRENCH EDITION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1266 (ii).

—— CHANGES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1221 (ii).

TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 1211 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ACQUISITION BY GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Denison*) for Sel. Com., 80 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 971, 1233, 1532 (ii).

Telephone, Telegraph, &c., Co.'s Wires (Toronto) B. No. 78 (Mr. *Small*). 1°, 322; 2°, 397 (i).

Telephone, Telegraph, &c., Wires B. No. 112 (Mr. *Perley*). 1°, 620 (i).

TÉMISCOUATA RY. CO., SHAREHOLDERS, SHARES AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 24 (i).

—— SUBSIDY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 943 (ii).

—— AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 676 (i).

TENDERS FOR CANAL WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 593.

TENDERS, TRANSLATION OF FORMS: Remarks, 1535 (ii).

TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, SALE OR LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 427 (i).

THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1573; in Com., 1641 (ii).

Threats, Intimidations, &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Three Rivers and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. *Riopel*). 1°, 468; 2°, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

TIGNISH BREAKWATER: on M. for Com. of Sup., 1222 (ii).

—— REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1146 (ii).

Timber and Lumber Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 469; in Com., 651; 1° of B., 669 (i).

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 661, 663; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 662; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 662, 666; (Mr. *Cook*) 663; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 662, 665; (Mr. *Kirk*) 664; (Messrs. *Ives and Charlton*) 665; (Messrs. *Parley and Mills, Bothwell*) 667; (Mr. *Edwards*) 668; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 669 (i).

TITLE AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE CO., REP. OF STANDING COM.: M. to ref. back (Sir *Donald A. Smith*) 620 (i).

TODD'S PARLIAMENTARY GOVT, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1600 (ii).

Tolls and Dues Collection B. No. 122 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 811; 2° and in Com., 912; 3°, 1117 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Small*). Rule suspended, 1°, 2° and 3°, 1262 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 100.)

TORONTO SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, BREAD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1082 (ii).

TOWN SITES IN N. W. T., RECEIPTS FROM SALES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 29 (i).

TRACY, A. R., ARREST AND SEIZURE OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1016 (ii).

TRADE AND NAVIGATION TABLES: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 3.

TRADE RELATIONS (AND FISHERIES) WITH U.S.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 323; neg. (Y. 65, N. 108) 423 (i).

TRADE COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AMERICA, SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 30 (i).

TRAVELLING EXPENSES AND CAB-HIRE: in Com. of Sup., 156, 168 (i).

TREATIES (COMMERCIAL) WITH FOREIGN STATES: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172; neg. (Y. 66, N. 94) 193.

- Tree Peddlers, &c., prevention of Fraud B. No. 6** (Mr. *Boyle*). 1°\*, 13 (i); 2° m., 1100; Amt. (Mr. *Brown*) 6 m. h., neg. on a div., 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1102 (ii).
- TRENT RIVER NAV.**: in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONERS' REP.**: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 20, 655, 676 (i), 872 (ii).
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. No. 103** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 524; 2°, 774; in Com., 775; 3°\*, 735 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- TURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1396; in Com., 1501 (ii).
- Trusts and Combinations.** See "FREE LIST." "COMBINATIONS."
- TUPPER, HON. CHAS. H., MEMBER FOR PICTOU**: introduced, 1.
- Union Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79** (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°\*, 322; 2°\*, 510; in Com., 792 (i); 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Bryson*) to recom., neg. on a div., 854; 3°, 855; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1233 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- U. S. AND COMMERCIAL UNION**: Telegram *re* Hitt's Res. read (Mr. *Charlton*) 384 (i).
- U. S., INVITATION TO MEMBERS TO VISIT**: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 34 (i).
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS**: in Com. of Sup., 1494 (ii).
- UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY.** See "RECIPROCITY."
- VANANCIES**: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VALIQUETTE, SERGEANT, PENSION TO FAMILY**: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
- VENTILATION OF CHAMBER**: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
- VETERANS OF 1812**: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, COST OF MAINTENANCE, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1081 (ii).
- Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32** (Mr. *Prior*). 1°\*, 138; 2°\*, 239; in Com. and 3°\*, 424 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- VINCENT, JOSEPH E., AND FRENCH EDITION OF TARIFF**: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 935 (ii)
- VOLUNTEERS (9TH BATTALION) DISCIPLINE**: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1327 (ii).
- VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN PREPARING, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 30 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 15 (i).
- PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 271 (i).
- WALDIE, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALTON**: introduced, 13 (i).
- WALLACE, W., PAYMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 1597 (ii).
- Wand, A.** See "DIVORCE."
- WAYS AND MEANS**: prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).
- Remarks *re* Millers of Ont. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1711 (ii).
- WEBSTER, W. A., SUMS PAID FOR SERVICES**: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 303; M. for Ret.,\* 303 (i).
- EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 979 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1320 (ii).
- Weights and Measures Act (Chap. 104 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 79; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 195 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES**: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1496 (ii).
- WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING**: in Com. of Sup., 1207, 1514 (ii).
- WATER POWER, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Rykert*) 304 (i).
- WEST BAY, N. S., CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER**: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427 (i).
- Western Counties Ry. B. No. 127** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 871; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1043 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS**: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1498 (ii).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS FROM U.S.**: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*) 33 (i).
- WHISKEY, ILLICIT MANUFACTURE**: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 935.
- WHITE, ROBERT S., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARDWELL**: introduced, 1 (i).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL**: in Com. of Sup., 1205 (ii).
- WILSON, J., PAYMENT AS RETURNING OFFICER**: in Com. of Sup., 1362 (ii).
- WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S, COR., &c**: M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 529 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 532; (Mr. *Kenny*) 534; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 535; (Mr. *Jones, Digby*) 536; (Gen. *Laurie*) 536; (Mr. *Freeman*) 537; (Mr. *Putnam*) 537; (Mr. *Lovitt*) 538; (Sir *John Thompson*) 538; (Mr. *Borden*) 539 (i).
- Winnipeg and Assiniboia River Water Power B. No. 63** (Mr. *Watson*). 1°\*, 269; 2°\*, 357 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 855 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- Winding-Up Act (Chap. 129 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 98** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 424, 2° m., 659; 2° and in Com., 660; 3°\*, 763 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- Winnipeg and North Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 82** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°\*, 346; 2°\*, 397; in Com. and 3°\*, 663. (52 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- Wires.** See "Telephone."
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°\*, 589; 2°\*, 663 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 921 (ii). (52 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- Wrecking, &c., in Canadian Waters B. No. 7** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°, 15; 2° m., 256; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. deb., 258; agreed to, 259 (i); withdn, 1107 (ii).
- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Can. Waters B. No. 2** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°\*, 13; 2° m., 250; 2° and M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 255; agreed to, 256; Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 384; B., in Com. 607; 3° m., 755; Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom., 757; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761; 3°, 761 (i). (52 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- Deb. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 607, 618; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 608, 614; (Mr. *Kenny*) 608, 610; (Mr. *Bowell*) 608; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 608, 610, 616; (Mr. *Charlton*) 608, 619; (Mr. *Labelle*) 611; (Mr. *Mulock*) 611; (Messrs. *Waldie and Curran*) 612; (Messrs. *Edgar, Dawson and Cook*) 613; (Mr. *Wellon, St. John*) 614; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 615, 618; (Mr. *Masson*) 618; (Mr. *Sproule*) 619; (Messrs. *Mills [Bothwell], Patterson [Essex] and Hesson*) 620 (i).
- Deb. on Amt. to M. for 3° (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 757; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 759; (Messrs. *Casey and Sir Donald Smith*) 760; (Messrs. *Bowell, Labelle and Mitchell*) 761; neg. (Y. 56, N. 108) 761 (i).
- WRECKS AND SHIPPING DISASTERS**: in Com. of Sup., 974 (ii).
- WRIGHT, ALLAN, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).
- WRIGHT, E. P., REFUND OF DUTY ON MINING MACHINERY**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Edwards*) 942 (ii).
- YARMOUTH CO., N. S., PUBLIC WORKS**: Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 34 (i).
- YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 85 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 428 (i).
- YOUNG AND FRONT OF ESSEX TOWNSHIPS, PETS., &c., TO DISALLOW UNION ACT OF ONT. LEGISLATURE**: M. for copies (Mr. *Taylor*) 436 (i).